

GAUDIUM ET SPES AND THE CHANGES IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC THINKING: FORTY YEARS AFTER

Uzochukwu Jude Njoku
Catholic Diocese of Umuahia, Nigeria.
uzonjoku@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper argues that historical and hermeneutical approaches are among the best ways of reading and appreciating an ecclesiastical document. The historical approach emphasises that the document in question is shaped by the questions, hopes and visions of its time. The hermeneutical approach appropriates the basic inspirations and concerns of the document and seeks to use them as tools in confronting contemporary problems. This approach does not make the past obsolete neither does it remain stuck in its repetition. It rather attempts to use the raw materials of the past in order to construct visions for the present and the future. *Gaudium et spes* is a product of the visions and hopes of the 1960s. However, the forty years, which separate 1965 (the year of its promulgation) and 2005 have experienced different visions, hopes and questions. These are reflected in the arguments of subsequent ecclesiastical documents. Within this context, there may be the danger of regarding the relevance of *Gaudium et spes* as minimal in contemporary debates. On the contrary, this paper uses the hermeneutical approach to emphasise that the signification of *Gaudium et spes* which hinges on its character of *social sensitivity* transcends the evolving changes in socio-economic thinking and cuts across historical and cultural divides.

Introduction

There are different ways of appreciating the relevance of an ecclesiastical document like *Gaudium et spes*. One of such approaches is to see it as a book of ready-made answers. This methodology may lead to a situation whereby the specific words of the document assume the forms of fundamentalist reference points. Another approach is to look at such a document as a hermeneutical key. In this case, its relevance transcends its own specific words and logic. From this context, the use of the document itself goes beyond a repetition of its verses and assumes a reflection on its signification and spirit.

Both methodologies are evident in theological discussions and directions of theological studies in different institutions. One of the aims of this paper is to indicate that if the first path constitutes the major thrust of our use or reading of an ecclesiastical document, then we would sooner than later discover that the specific words of such a document may not offer us sufficient tools for on-going debates with the realities of life. Secondly, we would also come to realise that the ideals and recommendations of such a document are often intricately tied to the historical visions of its time. This could mean that when the changing tides of human history open a different horizon, that the recommendations of such a document may become obsolete or fall under serious question marks. On the other hand, the second path has the advantage of making use of the basic spirit of the document and challenging our

imaginings, awakening our consciousness to present and future problems and furnishing us with the possibilities of creatively entering into dialogue with them. While this approach does not despise the words of the document itself, it uses them more as vehicles of meaning, which could enable the scholar to construct visions for the future while not isolating the past.

In order to specifically argue for the second approach against the first, this paper discusses *Gaudium et spes* from the angle of the changes, which have taken place in socio-economic thinking since its promulgation in 1965. The aim here is to show that this document is a product of the insights, hopes and arguments of its age; that it was written within a particular historical and ideological background, which characterised the 1950s and a large part of the 1960s. Between 1965 and 2005, socio-economic thinking has changed significantly. It has moved from purely economic analysis (modernisation theory) to political analysis (dependency theory) and cultural analysis. Each of these changes has considerably affected the arguments and assumptions of *Gaudium et spes*. Consequently, if our appreciation of *Gaudium et spes* in the 21st century restricts itself to a fundamentalist and closed reading of its specific words, then we may sooner than later appear as students who have the wrong text books in the wrong classroom.

The Modernisation Theory as a Background to *Gaudium et spes*

Gaudium et spes was promulgated in December 1965 as the last document of the Second Vatican Council. The year 1965 fell within a broader historical period (spanning between the 1950s and 1960s) in which profound changes were taking place that humanity was considered being on the threshold of a new era.¹ This period was also characterised by optimism on the prospects of development, which were offshoots of three factors. The first was the success of the US Marshall plan in rebuilding Western Europe after the destructions of the Second World War. Secondly, the period in question radiated an increasing technological growth, abundance and a more optimistic Western Europe and North America. Thirdly, the United Nations Organisation appeared as a guarantor of world peace.

These conditions may have inspired the convocation of an international conference in Bandung in 1955 to discuss the problem of inequities between the rich and poor countries.² The proposals of the Bandung conference played a major role in the United Nations' declaration of the 1960s as a 'Decade of Development'.³ Its aim was that "the rich would provide to the poor, either by outright gifts or long term loans, sufficient capital for them to replicate the process that had brought prosperity to First World Nations."⁴ President John F. Kennedy of the United States of America, followed the steps of the United Nations Organisation and launched an 'Alliance for Progress.' He did this in order to infuse "U.S. know-how, technology, and capital to spur development" in Latin America.⁵

This vision of development has been categorised as the modernisation theory. Scholars of this school of thought adopted the social evolutionary theory to interpret the disparities between the developed and underdeveloped countries. "Since the evolutionary theory helped them to explain the transition from traditional to modern society in Western Europe in the nineteenth century, many modernisation researchers

thought that it would shed some light on the modernisation of Third world countries.”⁶ The modernisation theory aimed at a complete transformation of a traditional or pre-modern society into the forms of social organisations that constitute the ‘advanced’, economically prosperous nations of the West.⁷ Development from this point becomes Westernisation and it unreservedly “assumed that development and economic growth were synonymous.”⁸

It attempted to explain underdevelopment from the perspective of the lack of capital and “the absence of features that have apparently made the United States (and Western Europe) successful: a business ethos that stresses productivity, competition, profit, available capital, a stable political system and successful technology.”⁹ It argued that development would come about by promoting economic growth through an infusion of capital, which will lead to industrialisation and eventual prosperity.¹⁰ It also argued that an injection of the economic features of Western Europe and the USA into the poorer countries would obliterate poverty and create prosperity for all. Proponents of this school of thought were therefore optimistic that the gap between development and underdevelopment could be closed within a timeframe and through an arithmetic formula. In the words of B. Ward,

when we look back to the 1960s, we can see most of us caught up in the euphoria of economic growth. It seemed clear that, thanks to the Keynesian revolution of ‘demand management’, developed societies had virtually solved their problems. We would gallop forward to the society of high consumption, there to enjoy its felicities – whatever they might prove to be. At the same time, behind us would follow the developing world by ‘stages of growth’, and the wealth created in the process would inevitably trickle down until it reached the poorest.¹¹

The modernisation theory was a historical product of three events in the period after the Second World War.¹² The first of these is the rise of the United States of America as a super power after the war and its major role in the reconstruction of the war devastated Western Europe. Development therefore came to be seen as a way of reproducing the society models of America.¹³ Secondly, the Soviet Union who equally emerged a strong power after the war began to spread a united world communist movement. The third factor was consequent on the second. It consisted of the attempt by United States of America and Western Europe to promote an economic stability among the newly independent Third world countries to avoid losing them to the Soviet bloc.

Gaudium et spes’ economic vision built heavily on the presuppositions of the modernisation theory – which (among other things) argued that availability of capital in the poorer countries (through aid and investment) would help to bridge the gap between poor and rich countries. *Gaudium et spes* (to a large extent), accepted this vision. This could be buttressed through a careful study of the uses of justice and charity in the document. It used the word ‘justice’ twenty eight times, more than the twenty four times it used ‘charity’. Nevertheless, its view of social organisation and strengthening the bonds of interaction among people was placed on the basis that charity should perfect justice (See *Gaudium et spes*, no. 72) and that charity ought to go “beyond what justice can provide.” (*Gaudium et spes*, no. 78). Hence it argued for a universal brotherhood flowing from the examples of the life of Christ and an international solidarity expressing itself in the “awareness of the responsibility of experts to aid and even to protect men, the desire to make the conditions of life more

favourable to all” (*Gaudium et spes*, no. 57) and in human and financial aids, investments and gifts, professional training and loans to developing nations (*Gaudium et spes*, no. 58).

Paul VI’s *Populorum progressio* which was published in 1967 also fell within the historical period when the modernisation theory consisted a major tool of economic thinking. Although it argued that “development cannot be limited to mere economic growth,”¹⁴ it however shared (with *Gaudium et spes*) the basic optimism and visions of the modernisation theory. The admonition of the encyclical that developed countries should give aid, grants and technical assistance to the developing countries display a subscription to the tenets of the modernisation theory, which propounds among other things, that the gap between the rich and poor countries could be narrowed through the giving of aids, technological assistance and by introducing the same conditions prevalent in the rich countries. Such statements in the encyclical as, “today the peoples in hunger are making a dramatic appeal to the peoples blessed with abundance”,¹⁵ implies that the poor countries are looking up to the richer countries not only for immediate financial assistance, but also as models of what they ought to become.

The Dependency Theory: From Economics to Politics

The dependency theory arose in an attempt to explain the failures of the modernisation theory.¹⁶ “After the ‘Decade of Development’, the gap between the rich and poor nations had actually increased rather than diminished.¹⁷ What ever benefits those at the bottom accrued were disproportionately small compared to the large benefits of those at the top.”¹⁸ On the part of the ‘Alliance for Progress’, the promises it offered were not realised, instead “it appeared to bring increasing American interference in the political economies of various countries.”¹⁹ The failures of these programmes to alleviate the problems of poverty in Africa, Asia and Latin America created the climate in which the analyses of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) aided the emergence of the dependency theory.

“The dependency school first arose in Latin America as a response to the bankruptcy of the program of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) in the early 1960s.”²⁰ Though this commission did not record much success to its favour, it made some analysis that later became a tool for the dependency school. In the first place it indicated that the world consists of a core of developed industrial nations and a periphery of underdeveloped nations. Secondly it highlighted that though the core and the periphery nations had some economic ties especially through trade and investments, these links only prevented true development among the periphery nations. It argued that these trade links were so designed that the nations at the periphery work for the advantage of the core nations. These periphery nations were made to depend on the economies of the core nations. Hence this commission recommended inward-looking import substitution, industrialisation and other strategies as ways of breaking out of the inequitable relationship of dependence.²¹

“These notions put forward by the ECLA were taken over by other Latin American social scientists who refined, modified and radicalised them.”²² Hence the dependency school came to perceive the failures of the modernisation theory from the perspective

of fundamentally unjust relations between ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ nations. They described the relationship between these two groups of nations as neo-colonialism.

The tool of analysis in this case changed from purely economics and insufficient capital to politics and unjust structures of dominative exploitation. The catch-phrase in this analysis was transformed from poverty to impoverishment. Clearly, core nations dominated the economics of developing countries through investments, trade, subsidies, and military aid. Simultaneously, they forged internal political alliances with ruling elites, who attempted to ensure a stable social climate for their interests through repressive measures. Such economic and social relationships actually negated the possibility of genuine development²³ but rather perpetuated underdevelopment.²⁴

While the modernisation school focused attention only “on happenings within the boundaries of the developing nations. The dependency approach broke out of this strait-jacket and identified the world economy as the principal object of analysis.”²⁵ The dependency school showed that the blame for underdevelopment should not be on the inability of the periphery nations to grow but on the economic relationship with the core nations.

This thought pattern became a tool in the socio-economic analysis of the Latin American Liberation theologians. It offered a lens through which they interpreted the poverty of their continent. This interpretation of poverty gained access to the commissions preparing for the Second Conference of the Latin American Bishops in Medellin.²⁶

The application of the dependency theory with the consequent prominence of the language of liberation during the course of the Medellin conference brought Paul VI to a new awareness of international socio-economic problems. His apostolic letter, *Octogesima adveniens* (1971) would accept having “seen in a new perspective the grave problems of our time” (*Octogesima adveniens*, no. 3) and would eventually critically accept some of the basic insights of the dependency theory and liberation theology. It would accept that the “flagrant inequalities” which “exist in the economic, cultural and political development of nations”²⁷ have unfortunately created a situation whereby “some nations or groups are poor not because they have so far failed to climb the ladder but because they have been prevented by others from doing so – or have even been thrown down the ladder!”²⁸ Hence it argued in article 46 for a transition from a purely economic analysis (the language of development) to political analysis (the language of liberation). J. Finn would remark that the analyses of *Octogesima adveniens* consisted of its appreciation of political power and its role in the question of world poverty.²⁹ This new impression would reflect in the documents, which emanated from the Vatican between 1971 till the end of Paul VI’s pontificate. Among these include Paul VI’s *Octogesima adveniens* (1971) and *Evangelii nuntiandi* (1975) and the synod of Bishops’ document (1971) *Justitia in mundo*.

The first chapter of *Justitia in Mundo* underscored a departure from the tool of modernisation theory, which was employed by both *Gaudium et spes* and *Populorum progressio*.

In the last twenty-five years a hope has spread through the human race that economic growth would bring about such a quantity of goods that it would be possible to feed the hungry at least with the

crumbs falling from the table, but this has proved a vain hope in underdeveloped areas and in pockets of poverty in wealthier areas.³⁰

Its reference to “international systems of domination”, which manifests itself when the decisions concerning the income, investment and trade of three quarters of the human race are placed in the hands of just one third (chp. 1) indicates the influence of the dependency school. In this light, it argued that this situation should “be overcome so that an end will be put to the systematic barriers and vicious circles which oppose the collective advance toward enjoyment of adequate remuneration of the factors of production, and which strengthen the situation of discrimination with regard to access to opportunities and collective services from which a great part of the people are now excluded.” (chp. 1)

Evangelii nuntiandi linked evangelisation and human advancement in a profound relationship. Its definition of salvation as ‘liberation from everything that oppresses the human person’ (EN, 9) is significant in this discussion. Though it tried to nuance its understanding of liberation (and above all tried to distinguish it from a purely political concept), nevertheless, its use of liberation (in the first place) was a major shift from traditional understanding of salvation. Thus pointing to a remarkable influence of Medellín (and by extension, liberation theology and the dependency theory) in the development of its arguments and views.

Between *Gaudium et spes* (1965) and *Octogesima adveniens* (1971), *Justitia in mundo* (1971) and *Evangelii nuntiandi* (1975) the emphasis of secular and official ecclesiastical thinking on social economy obviously changed from optimism and aid-giving to suspicion (of the intention of the donors) and pleading for a loose on the strings of dependency.

From Economics and Politics to Culture: The Change Continues

The optimism of the modernisation theory helped to shape the arguments of *Gaudium et spes* and *Populorum progressio*. The criticisms of the dependency theory helped shape the visions of such documents as *Octogesima adveniens*, *Justitia in mundo* and *Evangelii nuntiandi*. Later ecclesiastical documents like *Sollicitudo rei socialis* and *Centesimus annus* seem to have fallen under another influence, namely the shift from a purely economic and political analysis (of the problem of development) to a cultural analysis. Each of these aforementioned currents corresponds to their various epochs.

In the 1960s the lack of capital was a factor in explaining the underdevelopment question. In the 1970s the issue of dependence replaced that of capital as the tool for explaining the problem of underdevelopment. G. Kruip pointed out that in the 1980s, the dependency theory began to experience its own crisis. There was the problem of empirical verifiability of the assertion that ‘the poor get poorer just because the rich get richer’. Critics of the dependency theory pointed out that external dependence did not hinder countries like Chile from increasing their GDP in the 1980s. Furthermore, the success of the East Asian countries helped to raise more question about the veracity of the myth of dependence and external domination. Kruip tended more to point to the high birth rates in the Third world countries as a major factor for underdevelopment rather than the problem of dependency.³¹ Such issues as raised by

Kruip may have led to the attempt of scholars to search for alternatives to the dependency theory. Consequently, “in the 1980s, interest in culture as an explanatory variable began to revive.”³² This interest circulated around the idea that “attitudes, values and beliefs that are sometimes collectively referred to as ‘culture’ play an unquestioned role in human behaviour and progress.”³³ The main question, which may have generated this shift of emphasis in developmental discussions, is whether it is “possible to do good social analysis without doing serious cultural analysis?”³⁴

A shift or a broadening of perspectives from economic analysis to cultural analysis is noticed not only in secular developmental thinking but also within intra-ecclesial circles.³⁵ For example, since the 1980s African and Asian liberation theologians have in the EATWOT (Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians) conferences, tried to complement the Latin American economic thinking with a cultural perspective. It is noted that the theologians from Africa emphasised issues related to culture, while theologians from Asia focused on religion.³⁶ “In short, as Latin-American liberation theologians struggle against injustice that oppresses the poor in a capitalistic market economy, then the theologians of the other ‘southern’ countries also set out to struggle against injustice that oppresses local cultures by the imposition of uniform rational modern culture.”³⁷ J. Holland and P. Henriot are of the opinion that the social crises as manifested from the 1980s pertain to questions of culture, which includes religion within it.³⁸

In the introduction to the revised edition of his book, *A Theology of Liberation*, Gustavo Gutierrez said among other things: “it is clear, for example, that the theory of dependence, which was so extensively used in the early years of our encounter with the Latin-American world, is now an inadequate tool, because it does not take sufficient account of the internal dynamics of each country or of the vast dimensions of the world of the poor. In addition, Latin American scientists are increasingly alert to factors of which they were not conscious earlier and which show that the world economy has evolved.”³⁹

Prof. Georges de Schrijver (of the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium) has developed a line of thought, which seeks to underscore that the ‘paradigm shift’ from socio-economic to cultural analysis is after all the offspring of globalisation.⁴⁰ According to him, “a closer look at the nature of globalisation shows that the phenomenon cannot be separated from the politics of culture and the cultural issues that are generated by the very circulation of attractive consumer goods, which function all over the world as the ambassadors of the developed countries’ ‘good way of life.’”⁴¹ Before the popularisation of globalisation, liberation theologians through the instrumentality of the dependency theory, had interpreted the problem of underdevelopment and poverty from the perspective of the political relationships between the core and periphery nations.⁴² However, globalisation, (which De Schrijver described as a complex phenomenon) presents us with another logic and dynamics, which makes it more difficult to interpret the problem of poverty in terms of central and peripheral economies.⁴³ This situation therefore implies the search for an alternative tool of interpreting the problem of poverty. This alternative tool seems to have been provided by a recourse to the cultural analysis.

John Paul II’s *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, dated 1987 reflected the frustrations and ideas of the period concerning development. It was published to commemorate the

twentieth anniversary of Paul VI's *Populorum progressio*. The gap, which separated the world of the 1960s and the 1980s "while preserving certain fundamental constants, has undergone notable changes and presents some totally new aspects."⁴⁴ Prominent among these changes is the movement from optimism to pessimism on the thoughts concerning the possibilities of development.⁴⁵

Though *Sollicitudo rei socialis* borrowed *Populorum progressio*'s vision that development ought to embrace the well being of the whole human person, they shared different hopes on the development project. Granted that *Populorum progressio* did not restrict its understanding of development to economics, its major tool of analysis was economics. In *Octogesima adveniens*, this tool of analysis became substituted (or complemented) with the political. *Sollicitudo rei socialis* reflected the changes that were already taking place in the intellectual circles concerning the underdevelopment question. Hence, we read in *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, "modern underdevelopment is not only economic but also cultural, political and simply human."⁴⁶ The addition of cultural as a tool for understanding underdevelopment is new in this case. We also see this indication in some other areas of the text. "The obstacles to integral development are not only economic but rest on *more profound attitudes* which human beings can make into absolute values. Thus one would hope that all those who, to some degree or other, are responsible for ensuring a 'more human life' for their fellow human beings, whether or not they are inspired by a religious faith, will become fully aware of the urgent need to *change the spiritual attitudes* which define each individual's relationship with self, with neighbour, with even the remotest human communities, and with nature itself; and all of this in view of higher values such as *common good*."⁴⁷

There are two ways of understanding John Paul II's use of 'cultural' in the encyclical *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. One sense refers to the holistic nature of development – embracing the whole aspect of the human person and reality.⁴⁸ This draws from the ideas of Lebert and *Populorum progressio*. In another sense, it designates the life style of people. This use of culture is identifiable through the document's recourse to the issue of demography⁴⁹ (art. 25) and the parable of the talents. This feature seems to blame the life style of the developing nations themselves as a likely hindrance to development. It also indicates a tendency to appropriate this approach as a tool of analysing the problem of underdevelopment.⁵⁰ Another verse, which could highlight this understanding of culture in the encyclical is the recommendation that the developing countries themselves ought to exercise some spirit of initiative and not expect everything to be done for them by the richer countries. (art. 44) This recommendation could be seen from the background of the situation recounted by R. Royal.

From 1956-1986, governments in the developed world transferred nearly \$2trillion to the developing nations. This figure does not include military aid, and already allows for financial withdrawals, profit repatriation, and loan payments. Also not included are the billions of dollars churches and other charitable organisations have channelled into the developing world. This aid is quite considerable; Americans alone give about \$12billion yearly through private non-governmental institutions for work in developing nations, half of that figure through religious groups.⁵¹

Dependency theory's analysis has the tendency of leading to agitations and violence. Liberation theology is sometimes accused of having this trait. Cultural analysis turned

the focus of discussion inwards – from the deprivations suffered at the hands of the developed nations to the lifestyle of the developing nations themselves. Cultural analysis indicates that the development question may not be explained merely from the lack of capital (modernisation theory) or centre-periphery relationship (dependency theory). By extending the searchlight inwards to the lifestyle of the developing nations themselves, the cultural analysis may be revealing that the developing nations themselves and their leaders are not (after all) passive or innocent victims. This approach, may aim at reducing the violence associated with the struggles of liberation theology and other such agitations directed against the developed nations, - a idea which is said to be behind the publication of the encyclical.⁵²

Granted that the encyclical appealed to the rich and powerful to help the poor but at the same time, it called on the poor not to adopt a purely passive or destructive attitude (art. 39). It rather called on them to do something, namely to support one another without recourse to violence (art. 39). This recommendation (of pointing out what the poor should do or being concerned about what the poor do), corresponds to the general component of the cultural theory, which right-wing thinkers both within the ecclesiastical and secular circles have introduced into the poverty and underdevelopment discussions. This is an important issue in understanding *Sollicitudo rei socialis*.

There are various perspectives of cultural analysis. However, neo-liberal interpretations of culture, which appear evident in some lines of *Sollicitudo rei socialis* and *Centesimus annus* are influencing an increasing appropriation of a nuanced form of the charity paradigm in recent ecclesiastical documents on social economy. It may be necessary to point out here that there is some difference in the visions of charity in *Gaudium et spes* and such later papal social encyclicals like *Sollicitudo rei socialis* and *Centesimus annus*. In the former, charity is marked with an optimism that it would help to bridge the gap of poverty. In the latter, charity lacks this obvious optimism (of the former) and assumes the face of ‘*that is the much we can do for you.*’

Gaudium et Spes: Significance Beyond the Logic

In the foregoing, I have highlighted some of the changes that have taken place both within secular and ecclesiastical socio-economic thinking since the promulgation of *Gaudium et spes*. A pertinent question, which may follow the discussion of these changes is whether *Gaudium et spes* could be said to be obsolete given the fact that a major presupposition on which its visions were based no longer occupy central positions in current socio-economic thinking? My arguments in this paper do not intend to suggest that. Rather they are meant to emphasise that restricting the relevance of an ecclesiastical document to only its words could help to hasten its procession to the lumber-room of history. It insists that the relevance of *Gaudium et spes* does not so much consist in its specific recommendations as to the recognition that “the joys and the hopes, the grieves and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and the hopes, the grieves and the anxieties of the followers of Christ.” (*Gaudium et spes*, no. 1)

Coming from a country like present day Nigeria, I often consider whether there is a different world for the “men of this age” and a different world for “the followers of Christ” (within the context of the Nigerian polity)? The same person who receives Holy Communion on Sunday in a church in Nigeria is the same person who is a victim of police brutality on Monday. The same person who dances and sings in the church on Sunday is the same person who stands on a long line for two or three days in order to buy petrol in a petroleum rich country like Nigeria. The same person who actively works to promote the activities of his or her parish through the various councils and associations is the same worker whose salary has not been paid since the past four months. The same person who prays in the church on Sunday is the same person who is a victim of adulterated drugs, who lives in fear and intimidation from political and religious leaders, who has lost hope in his or her society and has been condemned to a life in an endless dark tunnel. Human questions, hopes and anxieties are on going. They affect as much “the men of this age” as “the followers of Christ.”

The argument of this paper is that the opening paragraph of *Gaudium et spes* acts as a hermeneutical key, which enables it to be relevant even in the midst of changing times and historical or cultural circumstances. In the first instance rather than being occupied with the search for a world for “the men of this age” and “the followers of Christ”, *Gaudium et spes* inserts social sensitivity into the heart of the Church’s ministry.⁵³ Social sensitivity consists not so much on the specific issues it discussed as to “the way in which it joined the entire social ministry to the centre of the Church’s life.”⁵⁴ The social sensitivity of this opening paragraph has the significance of being a turning point in an ecclesiastical thinking that conceives the world “as the perennial enemy, as a wicked and dangerous vale of tears⁵⁵ to be got away from as far as possible.”⁵⁶ It also represents a turning point from a posture of triumphalism and hostility, which the church had maintained against the wider human society. “From the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries Catholicism had defined itself over against three movements: the Protestant Reformation, the Democratic Revolutions, and the Enlightenment.”⁵⁷

Social sensitivity as a special character of the council came to be indicated in John XXIII’s *Humanae salutis* of 25 December 1961⁵⁸ and the opening message, which the Council Fathers gave to the world on 20th October, 1962. In *Humanae salutis*, John XXIII described the intended council as one which will attempt “bringing the modern world into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the gospel.”⁵⁹ These same ideas came to be reflected in the opening message, which the Council Fathers gave to the world on 20th October, 1962.⁶⁰ Among other things, this message indicated that the Council will address “the bodily and mental distress, the sorrows, longings, and hopes of all the peoples...(and) whatever concerns the dignity of man, whatever contributes to a genuine community of peoples.” This message hinted on their mission towards peace and social justice among peoples.⁶¹ It will further “denounce injustices and shameful inequalities and to restore the rightful order of property and economics so that, based on the principles of the gospel, the life of man may become more worthy of man.”⁶² This message in the first place, indicated the commitment of the Bishops gathered for the Council to the issues of human dignity, social justice and openness to the modern world.⁶³ These issues came to be embodied in the Council’s document *Gaudium et spes*.⁶⁴

Social sensitivity could imply a change from “the sometimes apocalyptic catastrophism that had marked a great part of the papal and episcopal Catholic response to modernity ever since the French Revolution”.⁶⁵ It could also imply a spirit of openness and a willingness to be part of a search process in addressing social concerns. *Gaudium et spes* could be said to signify the latter. Hence one can say that “*Gaudium et spes* presents a Church open to dialogue with all cultures and all social systems - a Church that is optimistic, but without any trace of naivete, because she is confident that the truth of man revealed to him in Christ has the necessary power to enable every human being to discover his deepest vocation to the freedom that comes from self-giving in love.”⁶⁶ In this light, the document’s preoccupation could be seen as seeking to be of service to humanity rather than hurling condemnations characteristic of previous councils.⁶⁷ This element is well captured in the statement in number 3 that the church’s mission is to save and not to judge. Hence, “its emergence involved a pastoral sensitivity, a loving awareness of humanity in its actual condition and loving sense of responsibility to it.”⁶⁸

Conclusion

This paper sets out to ask the question: in what does the importance of an ecclesiastical document like *Gaudium et spes* consist. Does it consist essentially in the specific recommendations (words) of the document? Does it consist more in the (spirit) concern shown by engaging in a particular discussion? There is no doubt that both the specific contents of a documents and the significance of its discussions are important. Nevertheless, it is my position that the contents of a document like *Gaudium et spes* are often shaped by historical circumstances, which also seem to direct the visions of the document itself. If the appreciation of such a document is restricted to its words, there is the danger that changes in historical circumstances could also affect the relevance of such a document.

In the search for the relevance of a document like *Gaudium et spes*, it is necessary to insist that the issue is neither univocity (direct repetition of the past) nor equivocity (new introductions without relationship to the past) but analogy (being inspired by the same concerns of the past and using this inspiration as a basis for constructing new visions, which make the past relevant to the present and future). Analogy in this sense therefore implies understanding *Gaudium et spes* as inserting social sensitivity into the heart of the Church’s life and thereby laying a foundation for a theology of social involvement. This input does not consist of simply citing texts or in the recourse to already made answers but more in what Paul VI’s recognised as the role of “Christian communities to analyse with objectivity the situation which is proper to their own country, to shed on it the light of the gospel’s unalterable words and to draw principles of reflection, norms of judgement and the directives for action.” (*Octogesima adveniens*, no. 4) The issue therefore becomes that of an attempt to be part of the searching process for a ‘new humanity’. It is not claiming to have already-made solutions. Although Paul VI’s *Populorum progressio* no. 13 and John Paul’s *Sollicitudo rei socialis* no. 41 argue that “the Church is an expert in humanity”, Paul VI in *Populorum progressio* no 13 and John Paul II in *Sollicitudo rei socialis* no. 41 and *Centesimus annus* no. 43 also accept that “the Church does not have technical solutions to offer for the problems of underdevelopment” (and by extension problems of humanity).

Human problems and questions are on going. Different ages and localities may see them in diverse ways but the commitment to be open and the readiness to be part of this ever evolving search for solution or meaning is one important way of making *Gaudium et spes* ever relevant even in the faces of changing logics of socio-economic thought. Christians live in the world and are part and parcel of it. They are neither strangers in the world nor in a transit camp. They share the hopes, anxieties and paradoxes of their immediate environment and beyond. There is no different world for the “men of this age” and a different world for “the followers of Christ.” By being part of this searching process, Christians demonstrate that they are equally members of the human society who are affected by the questions and anxieties of their immediate environment. They establish their readiness to share the insights and dynamism of their faith tradition, their visions and commitment so that the joys and hopes of both ‘the followers of Christ’ and ‘the men and women of this age’ may be fulfilled in Christ Jesus, who is Lord forever and ever.

¹ J. A. KOMONCHAK, *The Struggle for the Council During the Preparation of Vatican II (1960-1962)*, in G. ALBERIGO and J. A. KOMONCHAK (eds.), *History of Vatican II. Vol. 1. Announcing and Preparing Vatican II Toward a New Era in Catholicism*, Leuven: Peeters, 1995. 167-356. p. 168.

² R. M. BROWN, *Gustavo Gutierrez. An Introduction to Liberation Theology*, New York: Orbis Books, 1990. p. 60.

³ A. F. MCGOVERN, *Liberation Theology and its Critics. Towards an Assessment*, New York: Orbis Books, 1989. p. 6.

⁴ R. M. BROWN, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁵ A. F. MCGOVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 6. Another reason attached to the launching of the ‘Alliance for Progress’ by J.F. Kennedy was to stave off the threat of Communism from Latin America.

⁶ A. Y. SO, *Social Change and Development. Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories*, London, 1990. p. 18. This school of thought linked the situation of underdevelopment in some countries in Africa, Asia and South America to those of European countries before the industrial revolution. This period was characterised by scarcity of capital, undeveloped technology, lack of efficient production and profit incentives. They argued that these features were caused by traditional values and lifestyle. Hence they insisted that, “to achieve development, underdeveloped nations must break out of traditional mores, adopt a profit incentive, and discover newer ways to become productive.” [A. F. MCGOVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 118.]

⁷ D. HULME and M. TURNER, *Sociology and Development. Theories, Policies and Practices*, New York, 1990. p. 34.

⁸ M. H. SYNDER, *Development*, in J. A. DWYER (ed.), *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1994. 278-282. p. 278.

⁹ A. F. MCGOVERN, *Liberation Theology and its Critics*, p. 117.

¹⁰ M. H. SYNDER, *op. cit.*, p.278

¹¹ B. WARD, *Looking Back on Populorum progressio*, in C.E. CURRAN and R.A. MCCORMICK (eds.), *Readings in Moral Theology No. 5. Official Catholic Social Teaching*, New York, Paulist Press, 1986. 130-149. p. 130.

¹² A. Y. SO, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹³ L. BAECK, *Postwar Economic Thinking and its Relevance to Policy Changing Concepts and Goals of Development. Working Paper Center for Economic Studies*, Leuven: Faculty of Economics (K.U.), 1988. p. 1.

¹⁴ PAUL VI, *Populorum progressio*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 59 (1967) 257-299. no. 14.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, no. 3

¹⁶ Gustavo Gutierrez, whose theology of liberation appropriated insights from the dependency theory explained that the whole development project (which modernisation theory propagated) was led into frustration and confusion because its proponents and the donor countries were neither ready to attack the evils which constituted the roots of the whole problem nor were they willing to allow challenges

-
- to the status quo. [G. GUTIERREZ, *A Theology of Liberation. History, Politics and Salvation*, London: SCM, 1974. p. 26.]
- ¹⁷ Three reasons were adduced for this. Firstly, the whole process was described as tokenism, which concerned itself more, about profit than about the well being of persons. It was contended with cosmetic changes, which really transforms nothing. Secondly, it benefited the oligarchies in power, who were seen as the internal collaborators of external exploiters. Thirdly, its paternalistic character led to a situation of 'he who pays the piper dictates the tone'. These factors made the poorer nations more like pawns on the chessboard of international economics rather than liberating them from the quagmire of economic backwardness. [*ibid.*, p. 62.]
- ¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 61.
- ¹⁹ D. McCANN, *Christian Realism and Liberation Theology. Practical Theologies in Creative Conflict*, New York: Orbis Books, 1981. p. 137.
- ²⁰ A. Y. SO, *op. cit.*, p. 91. The economic depression of the 1930s reduced the demand of Latin American goods by Western countries. For the first time, these countries saw the dangers of over-reliance on external trade (as a vehicle for economic growth). These countries began to design internally structured development strategies that will survive the vagaries of world trade. However it was only after the Second World War that this strategy received an ideological support through the establishment of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) in Chile in 1948. [See D. HULME and M. TURNER, *op. cit.*, p. 46.]
- ²¹ D. HULME and M. TURNER, *ibid.*, p. 47.
- ²² *ibid.*
- ²³ M. H. SYNDER, *loc. cit.*
- ²⁴ Many Latin American social economists used Brazil as a case in point because in the 1960s, it had the largest concentration of foreign investments in the whole of Latin America. [See. A. F. MCGOVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 125]. The outcome of the studies conducted on the Brazil case, revealed what these scholars tagged, 'the development of underdevelopment.' This study showed that foreign investments drained the economy of the Third world countries rather than improving it. A U.S. Department of Commerce report showed that "between 1950 and 1961 U.S. investment amounted to \$2,962 million; U.S. remittance of profits and interest during that decade amounted to \$6,875 million – or an outflow of \$3,913 million lost by Brazil." This became a pointer to the analysts that what Brazil lost during this period was more than the whole financial assistance they ever received from the United States from the time of the Second World War. [A. G. FRANK, *Latin America. Underdevelopment or Revolution*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969. pp. 150-154. See also A. F. MCGOVERN, *op. cit.*, p. 127.] The case of Brazil indicated how the richer countries siphoned the poorer countries under the cover of aid and investments.
- ²⁵ D. HULME and M. TURNER, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
- ²⁶ Series of meetings were held in preparation for the bishops' meeting in Medellin (1968). G. Gutierrez reported that bishops, priests, laypersons and religious sisters gathered at various places like Brazil, Colombia, etc and discussed regularly on a variety of themes like education, social action, missions, etc. He also reported that the instrumentality of the social sciences was employed to enable the theologians and the bishops understand better the social reality of their continent. [G. GUTIERREZ, *Church of the Poor*, in E. L. CLEARY (ed.), *Born of the Poor. The Latin American Church Since Medellin*, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990. 9-25. p. 14]. This insight led the Medellin conference and the liberation theologians to reflect more about liberation than development. Prior to this conference, Gutierrez had already started using this analysis from the social sciences. In July 1968, he gave a talk at a meeting of priests in Chimbote, Peru in anticipation of the Medellin conference. During this occasion, he charged the bishops 'to speak of liberation rather than development in addressing the problems of Latin America.' [G. GUTIÉRREZ, *Toward a Theology of Liberation*, in A. T. HENNELLEY (ed.), *Liberation Theology. A Documentary History*, New York: Orbis Books, 1990. 62-76.]
- ²⁷ PAUL VI, *Octogesima adveniens*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 63 (1971) 401-441. no. 2
- ²⁸ D. DORR, *Option for the Poor. A Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching*, New York: Orbis Books, 1992. p. 212.
- ²⁹ J. FINN, *Beyond Economics, Beyond Revolution. Octogesima adveniens (1971)*, G. WEIGEL and R. ROYAL (eds.), *Building the Free Society. Democracy, Capitalism and Catholic Social Teaching*, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1993. 149-162. p. 152.
- ³⁰ SYNOD OF BISHOPS 1971, *Justitia in Mundo*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 63 (1971) 923-942. chp. 1. The modernisation theory was built in part, on the theory of social evolution, which served to

- explain the transition of the Western societies from primitive to modern cultures. This theory therefore, in turn tried to explain the poverty in the Third world countries in the terms of this social evolutionary insight. Justitia in mundo attacked the social evolutionary theory, which formed background to the modernisation theory: “the concept of evolution must be purified of those myths and false convictions which have up to now gone with a thought pattern subject to a kind of deterministic and automatic notion of progress.” (Chp. 1)
- ³¹ G. KRUIP, *Theologie der Befreiung und der Zusammenbruch des realen Sozialismus eine unbewältigte Herausforderung*, in *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*, 80 (1996) 3-25. p. 25.
- ³² S. P. HUNTINGTON, *Foreword. Cultures Count*, in L. E. HARRISON and S. P. HUNTINGTON (eds.), *Culture Matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*, New York: Basic Books, 2000. xiii-xvi. p. xiv. One of the scholars whose work was remarkable is Lawrence Harrison’s *Underdevelopment Is a State of the Mind – The Latin American Case*, 1985.
- ³³ M. E. PORTER, *Attitudes, Values, Beliefs and Microeconomics of Prosperity*, in L. E. HARRISON and S. P. HUNTINGTON (eds.), *op. cit.*, 14-28. p. 14.
- ³⁴ P. HENRIOT, *Grassroots Analysis. The Emphasis on Culture*, in G. DE SCHRIJVER (ed.), *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds*, Leuven: University Press, 1998. 333-350. p. 333.
- ³⁵ We may say that it is possible that the Vatican may have been preparing for this shift from economics to culture before the 1980s. We could interpret this from the transition from Medellín (1968) to Puebla (1979). While the key words, of the Medellín conference, were development and social change, Puebla concentrated on the evangelisation of cultures. The theme of evangelisation of cultures, while being inspired by Paul VI’s *Evangelii nuntiandi* (1975), had a marked departure from the thrust of the Medellín conference. This shift of focus could be read as the attempt of the Vatican to ‘rescue’ the spiritual dimension of the church’s mission from a purely socio-economic pre-occupation, with which the liberation theology movement was associated. [M. SANDOVAL, *Report from the Conference*, in J. EAGLESON and P. SCHARPER (eds.), *Puebla and Beyond. Documentation and Commentary*, Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1979. p. 34.] While bishops at Puebla restated the basic concern of Medellín on social justice, the poor and solidarity, they “apparently intended to treat the lacunae inherent in a social-justice approach, namely, the absence of a consideration of cultural development considered to be essential to ‘integral development’. Only uplifting the socio-economic conditions of the poor, it seemed, will not lead to the emergence of a new culture. A primary role is attributed to culture as the mediating element between the socio-economic reality and religious consciousness.” [G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation. From Socio-Economic Analysis to Cultural Analysis?* in G. DE SCHRIJVER (ed.), *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds*, 3-83. p. 5] The shift of focus from the major pre-occupation of Medellín to a cultural analysis as observed in Puebla, may have prepared the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to issue the two documents *Libertatis nuntius* (1984) and *Libertatis conscientia* (1986).
- ³⁶ J. C. SCANNONE, “*Axial Shift*” *Instead of “Paradigm Shift”*, in G. DE SCHRIJVER (ed.), *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds*, 87-103. p. 93.
- ³⁷ G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation. From Socio-Economic Analysis to Cultural Analysis?* p. 3.
- ³⁸ J. HOLLAND and P. HENRIOT, *Social Analysis. Linking Faith and Justice*, revised and enlarged edition, Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983. p. xii.
- ³⁹ G. GUTIERREZ, *A Theology of Liberation*, (revised edition) Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1988. p. xxiv.
- ⁴⁰ Prof. G. de Schrijver thinks also that globalisation ought to be understood within the framework of postmodernity. [G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Globalization and ‘Postmodern’ Culture Politics*, in M. AMALADOSS (ed.), *Globalization and its Victims. As Seen by the Victims*, Delhi: ISPCK, 1999. 171-186. p. 171]. In itself, postmodernity is a recent phenomenon in the field of cultural studies, which to a large extent, has come to designate the period after 1945. [G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation*, p. 33]. This period “hinges on the growth and spread of mass media and ‘immaterial’ means of communication: electronically transmitted codes (fax, E-mail) and images (television). This leads to a time-space compression and to a dislocation of stable places, local habits, and forms of community life, in spite of the supposed lasting endurance (‘longue durée’) of these forms. Advertising in view of consumption begins to fill the multilayered space of each one’s life-world. The media create desires and mimetic personalities ” [G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation*, p. 45.] De Schrijver argues that these

features of postmodernity enhance the process of globalisation. From another perspective, Paul Heelas cites James Beckford in outlining four features of postmodernity. (1) A refusal to regard positivistic, rationalistic, instrumental criteria as the sole or exclusive standard of worthwhile knowledge. (2) A willingness to combine symbols from disparate codes or frameworks of meaning even at the cost of disjunctions and eclecticism. (3) A celebration of spontaneity, fragmentation, superficiality, irony and playfulness. (4) A willingness to abandon the search for over-arching or triumphalist myths, narratives or frameworks of knowledge. [P. HEELAS, *Introduction. On Differentiation and Dedifferentiation*, in P. HEELAS (ed.), *Religion, Modernity and Postmodernity*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. 1-18. p. 4.] Zygmunt Bauman presents three themes as the ethical and socio-economic consequences of postmodernity. Firstly the wage of labour is displaced from the centre point of social existence. Secondly, consumer freedom has come to replace wage labour as the determinant factor of the entire socio-economic system. The struggle has thus definitely shifted from capital/labour relationship to the aspect of distribution in which what holds the entire system is pleasure in consumption. Thirdly, capitalism holds sway through seduction rather than production. [Z. BAUMAN, *Postmodern Ethics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. p. 243. See also Z. BAUMAN, *Intimations of Postmodernity*, London: Routledge, 1992. p. 52. See also J. A. BECKFORD, *Postmodernity, High Modernity and New Modernity. Three Concepts in Search of Religion*, in K. FLANAGAN & P. C. JUPP (ed.), *Postmodernity, Sociology and Religion*, London: Macmillan, 1996. 30-45. p. 31.] Probably it may be necessary also to mention postmodernity as being deconstructivist. J. L. Lyotard coined the term 'the end of the grand stories' to designate "the dissolution of those universal principles that the organic intellectuals of modernity had advanced as authoritative rules for insuring the rational improvement of social organization and individual conduct under the leadership of the modern centralized state." [G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation*, p. 37.] Postmodernity could therefore be said to be characterised by the absence of "grand meta-narratives, no total explanations, no overall structures of meaning, no universal foundation of knowledge." [K. WARD, *The Decline and Fall of Reason. From Modernity to Post Modernity*, in U. KING (ed.), *Faith and Praxis in a Postmodern Age*, New York: Cassell, 1998. 15-27. p. 15.]

⁴¹ G. DE SCHRIJVER, *Paradigm Shift in Third-World Theologies of Liberation*, P. 72.

⁴² *ibid.*, P. 71.

⁴³ *ibid.*

⁴⁴ JOHN PAUL II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 80 (1988) 513-586. no. 4.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, no. 12.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*, no. 15.

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, no. 38.

⁴⁸ *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, no. 46

⁴⁹ The encyclical's reference to demography precisely captures the arguments of the Neo-Malthusians who claim that the prospect of self-sufficiency in food production let alone development is virtually non-existent in the developing world. Their reason is that population growth outstrips agricultural growth, leading to environmental degradation (which includes encroachment into fragile land and shorter fallow). They insist that an over-blown population may destroy the ecosystem, which supports it. [For more reading see D. H. MEADOWS, D. L. MEADOWS and J. RANDERS, *The Limits of Growth. A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind*, London: Pan, 1983. See also D. H. MEADOWS, D. L. MEADOWS and J. RANDERS, *Beyond the Limits. Global Collapse or a Sustainable Future*, London: Earthscan, 1992; D. H. MEADOWS, D. L. MEADOWS and J. RANDERS, *Beyond the Limits. Confronting Global Collapse, Envisioning a Sustainable Future*, New York: Chelsea, 1992.]

⁵⁰ Hobgood is of the view that interpreting underdevelopment from the perspective of culture "accords with the capitalist view that persons in traditional societies are unable to make the individual choices that will insure their economic advancement." [See M. E. HOBGOOD, *Conflicting Paradigms in Social Analysis*, in G. BAUM and R. ELLSBERG (eds.), *The Logic of Solidarity. Commentaries on Pope John Paul's Encyclical "On Social Concern"*, Maryknoll New York: Orbis Books, 1989. 167-185. pp. 177-178. See also p. 170.]

⁵¹ R. ROYAL, *Populorum progressio*, in G. WEIGEL and R. ROYAL (eds.), *op. cit.*, 115-130. p. 126.

⁵² Robert Suro is of the opinion that the clash between the police and protesters during the course of the pope's mass in Santiago, Chile on 3rd April 1987 is the best starting point to understanding the story of *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Over thirty people were injured in the clash. It is believed that this clash, which he described as the worst in the course of his travels (at that time), provided an impetus for writing the encyclical. [R. SURO, *The Writing of an Encyclical*, in K. A. MYERS (ed.), *Aspiring to*

Freedom. Commentaries on John Paul II's Encyclical "The Social Concerns of the Church, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988. 159-169. p. 161.]

⁵³ J. B. HEHIR, *The Social Role of the Church. Leo XIII, Vatican II and John Paul II*, in O. F. WILLIAMS and J. W. HOUCK (eds.), *Catholic Social Thought and the New World Order. Building on One Hundred Years*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993. 29-50. p. 36.

⁵⁴ *ibid.*

⁵⁵ The Marian prayer Hail Holy Queen continue to echo: "...hail our life our sweetness and our hope. To thee we cry poor banished children of Eve. To thee we send forth our tears, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears...."

⁵⁶ P. DAY, *World versus Church*, in *AFER*, 8/1 (1966) 3-14. p. 3. P. Day looks back to the influence of Platonic dualism on Augustine and Christian thought. This dualism has led to a dichotomy which sets various elements in opposition. "It encourages an unrealistic and triumphant view of the of the Church set over against an unduly pessimistic view of the world. And it thereby encourages retreat from the world instead of greater fidelity to it. The supernatural, meanwhile, is made to appear static, ethereal realm of ordered perfection and holy sentiment, instead of a dynamic, existential reality bound up with the world of sun and moon and real people." [P. DAY, *op. cit.*, p.6.] Richard Horchler highlights on the ambiguity, which has accompanied the relationship of the church with the world, through history. The primitive Christians turned their back to the world. They eagerly waited for the kingdom of God and hence considered themselves temporary residents of this world. This led to the separation of the early Christians from the world around them. It led also to asceticism, the disparagement of marriage except as a refuge from sin. The medieval age witnessed a church that soaked itself in political power, while preaching renunciation to her members. The hopes of establishing any reconciliation between the church and the world in the 19th century and the first part of the 20th century, was defeated by Pius IX's 'Syllabus of Errors' of 1864 and Leo XIII series of rebukes in 1890s against what he described as the 'heresy of Americanism' and his condemnation of Modernism in two encyclicals during the early years of the 20th century. [R. HORCHLER, *The Church 'Yes' and 'No' to the World*, in J. G. DEEDY, jr. (ed.), *Eyes on the Modern World. Schema 13*, New York, P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1965. 19-42. pp. 21-33.]

⁵⁷ J. B. HEHIR, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁵⁸ H. de Riedmatten gives valuable indications on the genesis of this speech. The Archbishop of Malines-Brussels (Cardinal Suenens) had addressed a pastoral letter to his diocese in 1962. "In this letter he made clear the intense anxiety which was inescapable to a mind as open to the feelings of his contemporaries as his." By chance John XXIII saw this letter and immediately informed its author that it expressed exactly his ideas about the Council. The same John XXIII then got Cardinal Suenens to produce a report on the organisation and aims of the Council's work. The Cardinal did so and submitted two important memoranda: firstly what the Council ought not to be and secondly what the council ought to accomplish. It is largely believed that John XXIII's allocution of 11 September 1962 considerably drew its inspiration from the second of these notes, so much so that John XXIII the next day made the Cardinal a present of one of his books as a sign of his agreement "These precise details are extremely important because they show, as in any case might be surmised, that the very idea of the Pastoral Constitution goes back to John XXIII's fundamental intentions for the council." [C. MOELLER, *ibid.*, P. 8.]

⁵⁹ *ibid* p. 7. "Even if the Pope had foreseen an eventual dialogue between Church and world, he had not measured its full significance. This is shown by the fact that no commission was set up to prepare a text on this topic, and that no schema under this heading was in prospect." [*ibid.*, p. 9.]

⁶⁰ Manuel Velasquez described this message as a "short and astonishingly forward-looking statement." [M. VELASQUEZ, *Gaudium et spes and the Development of Catholic Social-Economic Teaching*, in J. A. DWYER (ed.), *Questions of Special Urgency. The Church in the Modern World. Two Decades after Vatican II*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press, 1986. 173-199. p.174.]

⁶¹ C. MOELLER, *op. cit.* p. 10. "Oddly, after this dramatically prophetic opening declaration, the Council for the next three years gave precious little public attention to the issues of 'peace' and 'social justice'. Instead, its attention remained wholly riveted on the internal church matters: debates over the liturgy, the role of bishops, marriage law, the renewal of religious life, the function of the Bible, and the issue of religious freedom. External social, political, and economic questions were omitted almost entirely." [M. VELASQUEZ, *op.cit.*, p. 175.] D. Dorr reports that after the initial declaration of the Council Fathers, "the bishops and their 'experts' became engrossed in other issues. So there was an interval of more than three years before the Council issued any formal teaching on

these two issues which they had singled out in their first message.” [D. DORR, *Option for the Poor*, pp.149-150.]

⁶² COUNCIL FATHERS, *Message to Humanity*, (Second Vatican Council, October 20, 1962), in J. GREMILLION (ed.), *The Gospel of Peace and Justice. Catholic Social Teaching Since Pope John*, Maryknoll-New York, Orbis Books, 1976. 351-354. p. 353.

⁶³ Granted that a general feeling of openness of the Church to concrete human conditions appeared prominent in the initial speeches of the Council, there was no schema or commission which was dedicated to this subject until a decisive impulse came to be injected by Dom Helder Camara, auxiliary bishop of Rio de Janeiro. He felt that the council concentrated excessively on internal issues of the church. Some of the frantic questions he asked included whether the council would spend the whole time discussing internal Church problems while two-thirds of mankind were dying of hunger? What is the council saying on the problem of underdevelopment? Will the Council express its concern about the great problems of mankind?[See C. MOELLER, *op. cit.*, p. 11.] Msgr. Dom Helder Camara (who was at this time, the secretary of the Brazilian Episcopal Conference), called together the secretaries of some other Episcopal conferences for a meeting. The countries, which participated in this meeting, were France, Germany, Holland, Japan, India, Canada and Congo. Msgr. Camara also got in contact with Cardinal Suenens. On 1st December 1962, a meeting of about 50 bishops (representing various countries) was held in the Belgian College in Rome. This meeting revealed the need to address some socio-political issues, which affect the wider society. The discussions and insights of this meeting, made Cardinal Suenens in his closing address to this meeting to speak of a document, which the Council ought to publish.[*ibid*] At the end of the meeting in the Belgian College, Cardinals Suenens, Lercaro, Lie' nart, Leger and Montini came to identical conclusions about introducing some re-arrangements to the conciliar schemata.[Thus the Schema 13 of the Council, which metamorphosed to *Gaudium et spes* was introduced. This schema sought to confront the Church with the daily concerns, not only with those referred to as the people of God but with the daily concerns of the entire human family. The schema sought to address some issues of urgency to the to the human mind and society at the time. Among these include, war and peace, family, poverty, economic life, community action, etc. J. G. DEEDY, *op. cit.*, p. 13.] On 4 December, Cardinal Suenens made a speech to the Council proposing a re-arrangement on the schemata on the Church around two poles: ad intra, ad extra. This proposition won the approval of the Council Fathers.”[C. MOELLER, *op.cit.*, p. 11. See also J. G. DEEDY, *op. cit.*, p. 14. The idea of grouping the schema on the church in two poles of ad intra and ad extra, implied that the subject of the church would be treated in two parts. Ad intra would concentrate on the Church in its self understanding and ad extra, would examine the Church in its relationship with the wider world and the realities that come with it. See W. KASPER, *The Theological anthropology of Gaudium et spes*, in *Communio*, 23 (1996) 129-140. p.132.] Following this intervention, “by January 1963 the general outline of the socioeconomic topics to be treated in the document on the church in the modern world was set, and the following month a commission began the long process of drafting and revising what emerged as *Gaudium et spes* three years later in December 1965.” [M. VELASQUEZ, *op. cit.*, p. 175; C. MOELLER, *op. cit.*, p.11]

⁶⁴ M. VELASQUEZ, *Op. Cit.*, p.174. One can notice the resemblance of this initial message from the Council bishops to the opening sentences of *Gaudium et spes*. “The joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the men of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted in any way, are the joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well.” [*Gaudium et spes*, no. 1.]

⁶⁵ J. A. KOMONCHAK, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

⁶⁶ P. MORANDE, *The Relevance of the Message of Gaudium et spes Today. The Church's Mission in the Midst of Epochal Changes and New Challenges*, in *Communio* 23 (1996) 141-155. p.155.

⁶⁷ Pastoral, in this sense is contrasted from the dogmatic and juridical in so far as the later involves a more explicit attention to exposition of truth and disciplinary regulation. Nevertheless there still exist some dogmatic elements within the document but wherever these dogmatic and disciplinary regulations occur, they are within their pastoral loving-care dimensions. [See E. MCDONAGH, *The Church in the Modern World (Gaudium et spes)*, in A. HASTINGS, (ed.), *Modern Catholicism*, New York, 1991. 96-112. p. 98.]

⁶⁸ *ibid.*