

The Catholic Vision of Peace After *Gaudium et spes* Kenneth R. Himes, O.F.M.

Early versions of what became the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World were not entirely satisfactory in their treatment of peace. The original material provided by Marie-Domenique Chenu in early versions discussed peace as the absence of war. Eventually, as is well known, a more positive vision of peace was presented. Augustine's famous description in book nineteen of *The City of God* was not quoted directly, but the understanding of peace as rooted in an order of justice and love became the conciliar teaching.

This positive understanding of peace was a retrieval of both biblical and classical understandings as is evident from the Hebrew *shalom* and Greek *eirené*. Since 1965 there has been great interest in deepening and advancing a theology of peace. This paper has several foci. First, we must articulate a vision of peace that is sufficiently inspiring as to motivate people to seek it. Second, we require a vision of peace, adequately clear, that it provides direction for our efforts. Finally, if peace is truly a cooperative effort and attainment then we need a suitable description in order to unify our efforts and direct our deeds to achieve a common aim. Wise words can inspire and shape great deeds.

A difficulty that arises, however, is that a vision of peace can be so idealized, placed at such a distant future in a transformed world, that it does not connect with the earthly realities of life in our time. Words of peace need to inspire deeds but must also be adequate to guide them. Too often religious communities can present a vision of peace that is wondrous to contemplate but impractical to seek, or it is a vision that lacks the specificity to provide political and moral guidance. Catholic teaching since the Council provides a helpful way of understanding the meaning of peace, though it is not without its difficulties.

The teaching of the church in this post-conciliar era is helpful because it offers both inspiration and guidance to good-willed people interested in building a more peaceful world. The difficulty the teaching presents is the tendency to expand the meaning of peace, especially in the annual pronouncements celebrating the World Day of Peace, to such an extent that peace becomes synonymous with all things good. Such imprecision can hinder a clear ordering of priorities and frustrate the formulation of strategies for building peace.

My aim is to clarify the meaning of peace in recent church teaching through several steps. First, I will distinguish the different meanings of peace in Catholic teaching and, after surveying a range of the hierarchical magisterium's statements, propose several elements of peace that deserve priority in describing the meaning of true peace. Second, I shall analyze the nature of one form of peace, what I will call political peace. I will then relate this form of peace to the issues of nonviolence, armed force, and just war theory. Finally, I will propose some implications of the church's teaching on peace for to select questions of public policy.

I. The Meanings of Peace

One useful way of distinguishing between different meanings of peace can be seen in the various terms used in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. *Shalom* implies a sense of well being, fulfillment, even prosperity for the Israelite. To experience *shalom* is to know fullness of life. The Greek, *eirené* was derived from a root that meant “linkage” or “order.” Peace had connections with order, coherence, a joining together. *Pax*, the Latin term, came from the same root as the contemporary English word, pact. Peace was an agreement, a treaty, not to fight. Already in the ancient world, then, there was the basic distinction between peace as a negative term, the absence of war, and peace as a positive state, the existence of a harmonious order or a way of being that led to a full life.

Whenever a war ends -- the shooting stops and a treaty between warring parties is signed -- we say that peace has been restored. The end of hostilities is widely thought of as the onset of peace. This is peace as non-war; a negative understanding of the term. Alternatively, peace can be understood as a positive concept, that is, it is equated with a particular value or state of affairs designated as the equivalent of peace. The candidates for such equivalence are multiple and include harmony, personal and/or communal well being, forgiveness and reconciliation, happiness, acceptance, security. Although the positive understanding of peace is closer to the Catholic tradition’s vision, it still has its drawback. If peace is the equivalent of any and all good things, it is difficult to know what it means to create peace or when we succeed in doing so.

Futhermore, the positive meaning of peace requires greater clarity because peace can refer to different realms, and in each of these realms, peace has been given a particular nuance. In one sense peace has to do with being in covenant with God; knowing and dwelling within God’s merciful and faithful love. To be at peace with God is to dwell as one with God and all of creation in a harmonious, just and loving community. Peace is intimately connected to fidelity to the covenant. This is the peaceful community of Isaiah, where the lion and lamb lie down together. It is the peace of the new creation when the heavenly Jerusalem will descend as depicted in the book of Revelation and there will be no more tears and pain, no more suffering and death. This vision of peace can inspire and comfort us as we deal with life’s troubles. It reminds us that God’s power is greater than human evil and that one day God shall truly reign over the earth.

A second biblical way of speaking about peace is especially found in the writings of Paul and John. This is the interior peace that an individual experiences when living in the presence of Jesus. We are told in Ephesians 2:14-16 that Christ is our peace for he has made us one. It is quite possible that this passage is a fragment of an earlier Christian hymn, used by the author of Ephesians to suggest that the reconciliation of humanity with God through Christ extends also to the reconciliation of Jew and Christian. Reconciliation here means a changed relationship between individuals, groups and nations. The change is from hostility and alienation to love and intimacy. Peace in this sense stems from the realization that Christ has redeemed us, our sins are truly forgiven by God, that we are cherished and loved far beyond what we deserve. Interior peace flows from the gift of faith, that God in Jesus has turned his smile upon us and that we are blessed to be in union with Christ. This peace is a result of the grace that Paul preaches has come to all who are baptized in the Lord; it is the union of vine and branches that John describes.

It is hard to imagine Catholicism losing sight of these dimensions of peace and not being committed to preaching and teaching such a vision of peace. These are certainly more positive conceptions of peace than the negative or residual idea of peace as the absence of war. But the eschatological and interior meanings of peace described above do not exhaust the tradition. There is at least one other dimension to peace, the political meaning of peace.

II. Political Peace

Throughout the Catholic tradition there is another way of speaking about peace that can be distinguished from both peace as interior serenity and peace as the fulfillment of creation beyond history. This third kind of peace is what Augustine described by the expression “*tranquillitas ordinis*.” An order of tranquility is the result of a political community that is rightly ordered, meaning that people live in truth, charity, freedom and justice directed toward the common good. It is peace that is within the grasp of human possibility, not just a distant goal for the end-time nor is it the interior peace that is achieved by knowing in faith the Lordship of Jesus Christ. Rather, it is the construction of an exterior space through institutions and practices that permit men and women to live together, if not as a Christian faith community then at least as a properly human community.

Peace in the political realm is a genuine kind of peace and is not to be disparaged because it is not the interior peace of Christian spirituality, nor the perfection of creation that is eschatological peace. Peace that is a rightly ordered political community is a noble thing to achieve and deserves our commitment to attain and preserve it. This sort of political peace has its counterfeit and inadequate expressions as well.

That peace can be counterfeit is seen in the prophet Ezechiel where he reveals Yahweh’s judgment upon those false prophets who misled the people “saying, ‘Peace,’ where there is no peace” (Ez. 13, 10). Recall, too, the ancient historian Tacitus’s description of how the Britons bitterly described their Roman conquerors, “*solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant*” (they make a desert and call it peace). There is, in short, a false “peace” that results from oppression and fear. Both history and our contemporary age provide illustrations of a “peace” unworthy of the name.

Another aspect of this political peace is cited in the documents of Catholic social teaching. In *Gaudium et spes* the bishops described the “peace of a sort” that marked the situation of nuclear deterrence at the time of the mid-sixties. This “peace of a sort” echoed the viewpoint in *Pacem in terris*. John acknowledged that deterrence had seemingly contributed to a measure of international order even while it also maintained the threat of nuclear war. Without dismissing the argument of those who saw deterrence as a partial good, the Pope wrote, “the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone” (113). On the one hand deterrence provided a “peace of a sort” but on the other hand it was not a satisfactory system of international order.

It is the eschatological “tug” or “pull” of Christian faith that calls humankind to move beyond the “peace of a sort” to a more genuine peace in the political realm. Here we see the

impact of a particular reading of Christian eschatology. An anticipatory or proleptic eschatology refuses to relegate the power of God's reign only to a distant future. So a true political peace is one that is subject to the lure of the *shalom* that marks the complete and total transformation of God's creation. The future peace of the end-time influences the present by inspiring human beings to build a more adequate political order now. Political peace must not be equated with "peace of a sort" but with a rightly ordered political community.

When discussing peace within the political realm there are three options: the risk of a counterfeit peace, the partial good of a weak peace or "peace of a sort" and, finally, genuine peace that establishes a rightly ordered political community, whether domestic or international. This last idea of peace is not equated with spiritual peace nor is it the fullness of peace that awaits the end-time, yet it is open to the transformative power of eschatological peace as that affects history. Such a political peace is a genuine good worthy of Christian support and commitment.

III. The Catholic Vision of Political Peace

At Vatican II, the bishops, quoting Isaiah, observed that peace is "rightly and appropriately called 'an enterprise of justice'" (78). In *Populorum progressio* Paul VI put it this way, "peace is something that is built up day after day, in the pursuit of an order intended by God, which implies a more perfect form of justice" among persons (76). In other words, peace in the political realm was not simply a blessing from God but a task that was to be undertaken by human beings. It could be 'actualized' as people of good will worked to create a more just world order. In his 1972 message for the World Day of Peace, Paul VI coined the expression, "If you want Peace, work for Justice." This catchy formulation of Isaiah's vision became a slogan for many Catholic activists working in the field of social ministry. Seen this way, the full title of the U.S. bishops' pastoral letter was aptly phrased: The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response. There was a range of activities that constituted peace building and human efforts on behalf of justice was placed at the top of the list.

Another significant element of the teaching on peace was suggested by a second aphorism of Paul VI. The papal encyclical *Populorum progressio* had as the subtitle of Part II, section 4: "Development is the New Name for Peace." That sub-title highlighted the particular aspect of justice that required attention.

During the decade of the sixties, there were competing theories of development as well as a growing disenchantment with the word itself, as the residents of poor nations found that many initial hopes for development were dashed. Paul VI used the expression "integral development" to express the conviction that development cannot be reduced simply to economic advancement; other aspects of human existence – cultural, political, psychological, religious – had to be included in any satisfactory understanding of genuine development. What was especially important for Catholic social teaching was that any theory of development worthy of the name had to address the stubborn resistance of social structures that hindered the genuine advancement of people toward a better life. In Catholic social teaching, justice was seen as the key virtue when discussing this need for social transformation.

Linking development and justice revealed the moral dimension of development. Justice entails the creation of a social system that promotes the common good and secures each person's right and ability both to contribute to, and benefit from, the common good.

This way of thinking led to the idea that both justice and development could be viewed as synonyms for political peace. There can be no "*tranquillitas ordinis*" without justice, and the particular shape of justice needed in our time is just development. Peace built on military or economic power may be a "peace of a sort" but it is not the Catholic understanding of political peace. For Catholic social teaching the surer path to peace in our world is just development.

As the dimensions of the challenge of just development on a global scale come into clearer focus, the significance of solidarity has also come to the forefront of Catholic social teaching. Twenty years after Paul issued *Populorum progressio*, John Paul II wrote that solidarity is "the path to peace and at the same time to development." For him solidarity is the virtue that allows us "to see the 'other' – whether a *person, people, or nation* – . . . as our 'neighbor,' a 'helper,' to be made a sharer, on a par with ourselves, in the banquet of life. . ." (39). Solidarity serves as the motivating energy that fosters a desire to work for truly just development by establishing proper national and international practices, policies and institutions. From this work of solidarity in the pursuit of just development there will emerge a true peace.

To sum up the papal vision, peace is the outcome of a committed engagement (solidarity) to the project of social progress for individuals and societies (just development). Paul VI promoted this understanding by his linkage of development and justice as new terms for peace. John Paul II, while echoing Paul's viewpoint, has added solidarity as the crucial step in working for justice. Solidarity is the path to development, and peace is the end result of working for development that is just.

***Gaudium et spes* and Militant Radical Islam**

John Langan, S.J.

One of the most quoted and most influential passages from *Gaudium et spes* is found right at the beginning of the introductory statement:

“The Church has always had the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.” (4)

For us as we look back on this invaluable document from the vantage point of forty years, this passage, which involved explicit reference to social and cultural changes and which implied a more historicist account of Roman Catholic social teaching, is both familiar and problematic. The notion of “signs of the times” quickly became a cliché, even while debate raged about just what constituted a sign of the times. But there can be little doubt that the rise of militant radical Islam has to count for us as a sign of the times, a sign given unforgettable form in the attacks of September 11, 2001 in New York City and Washington. How are we to use the teachings of *Gaudium et spes* to interpret and evaluate this surprising and distressing development? What guidance does this Pastoral Constitution on the Church and the Modern World, which was widely regarded as one of the crowning accomplishments of Vatican Council II, give us in a world which is in important respects post-modern?

What do we mean by talking about militant radical Islam? The two key positions that define it are the insistence on the normative primacy of Islam in structuring the fundamental institutions of society and the claim that the moral and religious urgency of the task of making this primacy effective justifies the use of unrestricted violent means. The first position, which involves both a return to the normative standards attributed to the earliest period of Islam under the prophet and his immediate successors and the establishment of sharia as the source of law, requires a radical reformation of existing regimes in most Islamic countries and sets the movement in more or less overt and permanent opposition to most governments and political parties in the Islamic world, even while it enjoys a significant measure of popular approval. It can thus exact lip service, financial support, and access to the means of warfare for its violent campaigns against the opponents of its political and religious program. It relies on a mode of justification which links religious values and norms to a sharply dualistic interpretation of political events and a policy of violent resistance to non-Islamic powers and their cultural influence. Militant radical Islam, which has been developing gradually over the period since 1945 and which has roots going back to the Wahhabist reform movement in Saudi Arabia in the 18th century and earlier to the teaching of ibn-Taymiyya in the 13th century. It has some claim to legitimacy within the Islamic tradition, but it should certainly not be seen as the mainstream of Islamic teaching. Given the numerous sources of social conflict in the Islamic world and the numerous disputes along the borders of the Islamic world, it has, however, little difficulty in drawing adherents in significant numbers and in achieving both visibility and plausibility for its interpretation of Islam. Whether it is to be counted as a correct or authentic interpretation of the Quran is not a matter on which I am competent to offer an opinion; indeed, it is a matter on which I think it only right to defer to knowledgeable and thoughtful Muslims.

Now such a movement seems to be clearly at odds with the values and the teaching of *Gaudium et spes*, which proposes a generally collaborative stance for dealing with other cultures and religions and which is clearly interested in using religious considerations to restrain the use of force. While *Gaudium et spes* is often criticized as an overly, even naively, optimistic statement of Catholic social teaching, it was written under the shadow of three major crises of the 20th century. These were: 1) the Cold War, the ongoing struggle between the United States and NATO on the one side and the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact on the other, a struggle which would not be definitively resolved until 25 years after the end of Vatican II; 2) the Holocaust, which displayed the vicious evil of racism, especially but not exclusively in the form of anti-Semitism and which made more than clear the enormous dangers of leaving Christians in an apolitical stance of passive obedience to the state; 3) World War II, which had been far more widely destructive than any previous war and which had ended with the use of weapons of mass destruction. The desire to commit the church to contributing ideas and values and examples to the reconstruction and renewal of society in the face of the calamities which had come close to bringing about the triumph of barbarism and irreligion and which still threatened the world with the possibility of nuclear war is powerfully present throughout *Gaudium et spes*. This leads to a very strong emphasis on collaboration for the common good across ideological and religious divides and on the universality of the church's mission in the service of humanity. *Gaudium et spes* had such a strong appeal throughout the world precisely because it spoke to human longings for community in a sharply divided world and to the human search for meaning in a world which suffered from recurrent nightmares. It is also a simple matter of fact that the universality aimed at in this document and elsewhere in the work of the Council did not include a deep or comprehensive engagement with the Islamic world and its problems. Marxists, secularists, Jews, Protestants are all clearly discernible in the audience the Council spoke to; Muslims are not. So, to a considerable extent, our view of the confrontation between *Gaudium et spes* and militant radical Islam has to be inferred and constructed rather than simply observed and reported.

But it is clear that the two fundamental claims of militant radical Islam which I laid out above are simply incompatible with the Council's view of the future common good of humanity. No one would expect the Council to affirm the normative primacy of Islam. The Council was in fact redefining and softening the parallel and contradictory claim for the normative primacy of Christianity and recognizing that such a claim had to be modified and qualified to meet the demands of democratic pluralism. The Church could argue for certain moral norms and for such institutions as marriage and free associations connected with the church's mission on the basis of the common good, of human rights, and of natural law. It could not simply present its positions to the general public as religious teaching, nor could it impose its authority or the authority of Scripture on the state or on society at large. It did not merely accept this point as the ineluctable outcome of the political forces of the moment; it gave reasons for acknowledging a division between its religious concerns and the priorities of society. Since Vatican II, the Church has lived through many painful reversals with regard to the values it cherished and promoted. But it is also true that it continues to champion the cause of human rights and to accept the separation of church and state as an irreversible condition in contemporary society.

This is a reversal of the intransigent anti-liberal position adopted by Gregory XVI and Pius IX against post-revolutionary society in the 19th century. But it is not an abandonment of the Catholic tradition, but a development of it. There are several reasons for adopting this view.

First, the church has, as a result of its own experiences in diverse cultures, seen the value for its religious mission of a pluralistic environment in which religious values are not imposed through coercive means. Second, it has come to feel the affinities between its contemporary situation and the situation of the early Christian church, which lacked the power to impose its norms and its practices on the pagan society around it. Third and most profoundly, the church has insisted on a convergence and a compatibility between its own moral teachings and the conclusions of human reason rightly exercised. This does not mean that there are not many painful collisions or that the convergence is always obvious. But it does mean that there is a place for rational criticism and revision of the religious tradition and the proponents of the Catholic religious tradition can and should look for allies in the secular world and in other religious traditions. As an example of this, I would point to the pro-life movement in the United States, which is united by a shared moral conviction about the wrongness of abortion rather than by a shared religious allegiance. Fourth, insistence on the normative primacy of the religious tradition is not abandoned as a claim affecting the conscience of individual Catholics and the public stance of various Catholic groups; but it is placed within the context of the norms of a democratic society, whose procedures and practices are necessary for the preservation of the common good.

The primacy of the common good in our practical thinking is a fundamental and governing principle for a Catholic social ethics. One is free to think that the common good would be more effectively achieved in a thoroughly Catholic society; and so it makes sense to desire a world of greater religious consensus and to work for the conversion of non-believers. But in the kind of society we in the United States and the European Union actually have and are likely to have for the foreseeable future, the primacy of the common good requires that we work out the best arrangements we can for an imperfect situation which will ensure the observance of human rights norms as a minimal protection for human dignity and the avoidance of such great evils as civil war and the totalitarian control of social life. In a divided society of imperfect moral attainments, implementing the primacy of the common good requires a principled and morally serious acceptance of many second and third best outcomes and a toleration of various evils. The result is a complex moral stance which reflects the complex political, religious, legal, and social history of the West but which there is good reason to think would contribute to the greater internal peace and clearer self-understanding of societies outside the West. Clearly Muslims are free to believe that a society ruled by Islamic law and acknowledging the normative primacy of Islam would be a better society than a Christian society or a pluralistic society. But it is a condition for peaceful life together that Muslims accept the view that the better course of action under present circumstances includes the affirmation of religious liberty for all. The only remotely viable alternative is for there to be a radical separation of the dar-al-Islam from the dar-al-harb. If this to be conducted in accordance with democratic procedures, it will inevitably leave significant minorities of Muslims outside the Islamic realm, and they will need to learn the lessons of tolerance, compromise, and mobilization for the protection of the rights which a truly liberal (as contrasted with a racist or intolerant) regime affirms that they have. Another way of putting this is to say that these Muslim minorities will need to develop a position parallel to that taken in *Gaudium et spes*. They may well find that this is a significant loss in the integrity or the simple directness with which they desire to live their religious faith. But they may also find that the suspicion and aversion which an insistence on the normative primacy of Islam must evoke within a mixed population are significant negative factors in the life of their own community and are barriers to the harmonious living out of their faith in the context of the larger community.

This, it seems to me, is a lesson which Catholicism took a long time to learn; one unintended benefit of this is that Catholics should be more sympathetic to the difficulties which conscientious Muslims feel in this regard. Muslims should regard as congenial the continued Catholic affirmation that a pluralistic and liberal social order remains under the judgment and providential care of God and that forms of secular autonomy which attempt to banish religious consideration from the public square are really a form of liberal intolerance. From a logical standpoint, the key to progress in this regard is for Muslims to develop a compartmentalized and hermeneutically sophisticated interpretation of the normative primacy of Islam, an interpretation which allows other considerations to be taken seriously, which enables them to remain faithful to Islam as a developing tradition, and which assists their integration into larger non-Muslim societies.

The second area of conflict has to do with the choice of means by which Islamic militants wish to advance their cause. *Gaudium et spes* is a document which comes from a church which has long espoused the just war tradition as its primary way of thinking about the use of force among states. It is also a church which has understood the urgency of working positively for peace and which has shown a growing reluctance to legitimize acts of war. It is clear that the authors of *Gaudium et spes* did not expect the speedy elimination of war from human affairs; and they explicitly recognize the possibility of just defensive war. But, like most thoughtful observers of international affairs in their time, they recognized the enormous destruction produced by modern warfare and they feared the consequences of any failure of the system of deterrence between the great powers. Therefore they announced that “all these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude.” (80) This determination leads the Council Fathers to the simple and emphatic condemnation of the use of weapons of mass destruction, though they do not use that term:

“Any act of war aimed indiscriminately at the destruction of entire cities or of extensive areas along with their population is a crime against God and man himself. It merits unequivocal and unhesitating condemnation.” (80)

This condemnation was applied at that time primarily to the possible use of nuclear weapons by the limited number of powers which had “modern scientific weapons.” The use of these weapons or the massive use of conventional weapons along the lines of the firebombings of Hamburg and Tokyo and Dresden would violate the principle of discrimination or non-combatant immunity. But the Council Fathers showed earlier in the document that they were aware of the moral problems raised by guerrilla warfare and terrorism. For many of them, the awareness of what had been happening in Algeria during the decade before the Council was only too vivid.(79). The Council also makes it clear that it is basing its moral assessment of war on “the permanent binding force of universal natural law and its all-embracing principles” and on the voice of human conscience (79)

This is a position which would enable those who aim to follow the moral teaching of the Council and of the Catholic church in general to endorse a defensive war waged by Muslims against aggressive enemies, whether these be Muslim or non-Muslim, and at the same time to condemn the indiscriminate use of terrorist tactics by guerrilla groups as well as the use of weapons of mass destruction by states. These last two possibilities are not so easy to separate as

they once war, since one of the great fears at the present time is that militant radical Islamists will somehow obtain weapons of mass destruction and will then proceed to use them against population centers in a way which violates the principle of discrimination. A Catholic moralist would have no hesitation about condemning such an attack, even in cases where there might be some uncertainty about who was responsible for the initiation of hostilities and about which side was properly on the defensive side. In so far as militant radical Islam endorses such attacks and indiscriminate attacks with lower levels of lethality its actions are simply unacceptable and merit the moral condemnation which follows from the principles affirmed by the Council.

But there are some further points on which those who are guided by the teaching of *Gaudium et spes* and by the spirit of Catholic social teaching are likely to respond more sympathetically to the aspirations of militant radical Islam. The first is that the proponents of militant radical Islam embody a kind of commitment to a transcendent cause and to a certain vision of an ideal society, a commitment which manifests courage and which requires the renunciation of the comforts and the egoistic dreams characteristic of modern consumer societies. This is an important source of prestige and persuasive power for terrorists within the Islamic world; and it confronts those of us who stand outside that world with the difficult task of combining our recognition of certain positive qualities in those who pursue the goals of militant radical Islam through violence and terror with a firm rejection of their means and of their starkly adversarial conception of world history and social conflict. The divide between militant Islamicists and proponents of Catholic social teaching is not merely about means; it is also about ends, about what are truly desirable outcomes for the whole process of cultural and religious interaction.

The second point for partial rapprochement is the welcome which John XXIII and the Council gave to the emergence of new states from the remains of colonial empires in the aftermath of World War II. In *Pacem in terris* (1963), John XXIII had saluted the “new appearance” of international society: “For since all nations have either achieved or are on the way to achieving independence, there will soon no longer exist a world divided into nations that rule others and nations that are subject to others.” (42) While it was clearly true that the classic Western empires, especially the British and the French, were in terminal decline at this point, the pope’s statement was overly broad and overly optimistic, as the Kurds would be more than willing to remind us. Internal forms of domination within post-colonial states and within the vast empire ruled from Moscow both prevented the papal view from being an accurate perception of the politics of nations and minority groups. But it has been a consistent theme in Catholic social teaching over the last half century that the end of colonialist and dominant relationships is a sign of human progress and is a step toward a more just international society and a broader recognition of human rights. It is beyond my competence to assess the current condition of relationships between Islamic states and peoples and Western governments; but the minimal generalization can be ventured that large parts of the Islamic world believe that they are subject to Western forms of coercion and pressure which show that hegemonic relationships continue despite formal independence. In so far as militant radical Islam calls for the end of such relationships and for such concrete expressions of them as the placement of American troops and bases, it is likely to evoke both sympathy and principled support within the world of Catholic social thought.

A third area of partial overlap between the concerns of militant radical Islam and of Catholic social thought is the critique of the existing governments within the Islamic world, many of which are brutal dictatorships, many of which are venal and corrupt regimes, and most of which deny to their citizens the exercise of basic human rights. But external observers are likely to conclude that while radical Islam and Catholic social thought reach the same conclusion about the moral failings of these regimes, the situation of Christians and other minorities would be worse under militant Islam than under more traditional and accommodationist forms of Islam. So a limited overlap in moral judgments will not yield a basis for sustained cooperation or for real consensus.

How Spirituality in Management Works To Reconcile Human Well Being with Productivity and Profits

J. Robert Ouimet

First I will link my presentation to *Gaudium et spes*. Second, in the PowerPoint presentation, I will share *how to live Gaudium et spes, day in and day out, in any organization*.

First, the link of our 35 years experimentation with *Gaudium et spes*.

It has taken mankind a few hundred thousand years, to slowly discover how to make our daily work more and more progressively efficient, productive, profitable, and also useful to the growth of the well being of the family, the community and of mankind. As dated in G & S.4-:

“Never has the human race enjoyed such an abundance of wealth, resources and economic power, and yet a huge proportion of the world’s citizens are still tormented by hunger and poverty, while countless numbers suffer from total illiteracy.”

This abundance of newly created wealth, resources and economic power, particularly since the 1990’s, is bringing out the urgency of not only to increase justice and equity. But also, because work for most humans is their main life activity, it is urgent to find simple, spiritual, practical and actionable ways, in the work place and in the daily management of any organization, capable to give a new beautiful spiritual meaning to work, productivity, efficiency and, if the organization functions in the free market, to profits.

And by doing so, we would begin to answer G & S. 9-:

“Still, beneath all these demands lies a deeper and more widespread longing: persons and societies thirst for a full and free life worthy of man; one in which they can subject to their own welfare all that the modern world can offer them so abundantly. In addition, nations try harder every day to bring about a kind of universal community.”

The 35 years experimentation we are going to talk about is one of the ways to answer this thirst, for a full and free life worthy of man. It is by using – a new innovative system – in the daily management of any organization. The foundation of this new management system is – the primacy of the human dignity of each person in the work place -, along with the social necessity of growing productivity and efficiency. - It does answer the following request of G & S. 12:

“According to the almost unanimous opinion of believers and unbelievers alike, all things on earth should be related to man as their center and crown.

But, in the work place, how can we react to G. & S. 13 – telling us:

“...all of human life, whether individual or collective, shows itself to be a dramatic struggle between good and evil, between light and darkness.”

In the work place of any organization, to cope with this dramatic struggle between good and evil, we need a new – Integrated System of Management Activities – *called ISMA*, capable of bringing in the work place on a daily basis, in a climate of full freedom, profoundly needed values of humanization and spiritualization. These values are capable of battling the evil of greed, power, egocentric behaviour and injustice. And the spiritualization of the work place, made possible by our new experimented ISMA, which is capable of bringing inner silence and sometimes prayers (for those interested) in the work place, is the key hope to win the battle over greed and injustice. It does answer the need of the presence of transcendence and of – God love – in the work place as recommended by G & S. 19 -:

“The root reason for human dignity lies in man’s call to communion with God.”

During the long experimentation of this new ISMA, we discovered that it is possible to give not only meaning to daily work, and to grow well being in the work place, but also to slowly discover in freedom, for those interested, ways on how to make – work a prayer, - how to pray one’s work, in communion with God, most of the time in the silence of our hearts. Yes it is possible. We are doing it in our companies.

It is our firm conviction this can be achieved, in any economic development and in the functioning of any organization, with the use of this ISMA. This innovative and unique management system can realize in daily work the following objective of G. & S. 69-:

“The fundamental finality of production is not the mere increase of products, nor profit or control but rather the service of man, and indeed of the whole man, with regard for the full range of his material needs and the demands of his intellectual, moral, spiritual and religious life”.

The ISMA is capable of realizing what Cf. Acts 4:12. is demanding:

“...economic activity is to be carried on according to its own methods and laws within the limits of moral order, so that God’s plan for mankind may be realized.”

We are convinced, that with the complete variety of humanization and spiritualization values, brought in the work place by the activities of this new ISMA, it is possible for some of us, in freedom, to pray our work, to offer our sweat and our work to God, and therefore be as suggested in G & S. 67-, every instant of our daily work:

“...associated with the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, Who conferred an eminent dignity on labour when at Nazareth He worked with His own hands...”

With the ISMA, it is possible to aim at giving, to every moment of our work, and to every management decision, the meaning described by Pope Jean II:

“Work exists for man; and not man for work.”

So the ISMA can pursue the fundamental objective of Mater and Magistra p. 430 -:

“By its very nature private property has a social quality which is based on the law of the common destination of earthly goods.”

.....

My role here, as a privilege business leader is to share with you *how Gaudium et spes can be lived, day in and day out in any organization.*

With a PowerPoint presentation, I will explain a unique 35 years new ISMA real life experimentation in my companies, described in a Ph.D. thesis of 1500 pages, and obtaining in 1997, for the public defence of the thesis at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, the mention – magna cum laude -.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our experimentation started in 1933. It accelerated after my graduation from Columbia University in 1961. The results I will share with you are based on reflection, experimentation including lots of mistakes, inquiries, and scientific research projects, carried out in the companies founded by my father, Mr. J.-René Ouimet, in 1933. These businesses are in financial management and equity investment; also we are one of the major Italian frozen food manufacturers in Canada. We are private companies. Our turnover is over 100 M \$ per year. Come and visit us in Montreal. You will see if what we are talking about today is a lie, or is true.

2. OBJECTIVE OF OUR EXPERIMENTATION

With the help of spirituality, reconcile in daily management the growth of both, the human development and well being, and the efficiency and profitability of any organization.

3. EXPERIMENTATION AND FINE TUNING

This experimentation is essentially aimed at researching and fine-tuning the various management activities of our ISMA. These activities offered in the work place, on paid time, to those who are interested, bring to the participants a cluster of humanization and spiritualization values. This balance cluster, *is cumulative* over the years. The values complement each other, like different vitamins do...

They gradually transform the work place. They enrich the organization's work culture. They contribute to the growth of the well being of the people who work there, and they also stimulate the organization's efficiency and profitability.

Follows is a partial list of the three categories of our experimented management activities.

Activities fostering mainly *humanization values*:

- Activity called – A Gesture -;
- after layoffs;
- dinner for four before hiring;
- community meals;
- small group meeting between the president and the personnel;
- prize of the Heart;
- wall-posters and illustrations;
- biennial research on the organizational climate.

Activities fostering a blend of *humanization and spiritualization values*:

- silence and sharing (sometime prayer) at the beginning of certain meetings
- testimonial meetings
- annual, one-on-one, personal conversation

Activities fostering *spiritual values*:

- quiet rooms for reflection and meditation
- small spiritual support groups
- gestures of reconciliation

4. EXCEPTIONAL CUMULATION OF VALUES FOSTERED IN THE WORK PLACE BY THE ISMAS

The research done on the cumulation of values fostered by the ISMA identifies six dominant values, brought in the work place over the years, by the variety of complementary activities.

- | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| - <i>solidarity</i> | - <i>brotherhood</i> | - <i>listening to other</i> |
| - <i>human dignity</i> | - <i>faith</i> | - <i>hope</i> |

The six values are not only complementary, but they are absolutely essential to insure growth of human well being in the work place.

5. POSSIBLE UNIVERSAL APPLICATION OF THE ISMA

There are five conditions necessary for using the ISMA activities anywhere in the world, in any kind of company or organization (small, public, private, cooperative, governmental, or charitable). The conditions are:

- freedom
- *aiming first* at the well being *and not at* productivity and profits
- progressive implementation
- leadership
- spiritual support group.

6. CONCLUSION

The management activities of our ISMA can work hand in hand with the economic management of the organization, and with certain activities which are calling for the help of – God love -. And as you will see, the growth of the well being in the work place will also contribute greatly, over the years, to the growth of productivity and efficiency of the organization.

The human and economic results over the last thirty five years are:

- creating good feeling of belonging in the organization;
- increasing motivation, productivity, and creativity;
- creating better communication and a climate of solidarity;
- since 1933: only one short labour strike; no lockout, not one single departmental slowdown;
- motivating each stockholders, Board of Directors member, and management to become more and more preoccupied in their daily management by the primacy of the human dignity of each and every person working in the company, and also by the fundamental importance of *authenticity in any human relations*;
- creating a better climate of freedom in which all participants feel increasingly at ease in expressing themselves, and in offering suggestions for improving things;
- reducing absenteeism and turn-over rate;
- slowly increasing the well being and happiness of the personnel as well as justice and fairness;

- Since 1988, achieving greater growth percentage of sales and profits, compared to the annual growth of major food processing companies in Canada (with three years of exception), along with sustained new capital investments and research and development;

In concluding, may I state with humility and objectivity, that our very unique and unusual thirty five years real life experimentation, is one of the not any available, implementable, practical, systematic and concrete answer in real life management of any organization and company, to slowly aim at satisfying the demands of
G & S. 72- :

“Christians who take an active in – the socio-economic development and fight for justice and charity should be convinced that they can make a great contribution to the prosperity of mankind world...Thus their whole life, both and to the peace of the individual and social, will be permeated with the spirit of the Beatitudes, notably with a spirit of poverty.”

By using the ISMA, we are convinced that it becomes possible as suggested in
G & S-72 for:

“Whoever in obedience to Christ seeks first the Kingdom of God, there from a stronger and purer Love for helping all his akes brethrens and for perfecting the work of justice under the inspiration of charity...”

Yes, “it can be done.”

Yes G & S and the catholic social doctrine can be lived in any organization, day in and day out, at certain fundamental conditions.

Yes it is “Mission possible, if it is done with Him.”

Please come and visit our companies in Montreal.

See by yourself if... we walk the talk... or if we are liars... and consult Internet.

www.our-project.org www.nuestroproyecto.org www.notreprojet.org

The Economics of the Modern World

Robert A. Sirico

Among the most notable features of the Second Vatican Council's document *Gaudium et spes* (1965) is its unabashed embrace, as a pastoral hope and strategic mission of the Church, of the cause of the material well being for the whole human family. This hope is not only for the ultimate mission of the Church, salvation of souls, which always remains the first concern of the faith, but also involves a proximate mission for lives, health, and prosperity of all people, not only Catholics, not only Christians, and not only theists, but the whole of the human race and the every society in the world. The stated mission of *Gadium* is to proclaim a social duty to all people. While this did not mark a change in doctrine from previous concern, it does signify and initiate a development of the Church's pastoral application. Perhaps, too, it serves as the most accessible sign of the significance of the council itself: a broadening of the concern of the Church from internal protection and management toward the much celebrated and courageous opening to the world.

But even more radically in light of current political trends and fashions, *Gadium* stands out as a reminder of the core social concern that should animate those who think about politics and economics, namely the flourishing of society in all respects, not excluding those that are properly considered economic. Indeed, it would be impossible to discuss the well being of the human family without references to economic issues, which encompass the whole of the material management of society. *Gaudium* does not fail in this regard, but rather contains a vast amount of material that falls within the domain of economic science. It offers not a model or blueprint but rather general principles and guidance to enable a great degree of social and international cooperation in the service of human well being.

Economics is the field of study that addresses the main problem presented by the Fall of Man, when the reality of scarcity first presented itself. No longer would all the material needs of the human person be provided in absence of toil (which is distinct from the vocation of work, given to the human family prior to the Fall). No longer would the natural resources of the environment grant everything necessary for human sustenance. No longer could abundance be taken for granted. Rather, there would need to be some method of organizing work, parsing out what is available, producing new materials, establishing priorities and discovering new and better ways to sustain a rising population, making use of the resources of Creation, including the whole of the material world as well as the creative capacities of the human mind, to find better ways to cobble together a flourishing society amidst a "vale of tears." This is the core of the problem that is typically called economic.

Modernity has discovered the solution to working through the economic problem in the institutions of entrepreneurship, property, contract, and the division of labor. These are all institutions embraced by the principles advanced within the framework presented by *Gadium*. Far from deviating from the divine plan for human life, these institutions and the market economies to which they give rise, fulfill God's plan: "When man develops the earth by the work of his hands or with the aid of technology, in order that it might bear fruit and become a dwelling

worthy of the whole human family and when he consciously takes part in the life of social groups, he carries out the design of God manifested at the beginning of time, that he should subdue the earth, perfect creation and develop himself. At the same time he obeys the commandment of Christ that he place himself at the service of his brethren." (Section 57).

Gaudium, however, did not dwell on the dismal side of economics but rather expressed great hope, consistent with the spirit and emphasis of *Mater et magistra* and *Pacem in terris*, about the prospects for human flourishing, even as it drew attention to the ongoing need for all to be included in the rising prosperity then evident." Through his labors and his native endowments man has ceaselessly striven to better his life," said section 33. "Today, however, especially with the help of science and technology, he has extended his mastery over nearly the whole of nature and continues to do so. Thanks to increased opportunities for many kinds of social contact among nations, a human family is gradually recognizing that it comprises a single world community and is making itself so. Hence many benefits once looked for, especially from heavenly powers, man has now enterprisingly procured for himself."

A passage early in *Gadium* speaks directly to economic change, and might have been written only this year, given the reality of the current technological revolution: "Profound and rapid changes are spreading by degrees around the whole world. Triggered by the intelligence and creative energies of man, these changes recoil upon him, upon his decisions and desires, both individual and collective, and upon his manner of thinking and acting with respect to things and to people." (Section 4) One is struck by the clarity of the passage in attributing economic change and advancement not to Hegelian historical forces or geography and even demographics. Rather *Gaudium* locates the source of change as the "intelligence and creative energies of man."

This is the first of a number of critical passages in *Gadium et spes* impacting on the world of economics in a manner that is sympathetic to the institutions of market economies. We must recall too that this was written at a time long before the internet or personal computers. Mass plane travel had just become more common. Typewriters were manual. Fax machines were available only to the elite. Televisions were not yet displaying color. Telephones were attached to the wall and owned and operated by governments. Cars were still a luxury good even in the developed world.

World GDP per capita has increased 2.5 times since 1965, which is twice the rate of growth of the forty year period (according to Brad DeLong of Berkeley). To illustrate just how phenomenal this is in the sweep of history, it took 400 years between 1450 and 1850 to equal the same growth levels. Economic growth means exponential increases in the living standard of all peoples, not just in the developed world. To further underscore the economic miracle that has occurred since *Gadium*, we must not forget the primary focus on the human person, the global population of which has nearly doubled since 1965. These economic growth rates need to be understood in context of these population increases. In any other century in the history of the world, a 40 year doubling of the population would have led to catastrophe: famine, death, and suffering for the living. But because of the market economy and its unrelenting tendency to produce and distribute goods universally over time, this catastrophe has not only been avoided but the rising numbers of people have experienced vast increases in their standard of living. What has been responsible has not been the advancement of existing socialism but rather the rise

of the global market economy that continues to draw in ever more of the human family within the matrix of exchange, cooperation, and creativity in service of the human person. It is the institution of the market economy, and its production of wealth available for charity and ever more wealth creation, which has served so well to address *Gaudium's* concern for the least among us.

Much of this growth is owed to the increase in technology. *Gaudium* said: "Technology is now transforming the face of the earth ... To a certain extent, the human intellect is also broadening its dominion over time: over the past by means of historical knowledge; over the future, by the art of projecting and by planning" (section 5). What emerged in the intervening years was technology not in the service of large governments or big public relations campaigns but smaller life saving devices, consumer products, and production techniques that deliver food and health to all. Thus did *Gaudium* anticipate many of the dramatic changes in economic of the past decade, as well as subsequent developments in the social teaching of the Catholic Church.

It also anticipated the most important economic development of the last decade: the globalization of the industrial economy. "The increase of commerce between the various nations and human groups opens more widely to all the treasures of different civilizations and thus little by little, there develops a more universal form of human culture, which better promotes and expresses the unity of the human race to the degree that it preserves the particular aspects of the different civilizations." (Section 54) We see here not the condemnation or demonization of globalization we find in the popular press today, but a recognition of material benefits of such change while cautioning about the need to preserve the common good in all societies.

Globalization has also led to dramatic change in the economic structure of societies themselves. "The industrial type of society is gradually being spread, leading some nations to economic affluence, and radically transforming ideas and social conditions established for centuries" (section 6). If this was the case in 1965, it is true many times over in our own time. The collapse of socialism in Russia and its former client states in Eastern Europe, the opening up of China to market reforms, the expansion of trade worldwide, and the democratization of Latin America has resulted in massive production shifts away from agriculture toward industry. These changes have resulted in increased rates of growth.

Globalization has expanded the division of labor and permitted the developed world to specialize ever more in financial services and information technologies. The "information revolution," which only came to be discussed as a matter of public debate in the late 1980s and more so during the 1990, was also anticipated by *Gaudium*: "New and more efficient media of social communication are contributing to the knowledge of events; by setting off chain reactions they are giving the swiftest and widest possible circulation to styles of thought and feeling." These words, we must recall were written 30 years before the public availability of the web browser. In the intervening decade, we have seen the internet lead to a complete upheaval and transformation of the way nearly all people's in the world acquire and transmit information.

One of the criticisms made of *Gaudium* in the 1960s and beyond was that it tried too hard to be contemporary and ended up only offering up a snapshot of its time that quickly became dated. Perhaps that interpretation enjoyed some degree of plausibility during the stagflations and

inflations of the 1970s and early 1980s. But today, it is easier to see that *Gaudium* not only avoided the trap of speaking only to the moment; it spoke way beyond that and saw what few others even imagined. It foresaw the rise of economic liberalization.

To understand their implications and applications in our time, however, requires a theoretical understanding of economics, specifically the liberal economics tradition interpreted in light of humanistic Catholic theology. A proper conception of the relationship of economics to the social sphere generally embraces the liberal conception of the ordering of economic processes, domestically and globally, and illuminates the very source of economic progress that gave rise to many of the insights of this central document of Vatican II.

Though mainstream economic theory in an age of positivism has become methodologically narrow even as the subject matter to which its method is applied has become inappropriately imperious, an older and theologically informed view of the scope of economics encompasses not only the commercial activities of *homoeconomicus* but a broad range of human endeavor that shapes social patterns in religion, arts, leisure, demographics, health, philanthropy and the charitable sector. In the same way, this humanistic tradition of economic thought—born within the Catholic intellectual milieu of the late Scholastic period and protected and enlivened by modern Catholic social teaching—conceives of the market as not only a place of buying and selling but a vast web of voluntary human activity that includes giving, receiving, creating, sharing, discovering, and virtually all other forms of social participation and association.

Gaudium permits us to gain an appreciation for the role of enterprise and entrepreneurship in wealth creation and distribution, the importance of decentralized knowledge in the orderly formation of a global economic order, the place of creativity and charity in assuring a common destination of material goods, as well as the relationship between freedom and human dignity in a world market for goods, services, culture, and even faith. *Gaudium*, for example, embraces private property and ownership as the foundation of economic growth (section 71: "Private property or some ownership of external goods confers on everyone a sphere wholly necessary for the autonomy of the person and the family, and it should be regarded as an extension of human freedom") and liberty itself ("it constitutes one of the conditions for civil liberties").

Other economic themes in *Gadium* that have been central to both later social teaching and developments in world affairs: progress, creativity, ownership, the common destination of earthly goods, internationalization, social interdependence, growth, participation, spontaneous ordering, human partnership, freedom, and goodness. Later teaching has further illuminated these themes. Indeed, just as *Gaudium* completed the person-centered social teaching of *Mater et magistra*, a strong affinity exists between *Gaudium's* call for a just economic order and *Centesimus annus's* embrace of the business economy within the framework of a morality and virtue.

Gaudium also points to the future of the state as a less intrusive part of economic and culture life as all forms of freedom as essential the flourishing of the human family: "Only in freedom can man direct himself toward goodness." The future does not lie with central planning and political authoritarianism. Rather, "Economic development must remain under man's

determination and must not be left to the judgment of a few men or groups possessing too much economic power or of the political community alone or of certain more powerful nations. It is necessary, on the contrary, that at every level the largest possible number of people and, when it is a question of international relations, all nations have an active share in directing that development." (section 65). We see here a recognition that the future of world economic active rests with international cooperation, not war, and with international commerce, not central planning.

Gaudium also contains the first strong warning of what would end up as a continuing theme of the social encyclicals of John Paul II, and now the recently published Compendium of Catholic Social Teaching, that freedom in the economic sphere is *necessary* but not a *sufficient* basis for the good society; that consumerism and materialism of developed societies must be abandoned in favor of a gospel call to assist the poor, and give unto others. Further, we would be mistaken to imagine that the future of the world economy should or could be imposed through interventions by one power over others but rather can best emerge through a liberal internationalism that puts trade before protection, diplomacy before war, and cooperation before all manner of conflict: "If an authentic economic order is to be established on a world-wide basis, an end will have to be put to profiteering, to national ambitions, to the appetite for political supremacy, to militaristic calculations, and to machinations for the sake of spreading and imposing ideologies." (section 85).

Thus do we see that *Gaudium* was not a snap shot in time—merely a period piece of pastoral advice—but rather is a prescient forecast of a world that has only come into full view in our own time, a world of market globalization, increased opportunity, an embrace of commercial freedom and exchange, and explosive technological improvements that benefit all societies and sectors within societies. *Gadium* embraced the well being of the world and, by necessity, the structures of the enterprising economy—not the static, controlled, and regimented economy but the dynamic, spontaneous, and open-ended process of market-driven economic growth that serves all people by people serving each other. Neither did *Gadium* neglect the moral demands made on a world that has overcome so much of the economic problem left by original sin: it calls on all people to put aside material satisfaction for the pursuit of higher ideals.

When this document was written, traditionally-minded people may have found themselves squeamish about both its tone and message, its anthropocentrism and its unrelenting optimism. Today we can see that this emphasis was much needed then and is still much needed now, especially since its expectation of a world undergoing dramatic change turned out to be incredibly accurate. Forty years later, this document speaks to the economic needs of all in a way that is both friendly to market economics but also uncompromising in its call for modernity to follow a higher ethical standard than any economic order is capable of calling forth on its own. The call to justice in *Gaudium* includes a call to economic freedom—in both its practical result of expanding prosperity for all and its moral center that emphasizes the dignity of the human person—and a call to go beyond the merely economic to achieve the first principle of *Gaudium*: "to carry forward the work of Christ."

A CHURCH IN THE MODERN WORLD OF AFRICA: THE ZAMBIAN EXPERIENCE

Peter Henriot, S.J.

Zambia became independent of British colonial rule in 1964, one year before the greatest document of the Second Vatican Council, *Church in the Modern World*, was published. The Catholic church in Zambia has over the past forty years played a highly significant role in the development of the country. This has occurred both through direct service institutions (e.g., schools and hospitals) and through explicit social teaching on key issues facing the country at large. Today the church enjoys a prominent and respected place, in cooperation with other church bodies, in influencing the social, economic and political life of the people, as well as the religious life of individuals and the community.

Key to the influence of the Catholic church in Zambia has been the guidance provided by church's social teaching (CST), in offering both *clarification* of issues and *motivation* for responding to those issues. This social teaching is found both in official documents (many of them ecumenically produced) and in actions undertaken by significant organisations such as the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP) and the Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR).

One can honestly say that the *Church in the Modern World* has found an incarnation – indeed an *inculturation* – in the life of the Church in Modern Africa as experienced in Zambia. Because of that, it is helpful to trace the *methodology* of the CST in Zambia, the major points in its *content* and the significant *lessons* that be drawn from its experience.

METHODOLOGY

The Zambian expressions of the church's social teaching have been examples of serious *ecumenical cooperation*. Many major pastoral letters have come out signed by the leaders of the three major church bodies: the Zambian Episcopal Conference (ZEC – Catholic bishops), the Christian Council of Zambia (CCZ – mainline Protestant) and the Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia (EFZ – mainline Evangelicals). For example, a 2004 document celebrated the 40th Anniversary of Zambia's independence with reflections on God's blessings, our failings, and national hopes.

The letters have followed an *inductive approach*, beginning their message with a "reading of the signs of the times" and following with good social analysis. For example, the 1993 letter on the effects of the IMF-World Bank imposed structural adjust programme (SAP), entitled *Hear the Cry of the Poor*, begins with a story of a women facing immense problems of poverty, with the specific case of poor health care offered by government facilities.

Frequently, the letters have been written in a *consultative fashion*. For example, at the start of the Third Republic (1992), the bishops asked people to submit recommendations to be made to the new government on the way forward. Also, the very active presence of over 250

local justice and peace committees around the country feeds into the national office information and perspectives that then find expression in the statements of the bishops conference.

The social teaching has been very *practical and policy relevant*, taking up issues of daily concern for the people and addressing larger topics that have consequences for the nation's future. For example, in the midst of a controversial constitutional review process, the bishops issued a letter of analysis and recommendations regarding a people-directed adoption of the new constitution, with specific comment on matters such as the Bill of Rights and the electoral process.

While guided by universal CST materials, the letters have tended to take more of “*values approach*” than emphasising “quotations” from papal and other church documents. What this means is a more acceptable form of teaching, less “churchy” and more understandable to a wider audience.

CONTENT

A review of the major documents coming from the ZEC and relevant actions by church organisations such as the CCJP demonstrates how the principles of *Church in the Modern World* have indeed found practical application in addressing major issues facing Zambia over the past forty years. This application is not only “doctrinal” (documents, statements) but also “action” (practical involvement in public affairs) Some examples of this are as follows:

The struggle for *political democracy* has moved the country through a one-party state to a multi-party system. But all too often we have experienced a change of structures without a corresponding change of attitudes. The social teaching of the bishops has emphasised the need to develop a culture of responsibility, accountability, service, etc. This is seen, for instance, in letters and statements issued at the time of elections.

Economic development in the country has meant a movement from a state controlled “command economy” (socialism) to a liberalised “free market economy” (capitalism). This has been done with very little immediate and planned regard to the welfare of the people.

The teaching of the bishops has therefore repeatedly evaluated the economic development in terms of the basic question “what is happening to the people, especially to the poor?”

Cultural questions are major issues in Zambia and the social teaching and the social action of the church have directly addressed these issues. For example, the questions of family, of women and of abortion have all been dealt with. The letter on abortion (1999) is a good example of paying attention to the wider question of why women seek abortions and how to work for solutions beyond mere legal restrictions – e.g., education of the girl child, challenge to male dominance in the culture, etc.

The teaching of the church has been accompanied by a *training* of pastoral agents and the general public in the evangelical values of justice, peace, development and the integrity of

creation. Courses in CST are mandatory in the seminary instruction. Special workshops are provided for women and men in formation for religious life. One significant event has been a regular “retreat day” for Catholic Members of Parliament and other significant national leaders.

Certainly one of the best instruments for promotion of the CST values has been a well organised and well trained network of *justice and peace committees* throughout the country.

Over 250 parishes host these committees, whose members are required to go through five phases of training, the first of which consists in an introduction to the relevant CST. At the national level, a competent staff of CCJP advise the bishops on social issues and involve themselves in matters such as budget analysis, electoral reform, economic policies, etc.

LESSONS

Some simple but significant lessons for the future of CST can be drawn from the experience of the church in Zambia.

First, to be relevant in effectively serving the people’s needs, the church must learn to read the signs of the times and to engage with the issues that affect people’s lives. This does require a learning stance, a willingness to listen to what people are saying. The church in Zambia has gained respect for its willingness to take positions on controversial questions such as political and economic policies of the government. By and large, church leaders have not remained silent on these burning issues.

Second, the church must make a commitment to train both good scholars and competent social activists. Effective promotion of justice, development and peace requires workers who can gain the confidence of the public by their expertise and dedication. Good use of media, for instance, in publicising the church’s teaching is essential. One specific help in this matter has been the recent formation of the African Forum for Catholic Social Teaching (AFCAST), which has focused CST expertise on regional issues such as corruption, environment, elections, poverty, etc.

Third, the local church has the need to engage with the regional church and with the international church on the critical social issues. Zambia has been active in both the AMECEA conference (of which it is a member) and the IMBISA conference. Though its CCJP and other institutions, it has played a role in international issues such as debt cancellation, the GMO controversy, human rights violations, etc.

It can only be hoped that the international conference on the 40th Anniversary of *Church in the Modern World* will both learn from the experience of the church in Zambia also contribute to its future service of the Zambian people.

***Gaudium et spes* and the Changes in Socio-Economic Thinking:
Forty Years After
Njoku Uzochukwu Jude**

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. This paper argues 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 imaginations, 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.

To specifically make a case 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. The 1950s and 1960s have a different dominant socio-economic vision from the 21st century. 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.

An increasing technological growth, abundance and a more optimistic Western Europe and North America marked the period of the 1950s and 1960s. The United States' Marshal plan at the end of World War II had succeeded in re-building Western Europe. The United Nations appeared as a guarantor of world peace. Social theorists applied the social evolutionary thinking in explaining the disparities between the richer and poorer countries. Their analyses created the conviction that the human society was only a few steps away from discovering the roots of poverty, banishing it permanently and creating a better world. The optimism, which this period radiated, helped to encourage the Church to a dialogue with the secular world and a readiness to be open to it. These constitute (in part) the backgrounds of John XXIII's *Pacem in terris* (1961)

and also underlie part of his presuppositions in the convocation of Vatican II (1962-1965). An economic expression of the optimism of this period came to be represented in the modernisation theory, which assumed the major tool of analysing the problems of world poverty at that time. Modernisation theory used the tool of economic analysis. *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 use 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).

The general optimism and the use of economic analysis that characterised the period in which *Gaudium et spes* was promulgated encountered a twist in the rise of dependency theory. Dependency theory involved not only economic analyses but also incorporated political analysis. The failures of the United Nations' Decade of Development and the United States' Alliance for Development (in alleviating 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 theory in turn became a strong tool in the arguments of Latin American liberation theology. The Second Conference of the Latin American Bishops held in Medellin (1968) appropriated the basic insights from the dependency school and its use by liberation theologians. Hence it replaced the language of development and aid as seen in *Gaudium et spes* and Paul VI's *Populorum progressio* with the language of liberation. Paul VI's *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 actually went further to argue in article 46 for a transition from a purely economic analysis (the language of development) to political analysis (the language of liberation). Paul VI's *Octogesima adveniens* and *Evangelii nuntiandi* and the synod of Bishops' document (1971) *Justitia in mundo* could be categorised as falling within the influence of the dependency theory. Between *Gaudium et spes* (1965) and *Octogesima adveniens* (1971), 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.

While the lack of capital was a factor in explaining underdevelopment in the 1950s and 1960s, the question of dependence replaced that of capital as the tool for explaining the problem of underdevelopment in the 1970s. In the 1980s, the dependency theory began to experience its own crisis as a tool in explaining the predicament of poorer countries – a crisis that reached its

crescendo with the collapse of official communism in Eastern and Central Europe. Some of the problems, which confronted the dependency theory, included the lack of empirical verifiability of the assertion that ‘the poor get poorer just because the rich get richer’. Another point is 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 questions about the veracity of the myth of dependence and external domination. These questions helped to stimulate the interest in culture as a likely explanation to the problem of poverty and underdevelopment. Worthy of note here is Lawrence Harrison’s book: *Underdevelopment is a State of the Mind – The Latin American Case* (1985). 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.” (M. E. PORTER, *Attitudes, Values, Beliefs and Microeconomics of Prosperity*, in L. E. HARRISON and S. P. HUNTINGTON (eds.), *Culture Matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*, New York: Basic Books, 2000. 14-28. p. 14.) The third conference of the Latin American Bishops held in Puebla (1979), John Paul II’s *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (1987) and *Centesimus annus* (1991) show the tendencies of appropriating elements of cultural analysis. 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.*’

Do these changes in socio-economic thinking both within secular and ecclesiastical circles since the last forty years render *Gaudium et spes* obsolete? 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 the recommendations of the document 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) This verse acts as a hermeneutical key, which enables *Gaudium et spes* to be relevant even in the midst of changing times and historical circumstances. The point here 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) This will involve a re-examination of our concepts and visions of Catholic social teaching as a tradition.

Here lies the relevance of *Gaudium et spes* even in the midst of the changes taking place in social thinking. 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.” The same person who receives Holy Communion on Sunday in a church in Africa 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.” Even if different ages and localities see these in diverse ways but the commitment to be open and the readiness to be part of this on going process and 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.

Justice and Justification: the New Life in Christ

Stefano Alberto and Alessandro Gamba

Any discussion of man's call to justice would run the risk of seeming abstract if it did not take as its starting point the connection which the *Gaudium et spes* establishes between the idea of holiness and the idea of justice. Man «received a mandate to subject to himself the earth and all it contains, and to govern the world with justice and holiness»¹. The righteous man is, therefore, the holy man. This identity is already found in Zechariah's Song², where the latter gives praise to the Lord for having enabled us men to serve and follow Him «in holiness and righteousness before Him all our days»³.

In the Catholic tradition, holiness is not a vague, hazy concept as it is in other religions in which the saint is an extraordinary person *quo talis*, given that there is a radical distinction between the sacred (reality as most directly related to the divinity) and the profane (reality as not related to the divine)⁴. Nothing is, from a Christian perspective, *pro-fanum* (that is: outside the temple), as all reality points to Christ the Saviour. «In the Catholic tradition, the whole is a saint, and, in the strictest sense of the word, the saint is the individual who realizes more completely his or her own personality, what he or she is supposed to be»⁵.

Until the dawn of the Renaissance, the Christian people have humbly and simply trodden the path of a holy life as a kind of «demonstration of the possibility of Christianity»⁶; this was, in other words, something generally accepted and willingly embraced by most men⁷. These last five centuries, however, have witnessed a slow but progressive fracture in the man's life between one's human experience and the ideal of holiness. Consequently, the image of man as a *divus*, his own idol, dominates. The image of the saint, the man who is truly one and unified because of his faith in God is substituted by the man whose power rests in some particular human activity. Partiality substitutes synthesis⁸: man believes he can manage his life on his own, and his relationship with other men too, just by relying on his own strength. The fact that original sin and the need for redemption have been forgotten over time engenders the banishment of man's dependence from God. This condition, though, is inevitably marked by fear and

¹ *Gaudium et spes*, 34.

² Cf. *Luke* 1:67-79.

³ *Luke* 1:75.

⁴ «If therefore in the Church everyone does not proceed by the same path, nevertheless all are called to sanctity and have received an equal privilege of faith through the justice of God» (*Lumen gentium*, 32).

⁵ L. Giussani, *Why the Church?*, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001, pp. 219-220.

⁶ A. Von Speyr, *Mistica oggettiva*, Jaca Book, 1989, p. 252 [translated].

⁷ «The historian may well argue that the feudal baron is more typical of mediaeval culture than the monk or the friar; he may equally point out how the Church became a stronghold of feudal privilege. But he cannot deny that Christianity was one of the formative powers in mediaeval culture or that throughout the whole course of Western history there was a spiritual élite which was sincerely devoted to putting their ideals into practice and making the Christian way of life a reality, while at the same time the whole society was generally united in the acceptance of Christian beliefs and in at least a theoretic acceptance of Christian moral standards» (*Christianity and European Culture. Selections from the Work of Christopher Dawson*, The Catholic University of America Press, 1998, p. 244).

⁸ «Human life finds its unity in the adoration of the one God. the commandment to worship the Lord alone integrates man and saves him from an endless disintegration. Idolatry is a perversion of man's innate religious sense. An idolater is someone who "transfers his indestructible notion of God to anything other than God"» (*Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae*, 2114).

desperation, a reaction to the passing of time and the ineluctability of death: «Quant'è bella giovinezza, che si fugge tuttavia! Chi vuol esser lieto, sia: di doman non c'è certezza»⁹.

It is the logic inherent in this fragmentation of man's experience which has led and quickly leads to the worst kind of rationalism and its consequences¹⁰, which are still painfully visible in the mentality of our time today. Man's individual consciousness becomes the subject which guarantees and the entity which presides over truth; reason becomes the dominant element and measure of all things. Post-Cartesian *ratio*, with its typical sceptical attitude, deems itself capable of devising systems to explain all of reality and that it can be entirely self-sufficient: «The most perniciously typical aspect of the modern era consists in the absurd attempt to reconstruct a solid and fruitful temporal order divorced from God, Who is, in fact, the only foundation on which it can endure. In seeking to enhance man's greatness, men fondly imagine that they can do so by drying up the source from which that greatness springs and from which it is nourished. They want, that is, to restrain and, if possible, to eliminate the soul's upward surge toward God. But today's experience of so much disillusionment and bloodshed only goes to confirm those words of Scripture: "Unless the Lord builds the house, they labour in vain that build it"»¹¹. This is summed up by a slogan attributed to Cornelio Fabro: "if God does exist, He doesn't matter". This reduces God to a kind of private affair, an affair which can be, at best, something tolerated: something which at present has nothing to do with the concrete instances of human beings, with man's daily problems and the decisions he takes concerning his existence (even those related to the fields of aesthetics and ethics). This is how secularism (or laicism) was born, that is man's presumptuous claim to be absolutely autonomous¹²: stating that God is of no use paves the way for a potentially militant atheism.

The gravest consequences of this secularised mentality can be summed up as follows¹³. [1] A blatant reduction of the concept of reason: from its original openness in front of reality, reason becomes the ultimate measure of all things, a claustrophobic space, which might, perhaps, be enlarged, but which is inevitably destined to be the tomb of human intellect. What the rationalistic method cannot measure, cannot, quite simply, exist; any novelty in life is, consequently, to be excluded *a priori*. What is thus elided is the supreme category of possibility, which is the launching pad of any authentic search for meaning and of any fruitful creativity. [2] The notion of freedom is grossly misrepresented, being conceived as something totally autonomous, disconnected, deprived of any ties. According to this conception, a free man is a man who allows himself to fall prey to his own instinct, mood, opinion. [3] Conscience itself undergoes a radical mutation: it becomes the only source of ethical norm, the creation-point of the criteria which guide our actions. To "follow the voice of one's own conscience" – which for a Christian means to listen to the objective *ordo* which God has engraved in the heart of every man – becomes synonymous with an obstinate re-affirmation of subjective interpretation. [4] Culture is reduced to a way of dominating the surrounding world. Man's greed takes as its allies

⁹ Lorenzo il Magnifico, *Canzona di Bacco*, vv. 1-4.

¹⁰ «In modern philosophy and thought, doubt is in the same central position as the old *thaumazein* (the astonishment for everything which is because it is) of the Greeks. Cartesius was the first who conceived this modern doubt, that after him became the evident and taken-for-granted mover of the entire modern thought, the invisible central axis of every idea» (H. Arendt, *Vita activa. La condizione umana*, Bompiani, 1997, p. 203 [translated]).

¹¹ *Mater et magistra*, 217.

¹² «Secularized culture – which wants irrationally impose itself as the only possible in our times – seems to make it a point of honour by turning out every reflex of the invisible world and stifling every recall to another and higher life» (G. Biffi, *Piccolo dizionario del cristianesimo*, Piemme, 2003, p. 202 [translated]).

¹³ Cf. L. Giussani, *Il senso di Dio e l'uomo moderno. La «questione umana» e la novità del Cristianesimo*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1994.

the opportunities made available to it by science and technology; these are in fact always subordinate to an ideological emphasis on a particular detail as opposed to the greater horizon of truth – and this for reasons of power. If coherently pursued, the outcome of this false culture will predictably be violence and barbarism.

This situation corresponds exactly to the diagnosis of *Gaudium et spes* – diagnosis which today has become dramatically visible: «growing numbers of people are abandoning religion in practice. Unlike former days, the denial of God or of religion, or the abandonment of them, are no longer unusual and individual occurrences. For today it is not rare for such things to be presented as requirements of scientific progress or of a certain new humanism. In numerous places these views are voiced not only in the teachings of philosophers, but on every side they influence literature, the arts, the interpretation of the humanities and of history and civil laws themselves. As a consequence, many people are shaken»¹⁴.

In this context, acting justly becomes extremely difficult, given that man's innate need for justice is altered by the presence of original sin. «This kind of abuse of the idea of justice and the practical distortion of it show how far human action can deviate from justice itself, even when it is being undertaken in the name of justice»¹⁵. Where is this abuse most evidently manifest?

In his search for an answer capable of affirming freedom, goodness or justice, man comes up against a “wall”; he discovers that he is by nature limited, so that everything appears without any future hope, and it seems impossible for anybody to complete a single action in life without committing an injustice or creating some kind of contradiction. In this, the figure of the patriarch Moses is emblematic. He led his people hundreds of miles until he reached the edge of what would later become the State of Israel. From the top of the mountain he saw the Holy Land from afar, but was unable to touch it¹⁶. In fact, God, told him that he would never enter the Holy Land as a punishment for having hesitated and for not having paid Him justice (it was Joshua who was designated by the Lord to lead the conquering army in)¹⁷. Man is constantly on the fringe of a land longed-for but which he cannot reach on his own; and this is why the question concerning the aim of one's life dominates the daily life of each living person: «The ultimate mystery of human life is its incompleteness and the problem of overcoming it»¹⁸. There is only one explanation which can account for everything that can happen: that is the cross of Christ. His death is God's answer to our limitations and to our injustices: «The Church firmly believes that Christ, Who died and was raised up for all, can through His Spirit offer man the light and the strength to measure up to his supreme destiny. Nor has any other name under the heaven been given to man by which it is fitting for him to be saved»¹⁹. Everything would present a horizon void of reason, and any event would be without an adequate answer, without Christ: He marks God's ultimate victory over human reality²⁰. This is the only possible explanation which would

¹⁴ *Gaudium et spes*, 7.

¹⁵ *Dives in misericordia*, 12.

¹⁶ Cf. *Deuteronomy* 34:1-5.

¹⁷ Cf. *Joshua* 1:2-9.

¹⁸ R. Niebuhr, *Il destino e la storia. Antologia degli scritti*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1999, p. 87 [translated].

¹⁹ *Gaudium et spes*, 10.

²⁰ «For God has called man and still calls him so that with his entire being he might be joined to Him in an endless sharing of a divine life beyond all corruption. Christ won this victory when He rose to life, for by His death He freed man from death. Hence to every thoughtful man a solidly established faith provides the answer to his anxiety about what the future holds for him. At the same time faith gives him the power to be united in Christ with his loved ones who have already been snatched away by death; faith arouses the hope that they have found true life with God» (*Gaudium et spes*, 18).

prohibit pain and evil from having the last word on history. Man is often unable to understand it, or, sometimes, he just refuses to accept it. Then, what may seem impossible, what is so self-contradictory as to seem impossible, happens: man sets himself up as God's judge. This is the height of injustice.

What future awaits humanity if man deems God to be unfair because something occurs that he cannot understand? *Gaudium et spes* gives us a viable solution by stating that «far from thinking that works produced by man's own talent and energy are in opposition to God's power, and that the rational creature exists as a kind of rival to the Creator, Christians are convinced that the triumphs of the human race are a sign of God's grace and the flowering of His own mysterious design»²¹. The man of good will should not give in to the temptation of going against God's justice. God can allow and do whatever He wills (this is the mystery of God, which man cannot penetrate unless God opens the door for him²²), and he who judges God – out of pure presumptuousness – wreaks real havoc: «And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God handed them over to their undiscerning mind to do what is improper. They are filled with every form of wickedness, evil, greed, and malice; full of envy, murder, rivalry, treachery, and spite. They are gossips and scandalmongers and they hate God. They are insolent, haughty, boastful, ingenious in their wickedness, and rebellious toward their parents. They are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless»²³. On the contrary, Christ's destiny, His death, are the resurrection of life: the victory over evil²⁴. Those who accept this fact partake in the resurrection of life. Those who, not understanding it, do not accept it, are capable of destroying the world²⁵.

The new human being in Christ, the human being who yearns for holiness and justice, willingly subjects himself to a new law. «And that no one is justified before God by the law is clear, for “the one who is righteous by faith will live”»²⁶. The discover of this new law consists first of all, in going back to the most elementary dimension of humanity – a dimension possessed by every human being as such – which theology calls (rightful) conscience and the Bible calls heart. It is an originary complex of needs and evidences, immanent to the self insofar as given to man by his Creator. This complex has been given to man so that he can face reality. Loyalty towards one's heart is the first requirement of any just man: «In the depths of his conscience, man detects a law which he does not impose upon himself, but which holds him to obedience. Always summoning him to love good and avoid evil, the voice of conscience when necessary speaks to his heart: do this, shun that. For man has in his heart a law written by God; to obey it is the very dignity of man; according to it he will be judged. Conscience is the most secret core and sanctuary of a man. There he is alone with God, Whose voice echoes in his depths. In a wonderful manner conscience reveals that law which is fulfilled by love of God and neighbor. In fidelity to conscience, Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth, and for the genuine solution to the numerous problems which arise in the life»²⁷.

²¹ *Gaudium et spes*, 34.

²² «The holiness of God is the inaccessible center of His eternal mystery. What is revealed of it in creation and history, Scripture calls “glory” the radiance of His majesty» (*Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae*, 2809).

²³ *Romans* 1:28-31.

²⁴ «He has poured on us His grace, He has been with us in our perplexities, He has led us on from one truth to another, He has forgiven us our sins, He has satisfied our reason, He has made faith easy, He has given us His Saints, He shows before us day by day His own Passion» (J.H.C. Newman, *The Kingdom within. Discourses addressed to mixed congregations*, Dimension Books Inc., 1984, p. 223).

²⁵ «In our own day, the magnified power of humanity threatens to destroy the race itself» (*Gaudium et spes*, 37).

²⁶ *Galatians* 3:11.

²⁷ *Gaudium et spes*, 16.

If the originary dimension of conscience is common to all men, then it is the Church, the continuation of the presence of Christ in history, the place where this awareness is educated and sustained. Within the Church this education authenticates and develops man's true humanity: *educere* in this sense means to pull out, to dilate, gives weight to man's original identity as created by God. The origin of all human justice lies here. The Church is literally, in fact, the place where man meets the person of Jesus Christ²⁸. He who belongs to Christ in baptism (and the life of the sacraments) does not possess any characteristics which make him different in an intellectual or moral sense. The one thing he possesses and others do not is the experience of an unforeseen encounter with Jesus: an event which introduces one's life to the *incipit* of an answer.

Placing oneself in the position of the Apostles, if the encounter with Christ took place «then it must have been easy to recognise this Man, to recognise Who that Man was, not completely or in all of His particulars, but in His unique and incomparable (“divine”) meaning. Why was it easy to recognise Him? Because of an exceptionality with which nothing or no-one could compare. They had met with an exceptionality beyond compare: they had met an exceptional Man, completely out of the norm, which no analysis could exhaust. What does “exceptional” mean? When can something be defined “exceptional”? When it adequately corresponds to the original expectations of the heart, no matter how confused or vague one's own understanding is»²⁹. Christ's correspondence³⁰ with the heart of man – which cannot by its very nature be dialectic or intellectual, but can be only experienced *in actu exercitu*³¹ – is unique and incomparable. It is something impossible from the human point of view: this is the true divinity of Jesus of Nazareth. In front of this correspondence, man is asked to adhere with his freedom; Christian life, therefore, is not just a form (no matter how pious) of reminiscence, nor is it a theological interpretation or a hermeneutical exercise, neither of which are capable of reproducing the fullness of being which Christ gratuitously gives us, but it is the recognition of a presence³². Jesus, on his part, has no fear of man's reason or of his freedom. He is the truth, and truth inevitably proves itself insofar as it lasts over time. The Jews did not use the word “truth” but rather the word *aman* (“faithfulness” or “loyalty”) because faithfulness is that which lasts in time and God's faithfulness to he who follows Him is an everlasting promise («Whoever clings to Me I will deliver; whoever knows My name I will set on high. All who call upon Me I will answer; I will be with them in distress; I will deliver them and give them honor. With length of days I will satisfy them and show them My saving power»³³).

²⁸ «After all, *natus ex Maria virgine* indicates a proposition which is strictly theo-logical: it testify the God Who does not want to get rid of creation. Upon this are founded Christian's hope, freedom, peace and responsibility» (J. Ratzinger, *La figlia di Sion. La devozione a Maria nella Chiesa*, Jaca Book, 1995, p. 58 [translated]).

²⁹ L. Giussani & S. Alberto & J. Prades, *Generare tracce nella storia del mondo. Nuove tracce d'esperienza cristiana*, Rizzoli, 1998, p. 10 [translated].

³⁰ «Et ecce cognovimus quod sciebant viam, quia sciebant Ipsum qui est via; sed via est qua itur; numquid via est et quo itur? Utrumque autem illos dixerat scire, et quo vadit, et viam. Opus ergo erat ut diceret: *Ego sum via*, ut ostenderet eos qui Eum scirent, viam scire quam putaverant se nescire; quid autem opus erat ut diceret: *Ego sum via, et veritas et vita*, cum via cognita qua iret, restaret nosse quo iret, nisi quia ibat ad veritatem, ibat ad vitam? Ibat ergo ad Seipsum, per Seipsum. Et nos quo imus, nisi ad Ipsum? et quia imus, nisi per Ipsum? Ipse igitur ad Seipsum per Seipsum; nos ad Ipsum per Ipsum; immo vero et ad Patrem et Ipse et nos» (Aurelius Augustinus, *In Iohannis Evangelium*, t. LXIX-2).

³¹ «The conversion of the ancient world to Christianity was not the result of a planned activity, but it was the fruit of faith's prove as it was clear in the life of Christians and ecclesial communities. The true invitation from experience to experience and nothing else was (in human dimension) the missionary power of ancient Church. The communion of life in the Church invited to participate in this life, in which the truth, on which this life was based, revealed itself. While on the contrary the apostasy of modern age is founded upon the fall of verification in Christians' life» (J. Ratzinger, *Guardare Cristo. Esercizi di fede, speranza e carità*, Jaca Book, 1989, p. 31 [translated]).

³² «Not everyone who cries, “Lord, Lord”, will enter into the kingdom of heaven, but those who do the Father's will by taking a strong grip on the work at hand. Now, the Father wills that in all men we recognize Christ our brother and love Him effectively» (*Gaudium et spes*, 93).

³³ *Psalms* 90:14-16.

Christ's faithfulness and faith in Christ is also the source of justice. This is not a sociological reality – that is, one which derives from an analysis of rules governing civil society and from mundane applications of them – but rather an ontological reality: it is the fruit of a gift of grace from God and man's free adhesion to it. This adhesion does not come about in a solipsistic and isolated way, but through belonging to a people. The reality of the Church as the community of the Christian people coincides with an event, man's recognition of Christ: the union of these persons who partake of this event forms a new people; this is why this people bears witness to the victory of Christ's justice in history. The unity of the *ecclesia Dei* (those called by God and in God) is absolutely unique, as indicated by *Gaudium et spes* when it speaks of «saving resources which the Church herself, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, receives from her Founder»³⁴. The new life of the human being in Christ in the community of the Church displays the victory of the risen Christ, precisely because this victory consists in the powerful attraction of His presence in history. A reminiscence of the past is not enough to explain the Christian people: one needs the living Christ, who responds today to the needs of the heart of every man and enables one in this way to recognise Him in every instant of each day. «How can one be saved without Christ, if he alone is “the Way, the Truth and the Life”»³⁵? Without the living presence of Christ, justice as virtue would be reduced to a moralism where the more one realises that he or she cannot be coherent the more one risks being deluded over and over again. There is no set of rules, no matter how correct they may be, which can sustain the authentic desire for justice that lies in man's heart. An abstract ideal of justice as an obedience to a series of rules will sooner or later force man to recognise that he has been overcome by his own ineradicable sin. Given that in time God will no longer be at the heart of one's personal life, the outcome will inevitably bear the mark of nihilism: «either there is Christ or there is nothing, because it is only Christ who affirms reality for what it is, something belonging to Being, the emergence of Being, the manifestation of Being»³⁶.

Given its close ties with holiness the concept of justice becomes, in light of the experience of Christ's presence in time and history, akin to the concept of justification. The Christian justification as described in *Gaudium et spes* is at the root of an authentic morality («Whoever in obedience to Christ seeks first the Kingdom of God, takes therefrom a stronger and purer love for helping all his brethren and for perfecting the work of justice under the inspiration of charity»³⁷). This authentic morality is powerfully expressed at the end of the Gospel according to John, in the episode where the risen Lord reappears for the third time to the disciples. Peter is probably expecting to be rebuked by Jesus because of all his betrayals. But Christ³⁸ asks him three times: Peter, do you love me? And the third time Peter exclaims: Yes Lord, You know that I love You, You are the most important thing in my life, I do not know how, I do not know how to say this, despite what I have done and all of what I may still do in the future, I love You. Peter's “yes” is possible only in front of a dominant, living presence which is accepted, followed, served and perceived. This “yes” ontologically and aesthetically comes prior to any correct or incorrect, coherent or incoherent position³⁹. Peter shows a supreme attachment to the person of Jesus; he understands that all of his being yearns for Him. So, all of his sins,

³⁴ *Gaudium et spes*, 3.

³⁵ C. Schönborn, *Al centro della nostra fede. Il «Credo» nel Catechismo della Chiesa Cattolica*, Jaca Book, 1997, p. 66 [translated].

³⁶ L. Giussani, *Affezione e dimora. Volume quinto*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 2001, p. 287 [translated].

³⁷ *Gaudium et spes*, 72.

³⁸ Cf. *John* 21:15-17.

³⁹ «The Law has not been abolished, but rather man is invited to rediscover it in the person of his Master Who is its perfect fulfillment» (*Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae*, 2053).

past, present and future cannot pose any objection to the hope which he has derived from the encounter with God made Man⁴⁰. Authentic justice and justification are not based on a list of man's past virtues and vices, they do not derive from an abstract categorisation of that which is good and evil: «Now this is eternal life, that they should know you, the only true God, and the one whom you sent, Jesus Christ»⁴¹. Peter, just like any other man, can only live a just and justified life by saying "yes" to Christ. He can utter his "yes" because Jesus has revealed the true face of the Lord, and his relationship with His creatures: mercy. Mercy is the embrace of God towards man's weakness and error: in the face of man's capacity to sin, God is ready to love. Saint Peter's "yes" is the declaration by which man confirms that he loves God over every other thing («our faith is profoundly anthropological, radically rooted in co-existence, in the community of the people of God, in the communion with this eternal You»⁴²).

Justice as virtue, therefore, is not the acceptance of a series of dogmas nor is it our effort to analyse human behaviour, nor is it the formulation of exhaustive rules. Justice is the new protagonism of this whole person made new in Christ: love towards Being and being («Per se quidem et essentialiter consistit perfectio Christianae vitae in caritate: principaliter quidam secundum dilectionem Dei, secundario autem secundum dilectionem proximi»)⁴³. Good is not "good", but is adherence to Being and to the way in which He reveals Himself, that is Christ and the Church. The latter is the place where one can still say "yes" to the living and merciful presence of Christ, the place where one can still experience that transformation of the human which the memory of Him engenders, where it is possible to live the joy of this authentic justice which He alone can give.

⁴⁰ «Everyone who has this hope based on Him makes himself pure, as He is pure» (*1 John* 3:3).

⁴¹ *John* 17:3.

⁴² Giovanni Paolo II, *Varcare la soglia della speranza*, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1994, p. 38 [translated].

⁴³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I. II-II, q. 184, a. 3.

Toward a Theory of Justice within Trinitarian Theology

Amelia (Amy) J. Uelmen

When someone's life is imperiled and rescue would pose no danger to the rescuer, most agree that a passerby would certainly have a moral duty to rescue. But should there be legal consequences for failure to help? While most civil law jurisdictions have answered in the affirmative, this question has proven to be a difficult puzzle for common law countries. Two US cases illustrate the common law reluctance to impose a legal duty to rescue: neither the neighbors who watched or listened as Kitty Genovese was brutally murdered in 1964 on a Queens, New York street; nor David Cash, who walked away and did nothing after watching his nineteen-year old friend begin attacking seven-year old Sherrice Iverson in a ladies restroom, could be held legally responsible for any obligation to the murder victims.

The analysis explores two of the arguments for limiting the imposition of a legal duty to rescue: first, that such duty might interfere with the protection and promotion of individual liberty; and second, that the only non-arbitrary way to reasonably limit the duty is to circumscribe it to "special relationships." It then considers how both of these problems might be illuminated by the theological and anthropological framework of *Gaudium et spes*, particularly its discussion of Trinitarian love as the revelation of the vocation of the human person. The analysis concludes with suggestions for further research on how a theory of justice may be grounded in Trinitarian theology.

I. Common Law Resistance to a Legal Duty to Rescue

A. Liberty as Autonomy

What is at the foundation of US reluctance to impose a legal duty to rescue? As Jewish scholar Robert Cover described, the key word in the American legal system is "rights," and "the story behind the term 'rights' is the story of social contract." He explains: "The myth postulates free and independent if highly vulnerable beings who voluntarily trade a portion of their autonomy for a measure of collective security . . . The first and fundamental unit is the individual and 'rights' locate him as an individual separate and apart from every other individual."

According to this theory, "negative duties" that can be universalized (in Kantian terms, perfect duties)—such as the obligation not to cause harm to another—are the heart of a legal system based on the social contract. In contrast, "positive duties"—affirmative obligations to help others that cannot be universalized (imperfect duties)—fall within the realm of morality or "beneficence." With limited exceptions, such obligations are not generally encoded in law. The concept of treating persons as ends and not means has been interpreted as a "right of self-ownership"—the right to use one's energy and one's possessions as one likes. As a general principle, the law ought not to require a person to restrict one's liberty for the sake of the needs of another except by voluntary agreement.

Thus the central problem in imposing a legal duty to rescue is that it interferes with this notion of liberty. The self and others are in fundamental tension. As philosopher Michael Menlowe summarized the problem, "[t]he more I have to do for other people, the less I can do

for myself”—thus, “the more extensive the duty to rescue, the more an agent’s individuality is threatened.” Certainly David Cash had a moral duty to alert someone that a seven-year old girl was being attacked. But within this strain of liberal theory, legally Cash should not be coerced into acting as a “means” to assure the safety of a person who was a “stranger” to him. Certainly Kitty Genovese’s neighbors had a moral duty to call the police—but legally it was up to them how to allocate their time, and it was their prerogative to go on watching TV or washing the dishes.

B. Exceptions: “Special Relationships”

A second common-law concern with imposing an affirmative duty to rescue a stranger is the practical difficulty in defining and limiting the duty. Where there were a large number of witnesses, such as the case of Kitty Genovese, how might one go about evaluating who should be held responsible? This is one of the reasons why the law of tort requires a clear causal link between the harm suffered and the defendant’s conduct. Any effort to draw a line, it seems, would be arbitrary. One practical response to this dilemma has been to impose legal obligations only when there is a “special relationship” between the rescuer and the victim, because of either relevant past conduct on the part of the person failing to act or a pre-existing protective relationship between the potential rescuer and the victim.

When this “special relationship” is lacking no legal duty should be imposed. As Lord Reid explained in the *Dorset Yacht Case*: “when a person has done nothing to put himself in any relationship with another person in distress or with his property, mere accidental propinquity does not require him to go to that person’s assistance.” In some cases, the very definition of “neighbor” has been circumscribed by the distinction between acts and omissions. For example, building on Lord Atkin’s “neighbor principle,” we owe a duty of care not to harm our neighbors, our neighbors being those who might reasonably be expected to be damaged by our harmful acts, Justice Brennan of the High Court of Australia explained, legally “neighbors” are persons “affected ‘by my act’, not by my omission.”

In the eyes of the law, therefore, David Cash was not a “neighbor,” for he had done nothing to put himself in any relationship with Sherrice Iverson. His mere “accidental propinquity” in the restroom as the attack began triggered no legal duty, for she was affected only by his omission, not by his act.

II. The Trinity as a Social Model

Given the shocking nature of some of the failure to rescue stories, it is not surprising that the common law duty to rescue puzzle has engendered a vast literature of deep philosophical reflection. Some argue that the liberal tradition itself, properly understood, could embrace such a duty. Utilitarian, feminist, and other currents in jurisprudence have greatly enriched the discussion. It would be more than a slight understatement to say that theological models and critiques have not been prominent. Recently, however, there seems to be increasing openness to the insight that “[t]he theological dimension is needed both for interpreting and for solving present day problems in human society,” as John Paul II put it in *Centesimus annus*.

I agree with Robert Cover, that while the liberal philosophical tradition of “rights” has definite strengths, it is “singularly weak in providing for the material guarantees of life and dignity flowing from the community to the individual.” And like Cover, who explored the Jewish foundations of jurisprudence, I believe that theories of justice have much to gain by delving into theological models and frameworks. The next sections focus on an aspect of the theological dimension as set out in *Gaudium et spes*, and now amplified in the new COMPENDIUM OF THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH: the description of Trinitarian love as the origin and goal of the human person. The analysis hopes to illustrate that this anthropological foundation can help not only to melt the paralysis of the “rights talk” that permeates many aspects of liberal legal structures, but also to open up vast horizons—for the particular jurisprudential problems in duty to rescue, and more broadly, for the foundations of legal theory.

In its opening chapter, the COMPENDIUM sets out: “The revelation in Christ of the mystery of God as Trinitarian love is at the same time the revelation of the vocation of the human person to love. This revelation sheds light on every aspect of the personal dignity and freedom of men and women, and on the depths of their social nature.” As the Council Fathers explained in *Gaudium et spes*: “Indeed, the Lord Jesus Christ, when praying to the Father, ‘that they may all be one... as we are one’ (Jn 17:21-22), has opened up new horizons closed to human reason by implying that there is a certain parallel between the union existing among the divine Persons and the union of the children of God in truth and love. It follows, then, that if man is the only creature on earth that God has willed for its own sake, man can fully discover his true self only in a sincere giving of himself. (cf. Lk. 17:33).”

Thus, as the COMPENDIUM explains, “Christian revelation shines a new light on the identity, the vocation, and the ultimate destiny of the human person and the human race. Every person is created by God, loved and saved in Jesus Christ, and fulfils himself by creating a network of multiple relationships of love, justice, and solidarity with other persons as he goes about his various activities in the world.”

How can this be concretely applied? What difference would it make for theories of justice? My work in this field has been greatly enriched by delving into the scholarship which is emerging from the Abba School, the Interdisciplinary Study Center of the Focolare Movement headquartered here in Rome. Because the analyses have emerged from decades of practical experience in living what Pope John Paul II now terms the *spirituality of communion*, the resulting descriptions of the Trinity as a social model are quite accessible, and one can intuit how they might be applied to the most varied disciplines. To illustrate the application, the analysis develops the contours of the anthropology in light of a Trinitarian model, and applies this model to the two issues discussed above: the definition of freedom, and the problem of limiting the scope of legal duties.

A. The Trinity as a Model of Freedom in Relationships of Openness to Others

An anthropology based on the model of a triune God whose very nature is communal and social offers a rich description a union of persons without loss of individual identity—in theological terms, *pericoresis*, or “mutual indwelling.” Specifically, the commandment of love is “lived out and measured against Jesus’ love for us, to the point of abandonment...” He who

was God “emptied himself”—*kenosis*. Mutual indwelling is possible through an essential attitude of openness to the other, of “making room” for the other, even to the point of “emptying” oneself for the other. Here is the nut: in the life of the Trinity, this openness or emptiness is not a negative encroachment on one’s personhood, but actually the positive key to self-fulfillment: “whoever loses his life will preserve it.” (cf *Lk.* 17:33).

Reflecting on the mysterious cry that Jesus addressed to the Father before dying, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Focolare founder Chiara Lubich probes the paradox:

There may be those who think that to affirm self is to struggle against all that is not self, because what is not self is perceived as limit and, what is more, as a threat to the integrity of the self. But Jesus forsaken, in that terrible moment of his passion, tells us that while the awareness of his subjectivity appears to be diminishing because it seems he is being annulled, in that very moment it is in all its fullness.

Based on this example, she draws out striking implications for the philosophy of being: “[Jesus forsaken] shows us, by his being reduced to nothing, accepted out of love for the Father to whom he re-abandons himself . . . that I am myself not when I close myself off from the other, but when I give myself, when out of love I am lost in the other.” This, according to Lubich, is the inter-personal dynamic at the heart of the Trinity: “In the relationship of the three divine Persons, each one, being Love, *is* completely by *not being*, each one mutually indwelling in an eternal self-giving.” And as the “heart of Christian anthropology,” this is the dynamic that can inform all human relationships and social structures. If “I am myself when I give myself,” to make room for the other is neither a sad concession to the realities of the social contract, nor a simple nod of respect for the principle of equality. Rather, it is one’s door to authentic freedom and human fulfillment. As *Centesimus* highlights:

When man does not recognize in himself and in others the value and grandeur of the human person, he effectively deprives himself of the possibility of benefiting from his humanity and of entering into that relationship of solidarity and communion with others for which God created him. Indeed, it is through the free gift of self that man truly finds himself.

B. The Universal Dimensions of Trinitarian Love

Trinitarian theology also offers a thick description of the universality of the human community, thus shedding light on the definition of “neighbor.” For example, in *Sollicitudo rei socialis* Pope John Paul II drew out the profoundly Trinitarian dimensions of solidarity as invitation beyond equality, beyond equal respect for the rights of others, to a more profound recognition of the fundamental unity of the human race:

In the light of faith, solidarity seeks to go beyond itself, to take on the specifically Christian dimension of total gratuity, forgiveness and reconciliation. One’s neighbor is then not only a human being with his or her own rights and a fundamental equality with everyone else, but becomes the living image of God the Father, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ and placed under the permanent action of the Holy Spirit.

The consequence of this vision is clear, “[o]ne’s neighbor must therefore be loved, even if an enemy, with the same love with which the Lord loves him or her; and for that person’s sake one must be ready for sacrifice, even the ultimate one: to lay down one’s life for the brethren (cf.

I John. 3:16). The result of this love is a “new criterion” for interpreting reality: “[a]t that point, awareness of the common fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of all in Christ – ‘children in the Son’—and of the presence and life-giving action of the Holy Spirit will bring to our vision of the world a new criterion for interpreting it.” This Trinitarian vision, then, is the ultimate source of inspiration for solidarity:

Beyond human and natural bonds, already so close and strong, there is discerned in the light of faith a new model of the unity of the human race, which must ultimately inspire our solidarity. This supreme model of unity, which is a reflection of the intimate life of God, one God in three Persons, is what we Christians mean by the word “communion.”

As distinguished from philanthropy, solidarity “is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary, it is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all.”

III. Toward a Theory of Justice Through the Lens of Trinitarian Theology

If, as *Gaudium et spes* reflects, “Christian revelation contributes greatly to the promotion of this communion between persons, and at the same time leads us to a deeper understanding of the laws of social life which the Creator has written into man’s moral and spiritual natures,” how then, might an anthropology grounded in Trinitarian theology illuminate legal categories and interactions? And—a crucial question for common law systems—while the life of the Trinity may be fine as a description of the life of grace, wouldn’t it muddle up the analysis to begin drawing connections to legal obligations?

As a common law litigator, my eye is often drawn to questions about whether rhetoric resonates with the common moral sense of a judge or jury. In many aspects, I believe that a model informed by Trinitarian theology is actually closer to the heart of the common law than some of the interpretations of freedom and duty that have emerged from liberal theory. For example, Lord Atkin’s definition of “neighbor” as “a person who is affected by my act, not by my omission”—simply defies the ordinary use of language. Similarly, few would seriously contend that a duty to call for help, perhaps as easy as punching 911 into a cell phone, is a real threat to an ordinary understanding of freedom. As Alexander Smith put it, the common law’s hostility to imposing duties of affirmative action is “a product of an individualistic ideology which is no longer widely supported . . . It would do no great violence to the common law if a duty to rescue were to be imposed in certain cases.”

In fact, many have arrived to this conclusion via alternative routes. For example, utilitarian and feminist theorists have argued that a legal duty to rescue should be imposed because, on balance, the threat to human life is more imperative than any infringement of individual autonomy by the imposition of an affirmative duty. (Ames, Sidgwick, Bender) What might Trinitarian theology add? In some of these analyses one detects a fundamental tension between the duty to care for one’s neighbors and individual liberty. In contrast, through the lens of Trinitarian theology, care for one’s neighbor *is* the door to human freedom. It is not a matter of care trumping freedom, but of finding freedom within relationships of care. Trinitarian

theology offers rich possibilities for a thick description of an anthropological foundation in which freedom may be fully reconciled with affirmative duties to others.

Within liberal social contract theory, some have articulated compelling arguments for a legal duty to rescue based on broad obligations to the state to prevent violence (Heyman), or because of the “great value” of fostering public knowledge of a social life in which one may depend on others to come to their aid in difficult circumstance (Rawls). An argument grounded in Trinitarian theology is, I believe, more immediate and therefore even more compelling. Although Trinitarian theology would also encompass more general societal benefits, its pull is with immediate implications for individual human fulfillment as well. In fact, one who does not respond to a call for help effectively “deprives himself” of the benefits of entering into the fulfillment of relationships of solidarity and communion with others.

One common critique of arguments for duty to rescue based in some feminist descriptions of “relational” duties is that they are too restrictive, and fail to fully explain the rationale for rescue of one who is not in a “special relationship” with the rescuer. Trinitarian theology combines the pull of duties rooted in “family” ties with universal solidarity. Within the anthropological foundations of Trinitarian theology, the “stranger” *is* brother or sister, in a concrete sense.

Conclusion

This brief analysis highlights just one example of how, as the COMPENDIUM describes, the revelation of God as Trinitarian love sheds light “on every aspect of the personal dignity and freedom of men and women, and on the depths of their social nature.” Admittedly, “easy” rescue in an emergency is, in many ways, an easy case. Broader extensions of the application of Trinitarian theology to a theory of justice would require thorough discussion of how application of the “self-annihilation” at the heart of Trinitarian *kenosis* would not swallow up important protections of personal dignity that the law must assure. Much, however, indicates that Trinitarian theology has much to offer to enrich theories of justice.

Gospel and Society. Man as a social being in the image of God who is all “communion”. How to develop this view in the future?

By Jean-Yves Calvez

I. The new winds with *Gaudium et spes*

Man was always understood as a “social” being in the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church. Without much of an explanation however. The effort of the Social Teaching was mostly geared toward the manifestation of man’s personhood (existence as a “person”) and his superiority and primacy over “things” – this founding in particular the right of property, let us say property itself, in the Encyclical *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII. In Pius’ XI *Quadragesimo anno* (1931), property appeared as having a “social” as well as a personal function: but this was not very much explained either. It was mainly supposed that *all* have rights. But what is “society” itself? To this question one practically never really answered, neither philosophically nor theologically.

The Vatican II Council on the contrary answered, very explicitly, and did give a theological answer, with a number of different aspects and corollaries. The main aspect is that man *is* social right from the beginning, man is the whole of “mankind” by its very creation (see about this H. de Lubac’s *Catholicism: the social aspects of Catholic Dogma*). All men come from one stock, one source, begins with saying *Gaudium et spes*, they form one human kind. This one mankind is clearly not the mere result of the conventions which they eventually strike with each other.

The Council then mentions the essential command of Jesus: to love one another as brothers.

Finally, there comes a third consideration of a still higher importance: if man is created in the image of God, he is social as God is himself social, he is « society » as God himself is society. God *is* a communion (of Persons). Man too is fundamentally communion. « The Lord Jesus, when praying to the Father ‘that they may all be one... even as we are one’ (Jn 17: 21-22), has opened up new horizons closed to human reason [alone] by implying that there is a certain parallel between the union existing among the divine persons and the union of the sons of God in truth and love”.

This does not mean that society is a kind of being by the side of man (*Man and Society*), as if it were a being apart, almost independent, existing in itself. Rather man is intrinsically social, is « relation » as God is himself wholly relation (Persons in relationship to each other, existing only by this bond, Love finally).

These statements of the Council were not much commented on by the first who wrote about it. They were, however, the answer to the many who reproached its individualism to Christianity, among these the Socialists in general. See de Lubac’s introduction to *Catholicism : the social aspects of Catholic Dogma*.

One can of course remark that Socialism, with the exception of Marx, strictly understood, did not either have so clear a theory of Society or of the « social » as such, it rather centers on an idea of equality between individuals, the persons themselves did not appear as bound to each other except through this equality or egalitarianism, which seems to Christianity to be rather mechanical, a kind of equality by addition. Christianity now answered by manifesting an intrinsic tie or bond, or relationship, in a view which tended to identify *personalisation* with *socialisation* (i.e. a view that the person exists *through* the other person...). The Gospel is very significant on this count.

II. Evaluating what became of this conciliar statement

There was something very strong in this statement by the Council and it basically answered liberal individualism, incapable of conceiving society but as an outcome of conventions and contracts, no even as equality (except “equality by right”, as such without effectiveness).

Was the Council’s stand “communitarian”? Not exactly, I think, because communitarianism as such frequently rests upon the presupposition of some kind of quasi-natural base, often of an historical nature, rather than on a dynamic *process* of personalisation through the relationship to the other person.

This has however not been the subject of much development or deepening in the following years, as I said. But it helped at least to prop and comfort (implicitly comfort) the affirmation of the social aspect of Christianity. “Solidarity” appeared and took quite a place, received also a clear foundation, with John Paul II. Let us note, too, his principle: “We are all responsible for all”. This development took place mainly in the Encyclical *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, 1988. “Solidarity”, a “Christian virtue”, says the pope, having to do with the fact that each person not only is “a human being with his rights and his fundamental equality in relationship to all” but “has become, too, the living image of God the Father, redeemed by the blood of Christ and object of the constant action of the Holy Spirit. He should be loved, even if he is an enemy, with the love by which the Lord loves him” (SRS 40). A “new model of unity of the human kind” arises from there, says John Paul II, “*reflecting God’s intimate life in three Persons*”. We Christians, he says, call it “communion”.

There appears indeed since, here or there, some recourse to « trinitarian » views about justice. See that idea of a « *trinitarizacion* » of justice in a book by Miguel Yanez and others *De la solidaridad a la justicia*, San Benito, Buenos Aires, 2003. In this regard one could have, I think, resorted more to Oriental theology, for instance to Bulgakov, Soloviev (at the turn of the XXth century in Russia). This source has not been exploited by the Catholics as much as it could have been, recently.

Rather there was at times some surprise in the presence of the effort at bringing Man so close to God (Man-God). Some remained struck and amazed at the statements which I have here recalled, indeed at the whole of chapters II and III of the First Part of *Gaudium et spes* in general. In the same way in fact as they were amazed at John Paul II quoting again and again the

Council's sentence that God has united himself in Jesus Christ with each one of us men. There was some resistance to that projection of the social aspect of man into the theological or "theological" structures.

III. What has to be done? A few paths that could be trodden.

In the meantime, liberal individualism has spread as a huge and powerful wave, particularly a practical individualism, a kind of "autonomism" of the person, tending even to a certain vanishing of love proper... Today much more than yesterday each one can live for himself alone. Solitude thus develops, but independence as well. The fact is that more than half of men or women dwell alone, separately (one person households), in the large cities like New York or Paris. There is ample scope in this for egoism. The Christians, the Church are in general conscious of the dangers and take part in actions to counteract these negative trends to de-socialisation (in French : *déliasion*, a significant neologism). They, however, seldom express convincing arguments to justify their reaction. They do not translate it sufficiently into a philosophy of the Person as relation nor into a theology of Society as an image of the communion existing in God. I am convinced that we would gain by such an effort, even if we entered through this in some amount of polemical debate. This is one of the most obvious countercultural aspects of Christianity, for the good of mankind.

It requires, at least in some countries, discussing current communitarianism, in order to free it from dangerous associations with historicist/traditionalist principles, and let it develop on the contrary its potential for (dialectical, dialogical) bonding.

It is equally important to stress, then, in the pastoral practice of the Church, a new conception of the family, a family more "articulate" (explaining itself), less purely spontaneous (intimist love, love, love...), a family with its relational, creational, voluntary potential. There is need of reevaluating friendship beyond precarious attraction.

In legal constructions, one should stress the *fundamental* relatedness, the community of mankind as such existing by the very fact of man's existence and not only through treaties and conventions. It is interesting in the process of building the European Union that one is trying to have a constitution, not just a treaty, even if it be still established (of necessity) by treaty. Similarly, it is important to give high value to international law as *ius gentium*, law of the peoples, law of mankind -concrete whole mankind-, thus not reduced to covenants and contracts.

Also it is important to stress the responsibility of the enterprise (the firm), never to be reduced to itself alone, it is a citizen enterprise by its very nature, not only through the agreements which it eventually, and more or less willingly, signed. And so on.

There are more general hints of the Council that should be revisited, this one for instance: "The Church can show to the world that social and exterior union comes from an [interior] union of hearts and minds, from the faith and love by which h its own indissoluble unity has been founded" (*Gaudium et spes*, n. 42). This means how deeply rooted Society should be. John XXIII had for his part written : "Life in society must be seen above all as a reality of the spiritual

order. It is indeed exchange of knowledge in the light of the truth, interplay of rights and obligations, emulation in the pursuit of the moral good, communion in the enjoyment of the noble satisfactions of beauty, with a permanent disposition of all to communicate to the others the best of himself and a common aspiration of all to constant spiritual enrichment” (*Pacem in terris*, n. 36). Much has to be done to bring all this perspective to effectiveness.

There is need, in general, in this hour, of the rewriting so to say, of whole sections at least of the Social Teaching of the Church in a more intrinsically “social” style –social not socialist but without any fear of harmful confusions if we are really conscious of the theological content proposed to us by *Gaudium et spes* and make ourselves capable of expressing it with its full weight of spirituality. There is great need precisely, too, of a *spiritual* expression of the Social Teaching profoundly merged with the more technical expression of it.

Interpreting the Signs of the Times in the Light of the Gospel Vision and Normativity of the Future

Mary Elsbernd and Reimund Bieringer

The Introduction to the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes* on “The Situation of Human Persons in the Modern World” begins “the Church has always had the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the gospel” (GS 4). In the context of revitalizing the original inspiration and methodology of *Gaudium et spes*, our primary task is the exploration of a faith-based and theological interpretation of the “signs of the times” by making use of future-oriented reading strategies. We shall proceed in four steps: First, we shall describe the presuppositions that undergird our understanding of normativity of the future. Second, we shall present normativity of the future as our own specific interpretive approach. Third, we shall analyze the meaning of ‘interpreting the signs of the times in the light of the gospel’ in *Gaudium et spes* and in the Vatican II era documents and investigate the contribution of our normativity of the future approach for a better understanding of this interpretive process. In a fourth and final step we are going to apply our own methodology to the ecological crisis as a sign of our times.

1. Presuppositions for Normativity of the Future as an Interpretive Approach to the Scriptures and Other Authoritative Texts

In the first section we lay out the presuppositions of our interpretive approach. We discuss the primacy of community, the role human sin plays in the interpretive process, the dialogical and ongoing character of revelation, the understanding of texts as symbolic mediation and the role of tradition.

2. Normativity of the Future

Section 2 consists of two subsections; the first one introduces normativity of the future approach as eschatological. The second develops the specific contribution of our normativity of the future hermeneutic for interpretation. The first subsection presents our understanding of an eschatological vision that engages not only the intellectual dimension of human persons but also their emotions, imagination and practice. Vision presents an alternative to the here and now that calls for transformation into that alternative future. Furthermore all have access to this eschatological vision and, in fact, the marginalized are more often ready to see the eschatological vision and to recognize the need for transformation. Finally eschatological vision blurs the distinctions between the material world and the symbolic representation of the future. Relying on some aspects of Paul Ricoeur’s work we take the position that revelation is (not exclusively, but significantly) a feature of the future dimension of a text, i.e., a feature of the eschatological vision which comes to meet us by way of the text.

By bringing the two seemingly contradictory terms “normativity” and “future” together, we deliberately create a dialectic tension which invites us to reassess the meanings of both terms. In the expression “normativity of the future” both “normativity” and “future” no longer simply carry their usual meaning, but “normativity” gains a dynamic dimension from “future” and the future is reined in by the concreteness of normativity.

In addition to this dialectic tension in the expression “normativity of the future” the word “future” carries an inherent ambiguity. We see the following (not necessarily mutually exclusive) ways of specifying the meaning of the word “future” in the expression “normativity of the future”. Taking “future” as a time indication, we are saying that the norms will be shaped in the ongoing future and that this process is eschatological in character. Another way of understanding “future” is to interpret it as “a future life for all”. In that case “normativity of the future” means the ethical claim by those things which make possible or open up a future for all, i.e., “those things that are decisive for the existence and future of humanity”. A third understanding of “future” recognizes claims on us coming from the content, i.e., values in the eschatological visions found in the Scriptures, Catholic Social Teachings and elsewhere (including people’s longings). Finally the term “future” may refer to an unanticipated *in-breaking*. We recognize people, events and structures through which risen life and the City of God have broken into this world. As a community struggles to embody the future in this time and place through discernment and reflection, ethical principles can emerge.

By their very existence end-times metaphors open up a future to humanity. The texts and the present are not all there is. In the midst of the historically situated statements in the Scriptures and in Catholic Social Teachings, there are flashes of insight which provide an existence and a future for the human community (e.g., access of all to the resources necessary to meet basic human needs). In the rhetorical laments against socialist unions-found in some documents, there are glimmers of a future where justice, peace and love provide the guiding principles (e.g., creation of opportunities, education and skills so persons can contribute to the human community). In ideologies of hierarchy, patriarchy and Euro-centrism there are moments when the dream of a just and inclusive community is recalled (e.g., participation, social anthropology). These insights, glimmers and moments herald the in-breaking of the future providing norms and content for just living today.

The age-old tradition of God as creator of all suggests norms which recognize life as a promise stretching into the future as well as norms which promote solidarity among peoples and nations. Similarly, the God who initiates covenants suggests norms of participation. Immediate experiences and feelings of outrage at injustice suggest norms urging action and transformation of existing injustices.

We discuss the role of the Spirit, the place of hope and the contribution of dialogue for our understanding of revelation within this interpretive approach. Finally we turn to the possibility of “intrinsically oppressive” elements in the authoritative texts of our tradition and to the need for criteria to identify them. In determining what in a text is sin-filled and what is grace-filled we propose the following criterion: inclusivity that makes possible a future for all. When we say ‘all’, we refer to human and non-human creatures, past, present and future generations, without discrimination according to gender, race, class, health status, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion etc. In a normativity of the future perspective, the formulation and development of the criterion is the task of the community. Particular attention must be paid, both in process and in wisdom, to the voices of creatures that are at the margins of a dominant group. The voices of all creatures need to be heard for broader range of possibilities for the inbreaking future. By “makes possible a future for all”, we mean the creation of a world in which humans today and in the future have access to what meets their basic human needs (sustainability) and a

measure of abundance. Such flourishing is situated within the network of relationships that is the whole eco-system. The creation of such a world requires respect for all creatures and incorporates coherent policies, structures, institutions and laws.

3. Normativity of the Future and “Interpreting the Signs of the Times in the Light of the Gospel”

In this section we return to the introductory statement of *Gaudium et spes*, namely “the Church has always had the duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the gospel” (GS 4). We investigate the meaning of this statement in GS 4 and how it developed in the official Church documents of the Vatican II era. In doing so, we first focus on the expression “signs of the times”, then we investigate what the GS 4 statement calls “the gospel”. In a third step we study the relationship between the signs of the times and “the gospel”. Then we present the elements of future vision present in the Vatican II era documents. We will finally elaborate the meaning of “interpreting the signs of the times in the light of the gospel” within our own normativity of the future approach.

The concept “signs of the times” has great potential in a normativity of the future approach. It already carries in itself a particular theology which significantly departs from pre-Vatican II theology. The concept “signs of the times” turns from a natural law to a more biblically inspired theology, from an insider perspective to the outside world and from a past orientation to a better future. From our own interpretive stance we will contribute some dimensions to a theology shaped by “signs of the times”. We see “signs of the times” as places where the in-breaking of God’s future into the world can occur. As such they are constitutively eschatological. The new epochal developments in our world are at least potentially the tangible representations of how God enters into this world and moves it toward its final destination.

According to GS 4 it is the duty of the Church to ‘interpret the signs of the times in the light of the gospel’. The term “gospel” here refers to the entire Christian message as it has evolved through the life and practices of the faith communities in dialogue with the signs of the times. In fact there are places where “gospel” is coupled with human experience or teaching of the church, making explicit that “gospel” refers to the Christian message as a living Tradition. Thus “gospel” refers to the living and lived gospel, not just the four written texts in the Bible. In GS 4 as in the remainder of the Pastoral Constitution and in the other documents of the Vatican II era, the gospel message is to provide the light for the interpretation of the signs of the times. This gives the impression of a one-directional relationship, namely “the gospel” sheds light on the signs of the times. However, when *Gaudium et spes* addresses culture, glimpses of a dialogical relationship are present. Putting this together in a normativity of the future approach, we propose a dialogical relationship between the ever-changing signs of the times and “the gospel”. Not only does “the gospel” shed light on the signs of the times, but the signs of the times shed light on the gospel. For example, a growing repulsion to the practices of slavery conscientized Christians to the anti-slavery elements in the Scriptures. Christian life is continuously renewed through encounter with persistent new developments by which human history reinvents itself and moves into the future.

A normativity of the future reading of ‘the signs of the times in the light of the gospel’ requires not only an ending of what is evil, inhumane or unjust, but the building of a new world.

This building of a new world in which there are no excluded ones is an option for all those who do not benefit from the present social order which reflects our ultimate criterion. The frequent refrain of love of neighbor, especially the poor, in the Scriptures and in Catholic Social Teachings as well as current economic and political realities point us toward the building of this future world in which all are included. Hence in a normativity of the future approach the place of believers and the church is with those excluded by contemporary developments and events. Our place is with people who, because of the current developments that we call “signs of the times”, are between power and powerlessness. This in-between place carries the risk of annihilation as well as the potential that, from the powerlessness, new life will rise. This risk of loss also concerns people who are currently in positions of power. A normativity of the future approach will therefore also engage theologies of loss and letting go.

Social transformation was not a concern in *Gaudium et spes*. This idea rather emerged in response to the signs of the times in the years immediately following the Council. The sense of urgency and an incredible optimism prevalent during those years led official church teaching to turn to social transformation as a requirement of “the gospel”. A normativity of the future approach replaces the sense of urgency with eschatological expectation and optimism with hope in the practice of social transformation. Thus it introduces an explicit faith perspective into its encounter with the signs of the times.

Throughout the shifts of meaning and method regarding ‘signs of the times in the light of the gospel’, faith and social realities have become dialogue partners. Discerning growing interdisciplinarity as a sign of the times, a normativity of the future reading maintains that effective dialogue needs partners that are solidly grounded and bilingual in the human and natural sciences as well as in “the gospel”. This requires from the experts in the sciences an openness for the contributions of faith and from the experts in religious matters an openness for the contributions of the sciences in an effort to address the global political, economic and environmental issues. This may also anchor social transformation in structural and policy change rather than attempting to respond to social issues with charitable action.

Authoritative texts which explicitly deal with the future are threaded through with visions, longings, desires, hope, Spirit and imagination. Raising consciousness to the Spirit’s activity, keeping alive longings, invigorating hope, investigating how norms flow from visions and studying their impact on people’s lives are constitutive tasks of the normativity of the future approach. Fostering such openness to the in-breaking future is a significant contribution of normativity of the future to social transformation.

With its changing articulations in the Vatican II era documents, ‘interpreting signs of the times in the light of the gospel’ came to mean different things and articulated different methodologies throughout the Vatican II era documents. These changes illustrate a type of normativity of the future in action and point to a future horizon that announces continuing shifts in meaning and in method.

The Scriptures and the Vatican II era documents that we are discussing here tend to rely on the dominant voices in their respective social contexts. Such dominant voices frequently speak for and on behalf of persons marginalized by race, gender and class. A normativity of the

future approach is inspired by a creation theology of inclusivity and by the gospel value of preferential option for the poor. Therefore it requires us to search for the marginal voices in the texts and to give them a hearing. Moreover the normativity of the future approach requires us to find in the texts horizons of God's liberating love which include those of whom the original authors may not even have been aware. Through normativity of the future God's Spirit leads us beyond the written texts to an ever new future.

4. Scrutinizing the Ecological Crisis as a Sign of Our Times in Light of a Normativity of the Future Reading of Authoritative Texts

In our concluding section we turn to a practical application of the theory to one pressing sign of the times at the beginning of the 21st century, namely the relationship between human beings and non-human creation as it presents itself in the ecological crisis. In this effort we search for principles that guide formation and practice which emerge from the future. We focus on contributions of the Scriptures and Catholic Social Teachings. In keeping with our normativity of the future hermeneutic, we do not approach the texts (what about: for their principles of the past). But we search for the future horizon present in these authoritative texts with regard to the issues raised by the ecological crisis. We proceed in three steps. First, we scrutinize the ecological crisis as a sign of our times. Second, we study passages from Scriptures and Catholic Social Teachings that explicitly deal with nature/creation to bear on the ecological crisis from the perspective of normativity of the future. Third, we briefly articulate what has emerged from our future-oriented reading.

In this section we embrace an eco-centric approach that accepts the intrinsic value of all creation with these nuances. First, a future for all creation urges us to take up the commitment to do all we can to contribute to the building of that future. Second, the interdependence between all created beings urges us to live in solidarity with all creatures since no one can have a future unless all have a future. Creation by God and the call to a common destiny, a new heaven and a new earth, is the ground of our solidarity. Third, the inherent dignity and worth of all creation urges us to respect each creature's intrinsic value and not unnecessarily harm any creature. This intrinsic value is highlighted by the participation of all creation in redemption and by its inclusion in sacramental action. Fourth, the eschatological future invites us to create an openness in our lives, in our rituals and in our work for the in-breaking of the Spirit, hope and God's unanticipated future.

Conclusion

At the end of our study we are convinced that the very expression "scrutinizing the signs of the times and ...interpreting them in the light of the gospel" (GS 4) resonated with a longing and a desire in people; it tapped into the reservoir of a vision for a new world which needs to be renewed and revitalized continuously. Even though the gospel may not have been well used in the interpretation process and later reuses of the expression shifted in meaning, still it carries a dangerous imagination. As the prophets attest, dangerous imagination is often the child of the Spirit and hope. The dangerous imagination we envision includes building an inclusive community of all creation, embracing a stance of life-giving letting go, interpreting the signs of the times in the light of the gospel and the gospel in the light of the signs of the times, and welcoming the wisdom of new questions and the gospels for the transformation of the world.

Transmission of the Catholic Social Teaching in *Gaudium et spes*: The Role of Seminaries in Preparing Knowledgeable Priests

Sister Katarina Schuth, O.S.F.

INTRODUCTION

Seminary formation programs are crucial venues for the transmission of the Catholic social teaching since these centers of theological education are the major sources of future church leaders. The forty-five or so institutions in the United States (plus Rome and Louvain), known collectively as theologates, enroll approximately 6,000 students, divided equally between seminarians who are preparing to be pastors and lay students who are preparing for other ecclesial ministry leadership roles. They all have enormous potential to influence the future direction and shape of the faith life of Catholics. Thus, their interest in and ability to transmit the Catholic social tradition is essential if this dimension of the church's teachings is to remain vital and significant in the life of Catholics. In this paper I will focus on programs for those preparing for priesthood, identifying first how guiding documents for seminary formation address the call to justice; second, I will review what seminaries are currently doing to implement the directives; and, finally, I will formulate suggestions for improving the present situation.

GUIDING DOCUMENTS

In the past fifteen years, Church officials have published several important documents to guide the work of seminaries. Among the most important are Pope John Paul II's *Pastores dabo vobis* ("I Will Give You Shepherds"), published in 1992; another is from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Program of Priestly Formation*, published in 1993; and from the Congregation for Education we have a 1989 document, *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests*. Each of these addresses the topic of justice in greater or lesser detail, but all three set a supportive tone for teaching this fundamental area of Catholic doctrine.

A. The first document, *Pastores dabo vobis* (hereafter *PDV*), addresses in a general way the circumstances of the present day that should guide the formation of priests. The Pope describes four broad areas of formation: human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral, a framework I will use later in the paper to explain how these programs transmit doctrines and practices relevant to social doctrine. All of *PDV* communicates the urgency of understanding the social and cultural context of ministry. It calls for the Church to be immersed in the modern world, paying special attention to the problems and concerns brought on by the culture. It names concrete places where seminarians are to obtain **pastoral experience**, such as visits to the sick, caring for immigrants, refugees and nomads, and various other social works, as well as being attentive to inhuman poverty, blind violence and unjust power (*PDV 43, par. 2; 58, par. 3*).

In the category of **human formation**, the document insists that if seminarians are to share in the Church's social mission, "They need to be educated to love the truth, to be loyal, to respect every person, to have a sense of justice, to be true to their word, to be genuinely compassionate, to be men of integrity and, especially, to be balanced in judgment and behavior" (*PDV 43, par. 2*). **Spiritually** this means seminarians must put into practice the 'radical self-giving' proper to the priest following the example of Christ. Through this identification with Christ in the suffering of the world, seminarians are to grow in awareness of the "martyrdom

within the present culture, which is imbued with secularism, greed and hedonism.” (*PDV 48, par. 4*). **Intellectual formation** is essential for the development of an understanding of the social and cultural situation. The Church's social doctrine, *PDV* states, “belongs to the field...of theology and, in particular, of moral theology and is to be counted among the essential components of the new evangelization, of which it is an instrument” (*PDV 54, par. 3*).

B. The second document from 1993, *The Program of Priestly Formation* (hereafter *PPF*), was issued by the bishops of the United States, and provides more specific directives concerning the Catholic social tradition, which is to be included in all aspects of formation. Emphasizing the importance of these teachings, the *PPF* designates this area as one of the four major themes of the entire program. “In a world that seeks to privatize religious commitment, seminary education should appropriately emphasize the social dimension of the Gospel, its concern for human life, for justice in the marketplace, and for peace in the world. This edition seeks to integrate these emphases into all dimensions of preparation for priesthood” (*PPF 20*). The *PPF* states: “Throughout the curriculum the biblical, theological, ethical, and historical foundations for the Church's teaching on social justice should be highlighted” (*PPF 391*). “Seminarians must be knowledgeable about issues of social justice, peace, and respect for life. During formation, seminarians not only should study such issues on a formal basis, they should also engage in works of justice and peace and issues of life insofar as the program of the seminary permits. Spiritual formation also should treat these topics and their intrinsic connection to Christian piety and priestly living” (*PPF 302*).

The *PPF* points out aspects of the Church's social teachings that should be emphasized in the curriculum. “The academic formation of seminarians should also lead them to study in detail the social teaching of the Church in order to understand from an informed theological perspective the Church's role in the struggle for justice, peace, and the integrity of human life. Such study should mold seminarians into articulate spokesmen for and interpreters of Catholic social teaching in today's circumstances” (*PPF 345*). Furthermore, theological field education is to be infused with social justice concerns since it “can engender a sensitivity for justice, peace, and the integrity of human life. Social ministry offers opportunities for work in disadvantaged areas with marginalized groups: immigrants, migrants, refugees, the sick, the aged, and the poor. The study of social legislation concerning civil rights, health, education, and welfare provides additional opportunities” (*PPF 407*).

The document calls for faculty involvement in pastoral field education and expects faculty to demonstrate an understanding of social justice issues (*PPF 494*). One of the major outcomes of education on the social teachings of the Church should be “candidates for holy orders who manifest commitment to justice, peace, and human life as well as to the universal mission of the Church” (*PPF 544*).

C. The third document, *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests* (hereafter *Guidelines*), is comprehensive in scope and insistent in tone. “It is absolutely necessary for knowledge about the major social encyclicals to be ensured during formation. These encyclicals must be the subject of special courses and represent required reading material for the students” (*Guidelines 73*). *Gaudium et spes* (hereafter

GS) permeates and influences the content of these *Guidelines*, and several of its themes receive special emphasis relative to the formation of priests.

To begin with, the document establishes the Church's **right and obligation to teach social doctrine**, while reminding its readers of the great history of social teaching (*Guidelines 13, 14; GS 63, 74*). Following the lead of *GS*, the *Guidelines* document describes **the condition of humanity** in the world today and reiterates the importance of scrutinizing the "signs of the times" (*Guidelines 8; GS 4*). It points out the imbalances and inequalities brought about by rapid change in the modern world, resulting in injustice that leads to conflict (*Guidelines 34, 49; GS 4, 8*). The *Guidelines* speak also about the **dignity of human persons**, including the exercise of their rights by **participation** in making changes in society (*Guidelines 5, 31, 32, 40; GS 9, 12ff., 17, 68*). Such dignity implies **human freedom** exercised by a rightly formed **conscience** for the sake of the common good. By participating in socio-economic, political, and cultural life individuals can join together in **solidarity** to improve the human condition, counteracting the individualistic morality of the times (*Guidelines 30-32, 41, 58; GS 26, 43, 73, 76*).

The Church recognizes that it cannot solve all the problems of humanity, but it can be of **service** by providing the principles and guidelines that come from the Gospel (*Guidelines 2, 32; GS 3, 41*). The Church continues to **make the teachings concrete** "by proposing principles for reflection and permanent values, criteria for judgment and directives for action" (*Guidelines 28, GS 91*). The document stresses the **role of individual Christians** in political, economic, and social life, as they live out their faith by concrete actions in the temporal world (*Guidelines 63; GS 75, 76*). Developing an awareness of how to relate faith and daily life is a serious responsibility of pastoral leaders. The local church will become the focal point for instruction and action if formation is thorough. **Pastors** must know and teach well social doctrine and be sensitive to ways of implementing it; therefore, seminarians must be taught how to invite their parishioners into the saving mission of the Church (*Guidelines 58, GS 43*).

TRANSMISSION OF CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING

Let us turn now to an examination of the organization of the entire formation program as it relates to the transmission of Catholic social teaching. *GS* served as an important impetus for incorporating required elements of this teaching in priestly formation, exemplified in *PDV*, *PPF*, and *Guidelines*. Formation programs are structured around four areas: intellectual and pastoral formation, and human and spiritual formation.

A. Intellectual Formation in the Catholic Social Tradition. Seminarians are usually required to take four courses in Moral Theology/Christian Ethics. Typically the courses are: Fundamental Moral Theology, Human Sexuality/Sexual Ethics, Medical Ethics, and Social Ethics. Strictly speaking, only Social Ethics is concerned with the social tradition of the Church, but, in fact, all of the courses relate to this subject matter. **Fundamental Moral Theology**, for example, is studied from the viewpoint of its history and contemporary concerns. Primary questions examined in the courses concern moral norms, moral responsibility, authority, freedom, natural law, sin, virtue, the nature of conscience, conversion, grace, and character. It is obvious that the grounding provided in the basic course is essential to the study of the social tradition of the Church.

Courses in human sexuality/sexual ethics have a close relationship to and are informed by the Church's social teaching as well. These courses touch deeply into concerns about care for the human person and the family. The fundamental rights of individuals to life itself, to adequate health care, especially for the poor and vulnerable, are treated directly in these courses. The study of human sexuality/sexual ethics considers the praxis of fostering communities of love and concern for the human person. They examine topics such as contraception, homosexuality, chastity, celibacy, non-marital sexuality, abortion, responsible parenthood, divorce, and the relationship of men and women and their corresponding responsibilities.

Courses in biomedical ethics have taken on a new urgency with the onset of major technological breakthroughs that have created new moral dilemmas. About half the schools require a separate course in this area, while another fourth combine the subject matter with sexual ethics. The courses aim at identifying relevant issues in health care in order to come to a publicly defensible and pastorally appropriate position on those issues. Another goal relates to preparing ministers who are able to speak to the more social and public issues of health care relating to availability and distribution of resources, especially where goods are in conflict. Obviously, this subject matter embraces many dimensions of the Church's social concerns.

Courses specifically dedicated to Catholic social teaching are usually identified under the rubric of "Social Ethics" or "Catholic Social Teachings." More than three-fourths of the schools require such a course and most of the rest include at least some of the subject matter under different titles. The principles, values, criteria for judgment, and directives for action are studied. The courses usually encompass the major Catholic Church documents on social teaching; typically, they cover teachings from at least *Rerum novarum* in 1891 to *Centesimus annus* in 1991, including importantly *GS*. The courses provide the theory for the praxis of social justice, using the Gospel as a means to discern the social demands for our time.

B. Pastoral Formation on the Catholic Social Tradition. Pastoral formation concerns itself more with the practical application of the social teachings. Students are taught to offer pastoral guidance on topics of morality in areas of marriage and family, health care ethics, and issues related to commutative and distributive justice. Opportunities for applied social teachings may come in the form of pastoral counseling and spiritual direction, and through the Sacrament of Reconciliation. Some seminaries also have a practicum experience as a requirement, which places students in a variety of social justice ministries where they use the tools of social analysis of justice issues, taking into account the social and cultural conditions. Another major forum for the practical application of social justice principles is through liturgical celebrations, especially through preaching with an awareness of how the Gospel speaks to the Church's social teachings. Both liturgy and homiletics courses provide opportunities to make the connection.

C. Spiritual and Human Formation on the Catholic Social Tradition. Spiritual and human formation are closely linked in the process of preparation for ministry. Among other topics, spiritual development calls for the individual to examine virtue, sin, conversion, and character, vocation and discernment. For priests, adopting a stance of simplicity of life is important to their spirituality and is clearly related to the social tradition of the Church. This stance requires a humble lifestyle, a spirit of self-denial, and an attitude of service that is grounded in prayer. It calls for a preferential option for the poor and demands pastoral

availability, thus modeling one's life and ministry after that of Christ. Human formation focuses on psychological and emotional development that promotes a stance toward others that is inclusive and humble. It requires students to be aware of dimensions of moral development and moral goodness.

ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSION

Throughout this paper, I have raised up ways in which seminary formation programs are attentive to communicating an understanding of the Catholic social tradition to future priests. Taken in the aggregate, one can point to a rich array of offerings from intellectual and pastoral dimensions, to human and spiritual dimensions. Yet, the 1998 report of the United States Catholic Conference (of Bishops), *Sharing Catholic Social Teaching: Challenges and Directions*, points out that some seminaries require courses on Catholic social teaching and others do not. The report states that the results of their survey “suggest that while there are many good examples of courses on Catholic social teaching, there is a serious need to ensure that all seminaries include in their curricula required courses on this topic. The minimum expectation should be implementation of the Vatican's *Guidelines*” (p. 16).

About three-fourths of the seminaries develop their programs with an awareness of the centrality of the social teachings of the Church. They require students to participate in field education experiences that move them beyond conventional middle class parishes to parishes that struggle with the poverty of their members and of their social location. They place students in centers where the poor are fed and clothed, where the sick are tended to even though they may not have the means to pay for their care. They also attend to providing knowledge about the social structures that lead to deprivation, so students may work with political action groups or participate in lobbying efforts that touch on the social tradition of the Church. In terms of spiritual development, prayer experiences, preferably prepared by the students, and opportunities for fasting for the sake of a particular cause may be offered. Liturgies and homilies that focus attention on the needs of the world keep before the community the importance of praying for and preaching about these concerns. Virtually every seminary does some of these things, but perhaps fewer than half are deeply invested.

In conclusion, I would offer two major critiques of seminary formation programs relative to the direction made indispensable in *GS*. First, the uneven application of the significant norms set out in the guiding documents is regrettable. As bishops and vocation directors evaluate their choice of seminaries for their future priests, if they were to call for improvement in the presentation of the social teachings of the Church, the schools would respond. Some already do have adequate programs, but the unevenness of emphasis is problematic. The relatively brief time dedicated to the Catholic social tradition in a few schools is a major shortcoming, even to the extreme that several do not require such a course at all. Exacerbating the problem throughout the system is the fallout from the recent sexual abuse scandals. The draft of a new *PPF* turns more attention than ever to matters of internal discipline—obviously needed—but resulting in a diminished emphasis on the Church in the world, especially in matters of social concern.

Second, a critique can be made of seminarians enrolled in theologates. Faculty and administrators suggest that the majority of students do only what is required and they have little passion for social justice. Some may even resist related requirements. A few also may focus on

one particular issue to the exclusion of all others; their lives are not directed toward a broader view of the church's social teachings. Fortunately, at least a relatively small proportion of seminarians become deeply involved in every dimension of their education that relates to social justice. They take more courses than required, they spend their pastoral time in settings that are focused on social concerns, and they develop their personal and spiritual lives in ways that take into account the social tradition of the Church. Their influence and enthusiasm is the foundation for the hope that participation and love for this ministry will spread.

Pope John Paul II and many bishops have been tireless in their call for a response to the suffering in the world, to poverty, and to the profound need for peace. They seek a greater response to the cause of justice from the faithful who are called upon to fulfill their vocation in the world. The leadership of priests is essential in moving forward this agenda through a passionate commitment to the Catholic social teachings. The proper focus of programs that reach their hearts and minds as they prepare for this mission is essential.

Parenting the Church: Mothers, Fathers, and Catholic Social Thought

Michael J. Schuck

One of many remarkable features in *Gaudium et spes* is the trust it places in dialogue as an appropriate mode of Church-world engagement. Notable too is the document's admission that the Church has been, in its history, not only *teacher*, but also *learner* in this dialogue. Drawing on these frank acknowledgements, this paper explores one form of Church-world dialogue: the mostly subtle, but always vital interaction between the guardians of authoritative Church social teaching and the lay faithful immersed in the day-to-day activities of the world.

Concerning this interaction, *Parenting the Church: Mothers, Fathers, and Catholic Social Thought* recommends that guardians enhance authoritative Church social teaching by learning from the moral experience of faithful mothers and fathers who endeavor mightily in marriage and family life to follow Jesus Christ. More specifically, this paper contends that the experience of covenant in Christian marriage and family life should be drawn into authoritative Church social teaching and articulated as a social-moral principle alongside the well-known principles of human dignity, the common good, solidarity, and subsidiarity.

On the basis of this contention, the paper makes two further claims. First, the paper argues that a principle of covenant usefully broadens the moral vision of authoritative Church social teaching and enriches the meaning of the other, well-known moral principles. Second, the paper claims that the principle of covenant brings a much-needed moral balance to two neuralgic issues in authoritative Church social teaching: the moral value of hierarchy for social life and the place of moral partiality within a global, social ethic.

The moral importance of covenant is not foreign to the message of *Gaudium et spes*. In fact, the document is the first to officially emphasize the covenantal character of Christian marriage in modern Roman Catholic thought. This paper expands the moral value of covenant in *Gaudium et spes* from marriage to family life to the structures of social life as a whole. While occasional interest in a principle of covenant has been shown by Roman Catholic moral theologians since Vatican II, no sustained argument has been made for locating it among the necessary moral principles of authoritative Church social teaching.

Similarly, the importance of marriage and family is not foreign to the message of *Gaudium et spes*. Indeed, an oft-quoted phrase from the document refers to the family as a "school of deeper humanity." This paper suggests that learners in this school should include not only children, but also the guardians of authoritative Church social teaching. It is true that one finds abundant praise of the Christian family in this teaching. However, neither a dialogue in trust with the moral experience of faithful mothers and fathers nor a willingness to learn from their moral experience has marked guardian practice since Vatican II. In the dialogic spirit of *Gaudium et spes*, one can imagine the parenting skills of faithful mothers and fathers serving both their children and their Church.

The argument of *Parenting the Church: Mothers, Fathers, and Catholic Social Thought* proceeds in three steps. First, select moral experiences central to Christian family living are identified. Among these, the moral experience of covenant is given particular attention. The

importance of covenant for Christian marriage in *Gaudium et spes* is noted and then shown as vital to family life and social life as a whole. In this section of the paper, the neglected discussion of covenant in Bernard Häring's *Free & Faithful in Christ* is retrieved and joined with contemporary treatments of covenant in Margaret A. Farley's *Personal Commitments* (1986) and Antonio Moser and Bernardino Leers' *Moral Theology: Dead Ends and Alternatives* (1990).

The paper's second step notes the contribution a principle of covenant can make to the moral vision of authoritative Church social teaching. The argument proceeds by showing the social-moral value of covenant and the particular clarifications it brings to the meanings of human dignity, common good, solidarity, and subsidiarity. It is further observed that although *Gaudium et spes* focuses on covenant as a feature of Christian marriage, it does suggest how this feature forms the basis for the "communitarian vision" of authoritative Church social teaching. This section of the paper draws, in part, on work done in my own study *That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989* (1991) and Michael J. and Kenneth R. Himes' *Fullness of Faith: The Public Significance of Theology* (1993).

Finally, the paper analyzes how the principle of covenant brings balance to the moral values of hierarchy and partiality in social life. An important aspect of this argument is the covenantal hierarchy and rightful partiality modeled in the lives of faithful mothers and fathers. In this modeling, mothers and fathers can parent not only children, but also the guardians of the Church. While *Gaudium et spes* is at pains to distinguish the moral wisdom of the lay faithful from the moral authority of Church guardians, the document does insist that lay people "have an active role to play in the whole life of the Church." In this third section, the paper works with Terence L. Nichols' idea of participatory hierarchy in *That All Be One: Hierarchy and Participation in the Church* (1997) and Stephen Pope's discussion of moral partiality in "The Moral Centrality of Natural Priorities: A Thomistic Alternative to 'Equal Regard'" from the *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* (1990).

The modest goal of *Parenting the Church: Mothers, Fathers, and Catholic Social Thought* is this: to acknowledge the importance for authoritative Church social teaching of the moral principle of covenant and the teaching of faithful mothers and fathers whose marriage and family lives witness to this principle. *Gaudium et spes* says the Church "must rely on those who live in the world." Hopefully, this paper makes a small contribution in showing how, on what, and with whom a portion of that trusting, learning reliance should rest.

**Protection of Rights and the Maxims of the Law:
From Gratian to *Gaudium et spes* and Beyond**
Charles J. Reid, Jr.

Gaudium et spes places enormous emphasis on the dignity, the worth, and the freedom of the human person. The human person is understood to have been created in the image and likeness of God. The human person is capable of understanding and achieving the good in a way unlike any other created being. Because of these capabilities, the person enjoys freedom. This is not freedom to be licentious or to act contrary to the laws of nature. The person, rather, is endowed with freedom in order to seek knowledge of and oneness with God.

The Christian anthropology espoused by *Gaudium et spes* has, to a surprising degree, been well-received by American academic lawyers. Well over one hundred academic articles rely on *Gaudium et spes* to examine the nature of the relationship of the human person and society; to articulate an understanding of the demands of the common good; and to search for principles of constitutional governance and international order. *Gaudium et spes* figures prominently in arguments over philosophical liberalism; economic and social justice; the death penalty; marriage and abortion; and even in such seemingly remote areas as environmental law and tax policy.

My article proposes to consider why an ecclesiastical document like *Gaudium et spes* should resonate so deeply with contemporary academic lawyers. There are, of course, some obvious, perhaps even easy explanations: a disproportionate number of these citations occur in law journals of religiously-affiliated law schools. Those advancing such arguments are often, but not invariably, Catholic. It is also true that *Gaudium et spes* was intended to speak to all persons of good will, not merely Catholics, and to translate natural-law concepts into a vocabulary readily accessible by literate lay audiences. Perhaps each of these factors contribute to this remarkable phenomenon.

But in my paper I propose to explore a less obvious explanation. I propose that the anthropology found in *Gaudium et spes* draws deeply upon concepts that have been current in the Western legal tradition since it came into being at the end of the eleventh century with Pope Gregory VII's declaration of independence from the German Emperor Henry IV and the subsequent rise of scientific canon law.

The system of canon law that emerged in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries placed an enormous premium on the protection of rights. Indeed, it has now been persuasively demonstrated that the canonists of the twelfth century invented the concept of natural rights. The generation of decretists who followed Gratian (fl. 1140) spoke of ius naturale as signifying a certain sphere of protected liberty. The thirteenth-century decretalists, so-called for their commentaries on the new collections of papal decretals, greatly expanded the canonistic rights vocabulary. The decretalists spoke of ius as signifying variously a liberty (libertas), an immunity (immunitas), a power (potestas), an interest (interesse), or a faculty (facultas). Entire areas of law were understood in terms of intricate interlocking patterns of rights and duties. This was the case, for instance, with the institution of marriage and domestic relations law, as I documented in my book Power Over the Body, Equality in the Family.

My paper only briefly recapitulates these features of medieval rights talk, which can be found discussed in greater detail in my work and the work of others, such as Brian Tierney. The heart of my presentation, rather, consists of a discussion of the maxims of law that developed to protect the exercise of individual rights. The term "maxim" is itself derived from the expression "maximum proposition," an analytical device current in the scholastic philosophy of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Maxims were used as a means of reaching generalizations about a group of particulars.

Maxims of law should also be understood as statements of principle that carried varying degrees of weight within the law. In using the words "principle" and "weight" I am drawing in particular from the jurisprudence of Ronald Dworkin. Dworkin distinguishes between rules, which can only be applied in an all-or-nothing fashion, and principles, which those interpreting the law must weigh and measure in determining whether they fit a given case. A principle differs from a rule in that a principle "states a reason that argues in one direction, but does not necessitate a particular decision."

The canonists developed and deployed various maxims to explore different features of the canonistic rights vocabulary. The canonists thus asserted that "one injures no one who uses one's right" (sic nemini facit iniuriam si utitur iure suo). This maxim was useful for exploring the sense of rightfulness that accompanied the exercise of one's rights. Rights were licit powers, lawful freedoms, immunities from ecclesiastical or state power. This maxim of law was useful in exploring this aspect of medieval rights discourse.

A second important maxim of law was the expression that "it is not a sin to use one's right" (quod non peccat qui utitur iure suo). Like the first maxim, this saying emphasized the rightfulness of exercising one's rights. It also emphasized the freedom that one who enjoyed a right lawfully possessed. Rights were a source of freedom in medieval law. One could choose to exercise or not to exercise one's rights. In exercising the right to vote (ius eligendi), for instance, one had both the freedom and the responsibility to choose among available candidates employing broad criteria by which to judge the candidates' suitability. By stating that one was blameless who exercised such a right the canonists emphasized the possibility that persons of good will might disagree, but that they were nevertheless free to exercise their best judgment. The same sort of analysis could be repeated with respect to other rights recognized in church law.

Perhaps the most prominent of the rights-based maxims was the saying that "no one should be deprived of his [or her] right without fault" (cum iure suo non debeat sine sua culpa privari). This maxim of law was deployed repeatedly by the canonists in their interpretation of papal decretals. Thus a composite gloss found in the Glossa ordinaria of Pope Gregory IX's *Liber extra* explained that a priest stricken with leprosy retained a right to office and was to be allowed to draw sustenance from his parish even though unable to perform his ministry. To hold otherwise would be to punish the priest, sine culpa, "through no fault of his own."

The expression cum iure suo was routinely used as an interpretive device to protect the rights of individuals and to limit the reach of charters, privileges, decrees, and laws, where their

effect was to infringe on the rights of third parties.

By the fifteenth century, the expression cum iure suo acquired a constitutional dimension. Paulus Vladimiri, the Polish canonist who took the occasion of the Council of Constance to defend the rights of Lithuanians against the depredations of the Teutonic Knights made use of this term to argue that the papal privileges granted to the Knights must be understood in a limited sense. One should not be deprived of one's rights without cause, he declared, and papal decrees should not be interpreted as permitting such drastic action where it is not clear that the pope had "certain knowledge" of the deprivation that might be caused by his decrees. Seemingly coining a new maxim, Paulus declared that "it is prohibited to disturb the rights of those who wish to live quietly."

This rights-vocabulary, the sense of freedom it entailed, and the commitment to due process that accompanied it, became fixtures of the Western legal tradition. In secular and ecclesiastical polities alike, this commitment to the dignity and freedom of the person, expressed in the idiom of rights, became a fundamental feature of the law. It is this heritage, which takes its origin in the medieval legal tradition of the Church, that serves as a deep wellspring of *Gaudium et spes's* commitment to the dignity of the human person. This common heritage, shared by the Church and by western lawyers alike, helps to explain as well the warm reception given to *Gaudium et spes* by portions of the American legal academy.

For a Technology with a Human Face

Gianni Manzone

1. Eschatological hope and technological progress

While the encyclicals of John XXIII appear above all as ethic-political appeal to men of good will, *Gaudium et spes*, in the context of the “pastoral” theme of the encounter between Church and the contemporary world, for the first time proposes at the magisterial level a theological synthesis of a certain commitment about the meaning of human progress, characterised by technology, in the prospective of the history of salvation.

Regarding the technological progress, first of all, it is said that there is “a monumental effort of man through the centuries to improve the conditions of life” (n.34), and a positive ethical evaluation is given about it, that draws its arguments from the Old Testament texts, especially Genesis c. 1 and 2, the texts that refer to the cosmic primacy of man, the “image of God”. Moreover it specifies the criterion for such a progress consistent with the genuine *humani generis bono* (n. 35). Later, the theme of ambiguity of fact inscribed within the development is introduced – not only from ethical prospective alone, but also from historic-hermeneutical – (n.37, history infected by sin); only through this way one has access to the Christian paschal (n.38) and eschatological (n.39, new heaven and new earth) prospective. Here, a very cautious and uncertain important affirmation is made, “...far from diminishing our concern to develop this earth, the expectation of a new earth should spur us on, for it is here that the body of a new human family grows, foreshadowing in some way the age which is to come. That is why, although we must be careful to distinguish earthly progress clearly from the growth of the kingdom of God, however, such progress is of vital concern to the kingdom of God”.

“The human activity in the world” is briefly described in its historic manner as increased scientific-technical “dominion” upon nature and is approved as in accordance with the “plan of God”, in opposition to the accusation made against the Christian message, that of “turning away men from the task of building up the world” (nn.33-39).

Even though the “vital concern” of civil progress for the kingdom of God remain undetermined, *GS* develops an interesting anthropological, humanistic and cultural approach that allows to verify with greater precision the negative and positive aspects of technology (n.54).

Recognising that science and technology open new frontiers, contribute to improve life and to spread culture, *GS* underlines the difference from human values. Therefore it indicates a search for an equilibrium between techno-scientific development and human-cultural values, as one of the important tasks of the contemporary culture (n.56).

2. A challenge for social theology

The dominion of the technological culture in the accustomed and more immediate ambient of life makes man attend much more to historical questions than to eternal questions. We see how the ultimate horizon of human life cannot in any way be constituted from history,

understood as that collective and progressive event of humanity, but it ought to be constituted from the truth of man. However, the humanity of man is not “the result” of the social conditions of his life; the freedom of man, in particular, is not “the result” of liberation or of emancipation by technology.

The foundation of ethical values beyond every reference to objective realizations of civil history, far from being an impediment to the socio-historical responsibility of man, is the condition. This foundation leads to the ascertainment of a nature insuperably partial, conjectural and in the end also ambiguous of every civil realization, always suspended in its justification from the total fulfilment of the collective plan.

The objective is a social theology which is not superimposed, but connects intrinsically and structurally to socio-cultural relationships, reinterpreting them without deteriorating into allegories, as gratuitous as unproductive for the critical discernment of technological facts. Such a project integrates the fragments in the direction of eschatological hope, as well as in the awareness of the permanent difference between such hope and every possible social realization. Theology does not use the eschatological reference in a purely negative critical sense, but develops the positive and creative aspect of the Christian eschatological tension, when it refers to ethico-social themes such as technology.

The first theological certainty which one needs to recall is that the salvation of man – or the ultimate good of man – is not the result of human effort, and even less of the collective activity of progress. This human activity, as all others, must be placed under the sign of faith and of obedience: obedience to the fundamental commandment, upon which every ethical norm turns, and that is to the commandment to love every person as neighbor.

The human activity of love, on one hand, is an activity permanently obliged to accept the limit: the good that can be willed by man and for man is good conditioned in many modes. Conditioned, in the sense that it is never the good in its fullness, but that it is given only in a constellation of goods, which as such are proposed within a determined historical situation, manifold and scattered, and which from the same situation their material positivity and the limit derive. Here the finality of our plans questions the meaning of our technological possibilities: the limit is not only a casual obstacle to overcome, but it is also a sign of a condition of reality which demands respect.

The industrial technological cultures, where liberty is reduced to only [is no more than] liberation from necessity, summon theology to a serious discussion about transcendence: the “transcending without end” is not transcendence. In reality, the finite existence of man and of his activity is given beginning with himself, is given but not as self-reference, but as a tension toward a goal which fulfils the desire, toward an actualization which constitutes an end and a fullness. Nevertheless, if infinity qualifies the desire, which goes beyond all boundaries, it does not make infinite that which is given as finite.

The auto-affirmation of the desire of life of man, which is manifested in progress, is always of a symbolic character. As in every particular desire, a more radical and ineffable desire is simultaneously announced and hidden, a desire which cannot be defined conceptually

nor even less realized practically, but it can only be partially and fragmentarily represented by concrete figures of historical-practical experience, believing and hoping in the completed revelation of it and the realization on the part of the faithful love of God toward his creature.

Because of the strict relationship between the subject and technology it is also necessary to raise this last from a simple notion of utility and to lift it to the essential part of the human person and his realization. Technology would be, then, an expression of the human spirit, and not simply a “remedy” for his biological insufficiency, as A. Golden affirms. Through this man expresses his radical desire to realize himself, to become a person, to become a subject who can be free. It belongs to the dynamic of man’s realization which is open to overcoming every limit and receptive of a sense of reality and of its technological transformation. This sense of reality goes beyond human activity itself.

The social teaching of the Church stimulates forms of knowledge and discourse which open certain cultural avenues, introducing a transcendent point of view; by contrast, the technological culture risks becoming a system of signs which point only to itself.

3. A symbolic interpretation of technology.

The technology is lived, in fact, as one of the major processes of invisible and pervasive liberation from the limiting conditions of man. Because of its success in all fields, today it is the living symbol of the concept of progress and liberation. From this point of view, the technology proposes itself as a good in terms of ability to liberate us from many physical bondages, and thanks to the technology, through which today the health conditions of contemporary man has reached unimaginable levels. These perspectives touch profoundly the desires of each person: the desire for a healthy life without limits, truly empowering in a strongly ageing society. The exhilaration for these discoveries and for the realisable dreams is spreading the desire for a society without suffering, without unbearable burdens, entrusted to progress. Understood as a project of liberation from all limits, what consequences does the technological development have upon the project of human self-representation? Can such a possibility become in itself legitimised, and is each limit encountered, presented as an obstacle to overcome?

To these questions, the authoritative response of GS focalises both the problem of the truth of human project and the resultant determinations of the characteristics of technological progress. On the basis of the anthropological presuppositions inspired by Christian faith, it examines the possibility to re-orient the technology so as to be at the service of man and remain as a sign of that good which is the organic principle and justifier of the great undertaking. Such a foundation does not need the technological process to unfold totally to justify itself, but comes first and gives not partial significance to the human undertaking. The technique, as far as a human activity goes, refers not just to an instrumental meaning alone. Such a meaning engages as well as makes man capable of evaluating his own praxis within the complex category of good that transcends (but also includes and judges), that which is useful or damaging, and helps to recompose the unity of reality (n.57).

This is to explain the “symbolic” dimension of the cultural and technological context, as far as it is a mediation of meaning, given and not built up, and an appeal to the human

freedom, in order to discover and recognise the meaning that precedes it. The technological function is acculturated, taking into consideration not only the finalities of the subject, but also of the objects, and fosters the peculiarity of their being. The inspiring line of a renewed technological culture should take into consideration the “symbolic” conscience that understands the structure of being as ultimately relational and the links of every being within the whole. The logic that emerges is, that which is capable of unfolding towards the recognition of “limits”, and in the “measure” that distinguishes as well as it unites, and unites while distinguishing. The technological action, above all, becomes attentive to the radical connectedness and to the constitutive relations, to reciprocity and unification of various meanings. Without the symbolic dimension, the technology which cannot not be a field of a total openness, becomes a whole closed in upon itself. Its self-openness to being reduces itself to an enclosure, that functions to conceal itself from other possible ways of disclosing the being. The technology thus becomes a check that makes of itself and to us, unavailable to the other. In such a way, the internet, instead of symbolic totality of the world, can offer a simulated world of totality, a closed reference of immediacy and transparency.

The “symbolic” dimension allows us to maintain externality to the omnipresence of technological environments, and at the same time explicates the authentically human dimension, that the technology can express and facilitate, impede and deny. It also illustrates the possibility that the Christian faith influences the whole human space, opens it to the divine and realises it by disclosing it. Thus, the technology can fulfil its noble and almost priestly task of safeguarding the work of the Creator and revealing its beauty. It does not reduce itself to just a useful instrument, but becomes an essential part of the human person and his realisation. However, technology could be an expression of the human spirit, and not simply a “remedy” for biological insufficiency, as Gehlen affirms. Through it, man expresses his basic desire for self-realisation, to become a person, to become a subject that can actualise himself (n.15). It belongs to the dynamic of self-realisation of man, open to the overcoming every type of limit and receptive of a meaning of reality and its technological transformation, a meaning that exceeds the work of man himself (n.39).

Above all the theological interpretation does a service to technology rather than dominates it, because it indicates the spiritual and ethical values that make technology a means of liberation and a hope for the human family in a dynamic not bound to mere earthly happiness with its traits of a secular religion but open towards the hope of eschatological fulfilment of human endeavours (n. 34).

4. The impact of technological developments

The impact of technological developments is particularly important under the anthropological and socio-political profiles. Under the first profile, as the biomedical enhancement technologies illustrate, it is a specific aspect of a human condition and one of the features of its praxis: the binomial of the possible and of the limit. If the question why the world exists is not substituted by the question how the environment around us functions, then it is possible to measure, from time to time, which limits are recognized as obstacles and which ones are recognised as morally important for the constitution of the human being. The ambivalence of techniques is tightly connected to the truth of the human plan, the truth that is of its own

condition (n. 35). By introducing a transcendent point of view, it derives a form of civilisation which underlines not only the features of the techniques oriented to control, but also other compatible attributes with the integral development of the person, with a broader distribution of cultural and power qualifications. Such attributes include vocational investments of the subjects in their work, collegial forms of self-organisation and integration of a wide range of values into the techniques, beyond the pursuit of profit and power. Today these dimensions of techniques can be put into play only in the context of the cultural re-organisation of advanced societies.

It is important to avoid the limits of the instrumental vision of technology (a tool is only a tool) and the excesses of the deterministic approach of technological development. To the first approach is noted how every technological product expresses always a vision of life and a hierarchy of values. To the second is noted the contingency: the technologies represent complex and frequently contradictory political decisions, even if it is yet possible to maintain a human interest in efficiency and in power of productivity.

The critical vision of technology focuses the contextual aspects of technology that are ignored by the dominant vision. Technology is not the rational control of nature, its development and impact are intrinsically social. As such the traditional trust of efficiency as a criterion of technological development is relativized and ample possibilities for change are opened.

The deterministic theories such as those of Heidegger and of Ellul, according to which we become objects of technology, incorporated in the mechanism that we have created, invoke a vague spiritual renewal, too vague to inform a new practical technology.

Their weak point remains the identification of technology in general with the specific technologies of conquest in the last century. These claim an unprecedented autonomy and their eruptions and social impacts remain hidden: they are a particular feature of our society and not a universal dimension of modernity.

The technologies are under-determined by scientific and technical criteria. This means that there is generally a surplus of feasible solutions for every problem and that the social actors make a choice between various technical options, and that the definition of the problem frequently changes in the course of the solution.

The technologies are not neutral because the social ends and the institutional interests are within the technical projects that are selected. Because there are choices, the decisions of public strategies around technology play a significant role. Technology must be seen, therefore, as an ambiguous tool of social power. There is not a better way to project a technology. Different individuals and groups can define a problem in different ways and can have different criteria for success.

The technological system remains flexible and can be adapted to a variety of social requirements: technology is a socially dependent variable, although always more important, and it is not the criterion of judgement of history. It follows from this that technological research must be guided by two other principles: I) technological development is not linear but branches

out in many directions and could reach the highest levels in more than one direction; II) technological development is not determinant for society but is determined by technical and social factors.

If technology has many unexplored potentialities, no technological imperative dictates the current social hierarchy. Technology is, rather, one scenario of social conflicts, in which cultural alternatives struggle. The differences in the way in which social groups interpret and use the objects of technology are not only extrinsic, but they differentiate the nature of the interests themselves. What the object is for the group that ultimately decides its destiny determines what it becomes, how it is re-designed and improved in time. Then we can understand technological developments only by studying the socio-political situation of the various groups involved in it.

However, the act of choosing remains hidden, the deterministic image of a technically justified social order is projected.

The legitimating effect of technology does not depend on the knowledge of the cultural and political horizon under which it has been designed. A critique of technology which puts it in the context can discover that horizon, demystify the illusion of technological necessity and expose the relativity of prevalent technical choices.

Only a democracy with decentralized power, which transfers responsibility to those upon whose wise exercise of it depends its survival, can correct the equilibrium in favor of persons who battle to conquer control of the technological machine.

Under the socio-political profile and from a conscious position of non-neutrality of technology towards the values and the political and economic interests that control the resources, the question of which technologies ought to be developed and for which ends, becomes the question of interest for every democracy. How can the opportunities that technology offers be increased so that they contribute to the participation in and to the construction of the common good? To have technology reformed and re-designed, there must be a democratic policy, which builds up a synergetic totality of natural, human and environmental elements without diminishing the efficiency of productivity.

5. The concern of freedom and of justice.

Beyond the individualistic-ethical approach, and also in service to such an approach, the Church proposes the inquiry about the institutional forms that better permit the control of the power of technological development and the just distribution of its benefits. The critic of technological civilisation, elaborated from the conscience point of view, permits to spotlight a political plan that is not hastily agreed upon in the vision of efficiency, but responds to the demand for the quality of human life that our civilisation produces. For that reason the Church is sensitive to the implications that technological development has on justice, specially towards the persons and groups that are not represented: "Likewise all that men accomplish within the scope of achieving a greater justice, a more wider fraternity and a more human order in social relations, has more value than the technical progress" (n. 35).

The religious vision of *Gaudium et spes* arouses problems of a wider horizon. One of its contributions is to offer greater structures of understanding and of commitment necessary for dealing with complex problems. It offers perspectives in which persons are responsible, beyond their own interests, towards the ultimate source of their lives' foundation. It emphasizes a need of science and technology with the purpose to serve the common good and for the realisation of a more inclusive human society.

The Church, "expert in humanity", stimulates a confrontation that is capable of changing worries for social justice, by transforming them into a greater impetus of planning and of intervention, and by seizing the positive opportunities that the technologies offer for the "good" that is superior to every definite historical and material objective; the good that is given in the witnessing of immediate and of the concern for the destiny of the other. The interest of the Church is that of making to grow a more lively conscience of the good that is the original foundation of every human enterprise and precedes it as guarantee, in advance, of the possibility of fulfilling the technological work. By contextualizing the announcement of salvation in the technological culture and making clear the transcendent meaning of the human activity in the technological systems, the Church offers an original and indispensable confrontation between the understanding of epoch-making phenomena and the planning of technology from the human perspective.

***Gaudium et spes* and the Struggle for Human Rights in Peru**

Mateo Garr, S.J.

In this paper I want to examine *Gaudium et spes* in two directions: In the first place, I want to look back at those influences which provided the content for what the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World says about human rights. And in the second place, I hope to show how *Gaudium et spes* helped to launch the human rights movement within the church. I will cite the church in Latin America in general and Peru in particular to demonstrate the importance of the ministry of human rights.

The concept of “rights” is mentioned in 19 of the pastoral constitution’s 93 paragraphs. More importantly, it is mentioned in three of the four chapters in the first part of *Gaudium et spes* concerning the orienting principles and in all five chapters of the second part of the constitution on some more urgent problems. In other words, the concept of rights underlies the whole document. It is not merely an aside.

On the other hand, the importance of rights did not begin with *Gaudium et spes*. That honor goes to John XXIII’s encyclical letter *Pacem in terris*, written two years and nine months before *Gaudium et spes*. In fact, great portions of the pastoral constitution owe their origins to John XXIII, especially the reference to both of his social encyclicals, *Pacem in terris* and the earlier *Mater et magistra*. *Gaudium et spes* quotes John XXIII more than twice as much as any other Pope. Those two encyclicals substantiate the four basic social principles presented in the first part of *Gaudium et spes* and also stand at the root of the final four chapters on the practical application of those four principles to the issues of culture, economics, politics, and peace.

Mary Ann Glendon in her book, *A World Made New* (2001), on Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, makes an interesting allusion to the fact that one of the three key writers of that 1948 Declaration was the French lawyer, René Cassin, who was also a personal friend of the then Apostolic Nuncio to France, Angelo Roncalli. What influence did each man have on the other? Considering John XXIII’s ability to listen and learn from others (Cahill 2002), it is highly possible that Cassin provided the future John XXIII with a method for interpreting his own lived experiences before and during the world war in Bulgaria, Greece, Istanbul, and France itself. Similarly, we can also hypothesis that one of the real purposes of the Council Fathers in publishing *Gaudium et spes* was to pay tribute to the man by whose inspiration the whole phenomenon of the Second Vatican Council was allowed to exist.

Perhaps those are only interesting hypotheses. And perhaps too *Gaudium et spes* adds only a little structurally to the issue of human rights than what *Pacem in terris* had already stated. Nevertheless, I do affirm that the importance of the Council in general, and specifically of the pastoral constitution on the Church in the Modern World, is that it provided the support of an entire Council which promoted human rights not merely as one other important aspect of the Church’s role in the world but in deed as the very backbone of the church’s entire social commitment.

Before we turn to the Latin American situation (demonstrated by the case of Peru) I will briefly summarize what *Pacem in terris* and *Gaudium et spes* have said about human rights and

what relation that teaching has to the content of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations in 1948. And the first point is that the church view of human *rights* never stands alone; it is always complemented with an equal insistence on human *duties*, a balance which the writers of the U.N. declaration were unable to achieve.

This should not be surprising since all the principles of church social teaching stand in a reciprocal relationship one to another:

- Human rights require Human Duties.
- Solidarity is possible when it works alongside Subsidiarity.
- Most importantly of all, the Dignity of the Human Person only makes sense in relationship to the Communitarian nature of the individual Person.
- The Common Good is discovered in practice through the lens of the Preferential Option for the Poor.
- And the Common Destiny of the Goods of Creation stands alongside the principle of our Brotherhood and Sisterhood with all of Creation.

What I want to show in the second half of this paper is how that teaching on human rights has had a significant effect on the structure of the Catholic church in Latin America and perhaps even on universal church. Or in other words, *Gaudium et spes* is still exercising an important role in the church forty years later.

This can be seen in the first place by the response in Latin America in the immediate aftermath of the Council. The major consequence of *Gaudium et spes* on the Latin American Church as a whole were the General Conferences of the Latin American Bishops (CELAM) held in Medellín, Colombia in 1968, Puebla, México in 1979, and the Dominican Republic in 1992. All three general conferences advanced the social proposals of Vatican II with respect to its analysis of the structures of institutional violence (Medellín), the preferential option for the poor (Puebla), and the priority of human rights (Dominican Republic) and have thus contributed to the ongoing growth of Church social teaching.

What happened at the level of CELAM during these four decades is the result of what happened previously at the grassroots level in the local churches. J. Bryan Hehir (1996), in speaking about the effects of John XXIII's encyclical, *Pacem in terris*, proposed that the encyclical provided the concrete motivation for local church groups to get involved in directly human rights work. The concrete example he cites is Brazil where a military coup occurred in 1964 which led to the repression of many political and social leaders. The principal organization that came to the defense of the victims of this violence and their families was the Catholic church. I am not trying to say that everyone was reading the encyclical and decided spontaneously to put its lessons into practice. But the fact remains that the local human rights groups founded by the church found their justification in Pope John's words.

The publication of *Gaudium et spes* at the end of 1965 had an even stronger effect. Three key examples are the *Vicariías de Solidaridad*, founded by the church in the aftermath of Pinochet's coup in Chile in September of 1973; the work of Archdiocesan office of human rights in El Salvador established by Mons. Oscar Romero; and the network of human rights offices in

25 dioceses in Peru in order to respond to the terrorist violence of the Shining Path and the consequent government repression during the 1980's and 1990's are all examples of the church's commitment to human rights. This is the example I will develop in more detail.

In the optimistic context of the last year of the Council, the Peruvian Bishops founded its Social Action Commission (*Comisión Episcopal de Acción Social* - CEAS) on March 11, 1965, just nine months before the promulgation of the pastoral constitution. CEAS began a forum where pastoral agents from around the country could get together to reflect on the ongoing political, economic, and cultural reality in the light of the Gospel and the Council.

By the 1970's CEAS moved from being merely a forum for reflection and began to assume practical applications of Church social doctrine. In response to the *Gaudium et spes* principle that the economic structures of society must exist for the service of the human person, CEAS helped to attend to the demands of workers who had been fired from their positions during the second phase of the 1970's military government. And in relation to the cultural welfare of the people during that same period, CEAS began to promote programs for training rural peasants who were already pastoral catechists for health care and promotion. Those concerns are examples of economic and social rights.

1980 marked the beginning of what turned out to be two decades of terrorist violence and government repression in Peru. When the mountain regions of Ayacucho were in the hands of the terrorist "Shining Path" organization, the newly elected democratic government declared that the region was under a state of constitutional exception and sent in military forces to restore order. At that time the local Bishops began to receive more and more calls to come to the aid of the victims of the violence and to defend the cause of the innocent people who were being arrested and "disappeared." CEAS responded by creating a central team of more than 60 lawyers, social assistants, and teachers and by supporting local human rights organizations in some 25 dioceses. So, in addition to its previous work, CEAS also began working on the promotion and defense of political and civil rights.

Since the end of the political violence in 2000, CEAS has supported the creation, carrying-out and follow-up of Peru's official Truth and Reconciliation Commission whose purpose was to discover the structures of violence and propose conditions for a permanent peace.

Since the 1990's and into the new millennium CEAS is working in a number of other areas of social concern described by the Council and by CELAM: In the face of globalization and neo-liberalism, CEAS works for an economy based on solidarity, and on the issue of the reduction of the foreign debt: In the Jubilee 2000 campaign, Peru presented more signatures than any other country in the world. Secondly, in the movement from social attention to advocacy, CEAS works for those goals of citizen participation in the political sphere (as proposed by *Mater et magistra* and *Gaudium et spes*). CEAS also proposes structures for citizen vigilance of municipal and regional governments and by proposing legislation at the national level for the adequate control of the environment and the economy with relation to such issues as the massive presence of foreign mining companies and the issues of the so-called free trade agreements with the United States.

Parallel to its work in social action in favor of an integral view of human rights, CEAS has always promoted educational programs in Church social teaching, and every time the Pope or CELAM presents a new social document, CEAS prepares “popular versions” of the social Magisterium so that basic Christian communities can know and apply these principles to their ongoing reality. In that way CEAS accomplishes the goal not only of educating people in terms of what church social teaching is all about but also promoting the effort so that those base Christian communities can become active participants in the ongoing process of the formation of this doctrine.

I present the case of CEAS and Peru as one example of what happened around the continent: This can also be seen in the work of CELAM. One of the departments of CELAM, Justice and Solidarity, holds regular meetings on human rights and church social teaching to which representatives of all of the countries are invited.

In 1993 representatives from several countries began to share their own experiences in the ministry of human rights. They were surprised to discover how similar their work had been over the whole continent. Even more so they came to realize that during the years of political violence, the ministry of human rights not only occupied most of their time quantitatively but in deed also provided a qualitative focus for all of their social ministries. In other words, even when they weren't working specifically on a human rights case, like for example when they were giving parish courses in church social teaching, the focus on human rights became the unifying principle of their efforts.

CELAM then convoked a continent wide encounter on the topic of human rights ministry and in order to ask that very question. Representatives from 19 Latin American countries met in Lima in 1994. At the conclusion of their experience, they formulated the following hypothesis: *“Human rights ministry on our continent is not simply one of many ways of being involved in the church’s social apostolate. It is rather the unifying principle of all of our social commitment”*.

Then in 1997 representatives, this time from 24 countries on the continent, including the U.S. and some observers from Catholic organizations in Europe, met again in Lima to share the results of their surveys. The conclusion of the CELAM encounter was the *magna carta* for bringing human rights into the mainstream of the church on the continent. Human rights activities could no longer be seen as a topic better left to the secular world.

One year later, 1998, marked the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on the part of the United Nations. John Paul II himself considered it an important enough event that he dedicated his message for world peace day on January first, both in 1998 and 1999, to commemorating that declaration. In fact, human rights and the dignity of the human person is perhaps the principle contribution that the Pope has made to the whole corpus of church social teaching. That was the central point he makes in his letter for world peace day (2003), in which he commemorated the 40th anniversary of, *Pacem in terris*.

In July of 1998 the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace, very much aware of the grassroots level development of the ministry of human rights, organized the first World Congress on Human Rights. While the Congress did not explicitly take on the thesis of the Latin American

conferences about the essential nature of human rights for all of social ministry, nevertheless the Pope's talk to the delegates on that occasion re-affirmed his own commitment to the apostolate of human rights. In that speech the Pope stressed two themes: first, that it is necessary to bring the spirit of human rights into agreement with the letter of the law, and secondly, in addition to civil and political rights, we need to work for the juridical application of economic, social, and cultural rights. I would conclude that partly as a result of that Congress, the content that human rights is now part of the ordinary agenda of the universal church.

I suggest that the experience of human rights ministry around the world, but especially in Latin America, is an example of the normal procedure by which the local churches participate in both the formation and the application of church social teaching. It is the way the process is supposed to work.

Church social teaching works (or *should* work) in two complementary directions: It is at the level of grassroots basic Christian communities that the members reflect on their own lived experience in the light of the Gospel. This reflection is not the same as a strictly political or economic social analysis of reality, although it certainly does not exclude those methods. But what distinguishes the reflection of the Christian community from a purely academic analysis is that it is accomplished in a spirit of personal and community prayer. It has more to do with the rules of the discernment of spirits than with sociology or anthropology.

The important thing is that the results do not remain at the grassroots level. Here too the ideal of participation is that the basic Christian communities share their insights at the level of the parishes; representatives of the parishes do the same at the level of the dioceses; and the diocesan bishops or their representatives carry these experiences to the national bishop's conference. The results of the bishops' reflection might be shared when the bishops gather together at the continental level, which was the case of the General Conferences of the Latin American Bishops in Medellín, Puebla, and Santo Domingo. It is also the system designed for further participation in the preparation for the Bishops' Synods in Rome.

Participation is one side of the process. And the other side can be called application: The pastoral letters written by individual bishops are sent to the local parishes where the basic Christian communities reflect on their content. Ideally the same thing happens with the declarations of the national bishops' conferences and the regional organizations like CELAM. But the principal examples are the apostolic exhortations written by the Pope after each of the bishops' synods.

Of course, we can and should question whether this process really works. If we were to do a survey among basic Christian groups concerning the content of the bishops' synods over the past couple of decades, most practicing and believing Christians would have little if any idea. In other words, the practice of participation in and application of church social teaching is not working as well as one would hope.

The issue of the relationship between the teaching role of the church's magisterium and the practice of the local churches around the world is still in debate, though the new Compendium of Church Social Teaching (2004), produced by the Pontifical Commission on

Justice and Peace, brings up the topic. A deeper reflection on this dynamic will be one of the most important tasks for theology in the future. The development of the ministry of human rights as a response to the call of John XXIII in particular and *Gaudium et spes* in general will play an important role in this discussion.

Efficiency with Social Justice: The Challenge Remains

Luis García Echeverría

Gaudium et spes 40 years later maintains a vigorous validity, as the general perception of the people about the problems identified then, remain today basically the same as 40 years ago, with some improvements and some worsening of situations, particularly in the field of economic organization with social justice.

Our basic concern deals with the basic relationship between the capability of the planet to sustain population and the central issue of the distribution of income and wealth, where technology operates in both directions: making mass production and mass allocation of goods and services possible, but at the same time affecting the basic capability of the planet for a long run sustainability of those levels of production and welfare. It also deals with human behavior aimed at attaining personal satisfaction and welfare and the capability of institutions to organize society to make it possible for all, without exclusion and with social justice.

It is probably possible to state, without large risk of error, that in the last four decades, *“efficiency in production and improved methods of distribution of productivity and services have rendered the economy an instrument capable of meeting the increasing needs of the human family”*(*Gaudium* 63), while on the other hand: *“... a few individuals enjoy almost unlimited freedom of choice, (while) the vast majority have no chance whatever of exercising personal initiative and responsibility, and quite often have to live and work in conditions unworthy of human beings”*.

These seem to remain secular trends still for a long time. Productivity remains growing and rewarding some with better living standards, while the well being of mankind remains unequally distributed, despite policies and nominal efforts within countries through social policies and between countries through international cooperation.

The two main dynamics to which this paper refers, are the dynamics which lead to more efficient allocation of resources, as a source of growth as is claimed by the economists of the leading international organizations (IMF, World Bank, and others) and the dynamics which lead to reduce inequality and improve living conditions of the less favored members of the world society.

Changes have been deep in the world economy since the eighties, as the collapse of the soviet economy and other developments led to a global dominance of the market economy, very much instrumented by the IMF and the countries which shape its policies. The promise that globalization would bring better growth in the sense of some of the international trade theories, with employment and better remuneration of labor, one of the privileged channels of the distribution of welfare, remains unfulfilled not only in developing countries but also in the developed world.

In fact, the global forces may have led to some improvements in technologies, communications, efficiency, etc, but these improvements have not translated into better living

conditions of the poorer in the richer countries, nor of the poor in the middle income countries and much less of the poor of the poor countries.

Growth performance

One of the major expectations when countries opened the economy to free trade was an acceleration of growth. Theoretically, the gains from trade via comparative advantage, specialization and dynamic world markets, would lead to faster growth, productivity gains and therefore better wages and returns to capital.

However, the link between openness and growth is not as straight forward as one might think. Although the literature registers some convergence towards the positive correlation between openness and growth, some authors have documented that this has been valid in certain periods of history but not in others⁴⁴. However, it seems to be more certainty as to the results for the period 1950 – 1990: openness is correlated to growth and through it to an increase in the living standards of the population in the third world.

Concerning Latin America in terms of GDP growth, the results are mixed: aggressive reformers (Argentina, Chile, Peru and Bolivia), which at the same time are the ones with lower growth in the post war period, and the hardest hit in the crisis of the eighties, previous to the reforms, show the largest gains. In fact, the average growth rate of GDP in the period 1950 to 1980 was of 4 percent, while the average growth rate during the post reforms years in the nineties, has been of 5.6 percent.

The cautious reformers (included Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Costa Rica and Jamaica), who had their economies more in control in the previous years, showed also a higher rate of growth of GDP in the period 1950 to 1980, of 6.1 percent on average and much lower rate of growth after the reforms, which went dramatically down to 2.8 percent.

Taken as a whole, the figures show that in the nineties, after the structural reforms, the growth rates are one half of those achieved during the previous 40 years.

Employment

In terms of employment, the nineties have shown the smallest growth of employment since the sixties, as documented by Weller (2000)⁴⁵. This has led on average to no improvement in the unemployment rates with deterioration in some countries. However, the issue of causality has to be taken into account. During this period stabilization policies in terms of a very

⁴⁴ Paul Bairoch. European Trade Policy 1815-1914. The Cambridge Economic History of England. Vol.8. Cambridge University Press. Athanasios Vamvakidis. ¿How Robust is the Growth-Openness Connection ?. Historical Evidence. Mimeo. Cambridge Mass. Harvard University. Reported in Lindert.op.cit. P.25

⁴⁵ Weller, Jürgen. Reformas Económicas, crecimiento y empleo: los mercados de trabajo en America Latina durante los años noventa. Santiago: ECLAC/Fondo de Cultura Económica. 2000. Forthcoming. Repoirted in: Barbara Stalling. Op.cit. P.27

successful reduction of inflation and of fiscal deficits, simultaneously with the opening of the economies contributed to this result.

Employment in manufacturing decreased by nearly one percent from 1990 to 1996, while value added increased by 3.9 percent. This points to a less labor intensive production, and an increase in labor productivity which in fact, is documented in the mentioned ECLAC study⁴⁶.

The employment situation has worsened in terms of quality⁴⁷: 60 percent of the new jobs created went to the informal sector, that is, jobs of low productivity and low wages. Following the definition of the International Labor Organization, this sector is comprised of micro - enterprises, self-employed and domestic service.

The above trends point to mixed news in the future: the good news is that a sector is developing with high labor productivity and high wages, but with low labor intensity. The bad news is that high rates of unemployment will concentrate in the less educated and that informal, low wage employment will absorb an important share of the labor force.

An important implication is that these developments will end up driving wider the income, wealth and welfare gap between social groups that, unfortunately, has characterized society in Latin America for a long time.

There is no doubt, that the main resistance to globalization which we are witnessing all over the world, is strongly linked with the outcome in the labor and employment situation in recent years, which brings us to the issue of income distribution.

Income distribution

The income distribution question, for obvious reasons, has always been at the center stage of any evaluation of economic and social performance, both within countries as well as between countries.

The issue has spurred a great deal of research through time, not only with respect to the low income developing world, but also with respect to the high income developed countries.

The subject is very complex, particularly to pin down causality, since several factors acting simultaneously exert various influences on living standards and income distribution. For example, William Cline in his book "Trade and Income Distribution", published in 1997, after an extremely comprehensive technical analysis of the literature, identifies at least five factors that explain the rise of wage inequality in the United States: Trade is one of them, but also immigration; skill biased technological change; falling real minimum wage; and decline in unionization.⁴⁸ These are all issues which clearly concerned *Gaudium et spes*.

⁴⁶ See. Satlling, op.cit. P.18

⁴⁷ See Stalling,op.cit. P.28.

⁴⁸ William R. Cline. Trade and Income Distribution. Institute for International Economics. Washington D.C.1997. P.274

Lindert and Williams⁴⁹, study the relationship between globalization and inequality in the world in the last two centuries, and arrives to similar conclusions to those of Cline, concerning the multiple factors determining it, including trade and mass migration as determinant factors in the periods where it happened.

The original expectation for the new globalization era ran in direction of validating the Stolper – Samuelson Theorem, a standard piece in the theory of international economics, following which, after opening to trade the countries would specialize in production of goods where they enjoyed abundance resources, such as unskilled labor. In that case, demand for unskilled labor would increase, and therefore their salaries, narrowing the wage gap and the relation between capital returns and unskilled wages.

Again the evidence is mixed and not encouraging: It seems that in the case of South East Asia, in fact wages differentials narrowed, in the sixties and seventies, but not in Latin America in the eighties and nineties. For example, Robbins on a recent paper analyzing Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Uruguay, and also Malaysia, Philippines and Taiwan, clearly concludes that trade liberalization is associated with increasing wage gaps and observes:

“The policy implications of these findings are far reaching. Many economists, politicians and institutions such as the World Bank have preached trade liberalization as unambiguously advantageous to LDCs... This optimism (continues Robbins), regarding the short and medium – run distributional consequences of trade liberalization finds no support here. While trade liberalization effects upon efficiency and growth and hence the level of average wages are likely of enormous benefit, this may come at a short and medium term cost of worsening earnings distribution”⁵⁰.

Berry - Tenjo on a study covering fifteen countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, report a high negative correlation between structural reforms and income distribution⁵¹. Also Morley finds that import and domestic financial liberalizations, and Tax reform, are regressive, that is, worsen household income distribution, while privatization has ambiguous effects on household income distribution in Latin America.

International problems and institution building

Globalization, more than ever before, has brought together the fate of countries, linked by trade and financial flows. The crisis of the nineties, as the market integration pushed new frontiers and found new problems, uncovered additional channels through which poverty contagiously spread to many countries and the painful process of adjustment and recovery is generating costs with winners and losers without institutional arrangements for compensation. In

⁴⁹ Peter Lindert and Jeffrey G. Williamson. Nacional Buro of Economic Research. (NBER). Working paper 8228. April 2001.

⁵⁰ Robbins Donald. Evidence of the Validity of the Stolper Samuelson and Rybzinski Theorems from Developing World. Mimeo. Universidad Javeriana. Department of Economics. March 2000. Page 28

⁵¹ Berry Albert, Tenjo Jaime. Trade Liberalization , Labor Reform and Income Distribution in Colombia. In A. Berry (Ed.).Poverty, Economic Reform and Income Distribution in Latin America. Lynne Reinner Publishers. London. 1998

fact, instability of highly integrated financial markets has placed a heavy burden in some countries in terms of growth crisis and critical levels of unemployment. That is, the risks of participation in the global market are high, and it seems that there is no pilot or authority to regulate the process.

In contrast, the European Union, for example, developed a range of institutions on its way to integration, and the less developed European countries emerged as clear winners with enhanced income, welfare and political participation. A similar process is expected regarding the transition countries of the east.

It is true that the international organizations, particularly the IMF, are approaching those problems, working on codes and transparency arrangements in the so called "New International Financial architecture" of which, one of its pillars is to overcome the problem of poverty, which is regarded by the IMF as the largest systemic risk to globalization. Therefore, this "new architecture" is being designed to prevent crisis, avoid its social costs and help alleviate poverty.

To that end, some measures have been implemented in the adjustment programs applied in the countries served by these institutions to make austerity programs less severe to the poor; additionally the "Milenium goals" have been revived. Is that enough? Is it just "words" and some limited action?; or are these changes substantive towards the shaping of a better world in terms of social justice, "among countries" and "within countries" ?. At this point it seems that more can be done, particularly in terms of the IMF work. For example: why not apply conditionality of IMF support to the attainment of the social targets and not only of the economic and financial ones?

Summing up

In sum, the basic question to which economic and social evaluation converges today is to what extent globalization of the markets can lead to globalization of welfare and prosperity and under which conditions will it be possible. The record so far, is at best ambiguous, and not very encouraging.

Would all this mean that the countries should abandon the idea of globalization and return to the previous model of market – planning mix? I would not think so: Simply, because I do not see a better alternative than coupling the benefits of the market, in terms of efficiency, with hard work on institution building within the countries and internationally to develop a more equitable society, where the Church is called to continue playing a major role aimed at the strengthening of ethical and moral values, from which the shaping of society, including the economic system, has to evolve.