

# The Call to Justice: The Legacy of *Gaudium et spes* Forty Years Later

## An Historical Perspective and *Gaudium et spes*

Prof. Andrea Riccardi  
Founder of the Community of St. Egidio

Vatican City, 17 March 2005

It is not easy to speak of *Gaudium et Spes* in an historical perspective. One must choose between presenting a history of the drafting of the text and presenting the historical perspective and the problems of the times in which this text was produced. I shall say from the outset, and with the risk of disappointing you, that my choice has fallen to the second option. We already have available a vast and complete reconstruction of how the document came about, thanks to Giovanni Turbanti. In more than 700 pages, this author traces the complex and heated process of drafting the text, from the Roman sketches, to the Rahner-Ratzinger schema, to that of Malines, to the text of Ariccia, up to the conclusion of Vatican II. The idea took shape in 1962 with the suggestion of a message of the Council to the world, a proposal made by the Most Reverend Guerry (and prepared, before the Council, by the Dominican Lebreton, who had an important role in *Populorum Progressio*)<sup>1</sup>. One can easily see how a summary of the 700 pages of the Turbanti work would have presented no real difficulty, but such a summary on my part would hardly have been a contribution to the question at issue. In the extensive bibliography we must not forget the convention promoted by the Pontifical Council for the Laity in 1995: on that occasion Cardinal Hamer, who had been one of the experts at the Second Vatican Council, offered a significant rereading of the process that produced *Gaudium et Spes*<sup>2</sup>.

The literary genre of the text is new in the Magisterium: a Pastoral Constitution on the contemporary world. Not sociological analysis, not theology, but a "pastoral" text. The Church has not failed to make statements on themes outside her specific competence, in a manner of speaking, such as occurs with her social doctrine starting with *Rerum Novarum*. Nonetheless, there is something new here. We can sense it in Rahner's article on the Constitution, published in 1966 and intended almost to justify such an unusual text<sup>3</sup>. Defining the Constitution as "pastoral" (a word that has been somewhat over-used in the post-conciliar period) reveals something new and an effort to be concrete. But concrete in what manner? Many and varied are the aspects of the modern world (and different interpretations are possible), such that it appears difficult that *Gaudium et Spes* should leave a single, unified impression. How can we summarize it all and make a judgment? This text does not arise, like a social Encyclical, from one authority who issues it, but arises from the mediation of conciliar positions that are different not only in theology but above all in the worlds from which they come, such as those of the young prelate Karol Wojtyła, of Cardinal Spellman of New York or of the Most Reverend Zoa of the Cameroon.

Why should we attempt such a risky undertaking? We find ourselves at the crossroads

between a movement that comes from afar and the historical situation in which the Council takes place. This situation, I shall say it quickly, is the bipolar world of the Cold War, which, however, has undergone changes with regard to the days of Stalin: for there now appear to be some openings for the action of the Church. Such seemed the case with John XXIII's intervention in the serious Cuban Missile crisis of 1962 between Kennedy and Krushchev. Moreover, the movement of non-aligned nations has been active for ten years, and has been broadened by the decolonization of the 1960s: did this represent a new dialogue-partner for the Church beyond the East-West bipolarism? The Holy See, from Pius XII but above all with John XXIII, had watched the emergence of the New World with great attention, both with the creation of autonomous episcopates and with the increase of diplomatic missions. Was not significant space coming to be formed for the Church in the social and political worlds of decolonized countries and of the South? On the other hand, it seemed that beyond the frontiers of the Cold War a movement aimed at the unification of the planet (this expression appears time and again in *Gaudium et Spes*<sup>4</sup>) was being advanced. This was also the case following McLuhan's insights on the world as a "global village", where everything is seen and everything is easily obtained. There is found in the Constitution this sense of the universal destiny of peoples, which comes from the ancient tradition of the Church, but there is also found the perception that a process is underway, a process that today we would call globalization.

Was this not the time of the Catholic Church, a community present among all peoples and beyond the confines of civilizations? The Catholic Church in fact felt called to interpret in depth the unification movement among peoples, starting also with her self-awareness as the sacrament of unity of the human race. On the other hand, progress -- as was said, scientific and technological development -- placed instruments in the hands of humanity such that it was possible to leave a profound mark on human destiny, in the sense also of grave harm if not destruction: did not the Church have the duty to speak out on this? Attention was paid to the "signs of the times", an attitude launched by John XXIII in *Pacem in Terris*, enthusiastically received by vast sectors of Catholicism. In short, it seemed necessary to look to history and to contemporary life.

The push to speak out in this situation came from afar: from the fact that, starting in the 1800s, the Church had refused to remove herself (as had been suggested by a certain secular culture) from social questions and to yield to liberal and socialist thinking. Every pontificate, sometimes in commemoration of *Rerum Novarum*, had updated doctrine, repeating a constant theme: "the indispensable function that religion has in promoting social progress"<sup>5</sup>. The Church does not yield, affirms *Gaudium et Spes*, "to a kind of mechanical course of the economic activity of individuals, nor to the authority of government": she rejects "the guise of a false liberty" but also collectivism<sup>6</sup>. In the conciliar text, the break-through of *Populorum Progressio* is prepared: from social doctrine for industrial society to the social question as a problem between the North and South of the world. In *Gaudium et Spes* one looks to the South of the world with a certain optimism (the optimism of the 1960s, according to which the gap between the North and the South could in part be overcome). There is a desire to suggest guidelines for action aimed at development: a commitment of cooperation on the part of rich countries (defined as a "grave duty"), the investment of undeveloped countries in the total human fulfilment of their citizens, the coordination of the international community<sup>7</sup>. The development of the international community is one of the principal perspectives of the document, because only strong international institutions can guarantee peace and development. There is a constant interest on the part of twentieth century

Catholicism in building the international community, with the accent placed on trust in international organizations, desired by John XXIII with respect to Pius XII and interpreted by Paul VI in his visit to the United Nations.

The Council made this appeal in the fight against poverty: "The greater part of the world is still suffering from so much poverty that it is as if Christ himself were crying out in these poor to beg the charity of the disciples. Do not let men, then, be scandalized because some countries with a majority of citizens who are counted as Christians have an abundance of wealth, whereas others are deprived of the necessities of life and are tormented with hunger, disease, and every kind of misery"<sup>8</sup>.

*Gaudium et Spes* wishes to promote a movement towards the poor, giving "not only out of what is superfluous but also from the substance of one's goods" (cf. GS 88). There is the echo of the group in favour of the Church of the poor gathered at the Belgian College, inspired by Ghautier. A volume, *Church and Poverty*, published in 1965 (with prefaces by two important Council leaders, Cardinal Leccaro and the Melchite Patriarch Maximos IV, and with contributions by Congar, Chenu, Viollaume, Loew) seeks to develop this awareness. It opens with an essay by Father Cottier on the geography of poverty in the 1960s (which recalls Josué de Castro's well-known and contemporary geography of hunger) and concludes with an invitation: "Is it not therefore the role of the Church to call humanity to an immense crusade against misery, to promote a general mobilization of spiritual and material energies for the fight in which the dignity of our species is at stake?"<sup>9</sup>. These are the perspectives of the Church, which wants a kind of "Christian Bandung".

Paul VI's visit to India in 1964, with his appeal to invest in development and divert funds from arms, had demonstrated this orientation. Hunger and poverty -- according to Cardinal Duval -- open the way to war<sup>10</sup>. *Gaudium et Spes* inseparably links the Church to the poor: the poor who are nearby but also those far off who, with the unification of the world (today we would say globalization), can be seen and reached by all. The articulated reflections of social doctrine, the charity of individuals, the fight against poverty, the witness of being close to the poor: these are all aspects of the profound connection between the Church and the poor, the roots of which are sunk deep in the Christian mystery. This is the conviction that Father Congar expresses so well in 1965 in the wake of *Gaudium et Spes*: "The poor are the Church's concern. They are not merely her clients or those who benefit from her substance: the Church cannot fully live her mystery if the poor are absent"<sup>11</sup>.

The Church of *Gaudium et Spes* qualifies herself as an international subject between North and South, with her eyes attentive to all the situations in the world: everything concerns her, no situation is foreign to her, she is involved everywhere. In geopolitical terms, we could say that she has "imperialistic" interests for the world (that is, not limited to one area). But faced with a world divided by two empires, Pius XII in 1946 had made a further qualification, using words to which the Vatican II Church can subscribe: "The Church ... is not an empire, above all in an imperialistic sense... Her progress and expansion are marked on a path that is the opposite of that trod by modern imperialism. She makes progress above all in depth". Behind this original vision there is the desire to belong to no country or civilization: the fight against nationalisms, having become tragic in the two world wars that seemed to overturn the Church's position of impartiality, had made it clear that all was lost with war and nothing was lost with peace. This Church, persecuted in the Communist East, strove in the period following the Second World War not to identify herself with Western civilization. One is

amazed to see in one of the notes of *Gaudium et Spes* a citation from the important 1936 convention of the French Social Weeks (*Semaines Sociales*) held at Versailles, where discussion took place already at that time concerning the clash of civilizations (European, Soviet, Islamic, Jewish, and so on). The indication at that time was that the Church needed to transcend the borders of civilizations with the universalism of the Gospel<sup>12</sup>. *Gaudium et Spes* affirms: "the Church by her very universality can be a very close bond between diverse human communities and nations". It then adds: "the Church admonishes her own sons, but also humanity as a whole, to overcome all strife between nations and race in this family spirit of God's children"<sup>13</sup>.

Here is placed the problem of peace and war, that occupies the last chapter, the fifth, of the Constitution. The Council could not fail to touch on a central theme for the Popes of the twentieth century, when Catholics were strongly attracted by nationalistic passions. The Catholic Church revealed her supranational character and took up the aspirations for peace in the heart of conflicts. This action, with Benedict XV and Pius XII, had known moments of disagreement: the polemics with regard to the "silence" of Pius XII on the Shoah begin in 1963. John XXIII's work for peace had received general approbation: "However, one would say that now, when the Pope speaks of peace, people stop to listen", Pope John XXIII had said to Monsignor Pavan<sup>14</sup>. The Church, in her twentieth century experience, was convinced of the perverse effects of war: had not the First World War provided the bases for the Second? And did not the Second leave the legacy of a divided world that was still the case at the time of Vatican II?

War was to be strongly resisted. But the Vatican II Church had to deal with the most diverse positions in this area: with pacifism, the underlying rationale of which had never been completely taken up by Catholicism, but which was not spurned either. She had to measure herself against a realist pacifism, like that of Father Luigi Sturzo who, between the two wars, wondered whether it was not possible, in a progressive manner, to abolish war as an instrument for regulating conflicts, as had been done with slavery. The brutality of war and the use of violence especially on the part of totalitarian regimes had strengthened the non-violent movements that had a point of reference in Gandhi (and the theme of conscientious objection is to be placed in this same context). On the other hand, one wondered how a State's right to legitimate defence in case of aggression, which had always been recognized by Church doctrine, could be denied. The Council relaunched two aspects of the papal magisterium on war: the insistence that total war represented something truly new and the progressive restriction of the conditions for a "just war".

But which war? The world conflict, which the Council Fathers speak of as "total war"? The Cold War? The American Bishops raised understandable questions, whether a condemnation of atomic weapons would not lead to a tendency of unilateral disarmament with regard to the Soviet Union. Was it a question of civil wars, to which the Spanish Bishops make reference, thinking of the 1930s? Was it a question of guerrilla warfare and wars of liberation, asks Ottaviani, which are often used to impose an ideology?<sup>15</sup> The Council has in mind the complex morphology of war in the twentieth century. The stimuli, the situations, the answers are different. The conciliar text cannot fail to end up being complex, but the whole is pervaded by a great concern for peace: "All these considerations compel us to undertake an evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude. The men of our time must realize that they will have to give a sombre reckoning of their deeds of war"<sup>16</sup>.

Differences remained concerning atomic weapons, but from the Church's history of the twentieth century there emerged a desire for peace: "War must be absolutely prohibited", declared Cardinal Ottaviani (someone who was not in favour of new things) to applause in 1964. Peace was one of the Church's great objectives: "It is our clear duty, therefore, to strain every muscle in working for the time when all war can be completely outlawed by international consent" (cf. GS 81). This is the ideal. The Church must work in the area of international relations with her many different subjects (among other things, it is said in the text that Catholic associations need to be strengthened, for these associations "can contribute in many ways to the building up of a peaceful and fraternal community of nations", cf. GS 90). Paul VI, accompanied by five cardinals representing the five continental areas, brings his message of peace to the assembly of the United Nations with the slogan "*jamais plus la guerre* (war never again)".

Peace and development are made realities with the involvement of everyone, in a world where non-Catholics are the majority. *Gaudium et Spes* is for all people: non-Catholic Christians (on the part of whom Paul VI brought a message to the U.N., also at the behest of Patriarch Athenagoras); "all who acknowledge God, and who preserve in their traditions precious elements of religion and humanity"; humanists, "those who cultivate outstanding qualities of the human spirit"<sup>17</sup>. The difficulty, as the theologian Giuseppe Colombo observes, is found precisely in the universal destination of the text, and not in its being addressed to other Churches or to other Christians. This is an innovative perspective, which was merely hinted at in the past. Pius XI, in the Encyclical *Caritate Christi* of 1932, had invited believers of every religion to confront together the problem of atheistic Communism. John XXIII, in addressing all "people of good will" with regard to peace and the social question, held that cooperation with non-believers or believers of other religions was legitimate. The Council speaks not only with its magisterial authority, but with what Paul VI called the "experience of humanity". Christians and non-Christians alike share a common destiny in a world marked by the need to live together: the people of God, says the Constitution, "can provide no more eloquent proof of its solidarity with, as well as its respect and love for, the entire human family with which it is bound up" (cf. GS 3).

In this regard, *Gaudium et Spes* advances the new method of "dialogue", proposed by Paul VI in his programmatic Encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*: "The Church becomes word; the Church becomes message; the Church becomes dialogue", the Pope wrote. But in the Encyclical, dialogue is staunchly connected to the renewed affirmation of the identity of the Christian and of the Church, which is found in the first part of the document and in the other texts of the Council. We must remember (despite my desire to avoid looking at the contribution made to the text by Karol Wojtyła), how this young prelate suggests the category of "presence" for speaking of the Church in the world. There is undoubtedly a transition -- which became enthusiastic in the years following the Council -- from a time marked by opposing positions (we can think of that contrary to the communist world) to a period of coming closer together, of cooperation and of dialogue. For Jacques Maritain, to whom *Gaudium et Spes* owes much (and to whom Pope Paul VI at the end of the Council entrusts the message for intellectuals), this is "a kind of kneeling down in front of the world that is manifested in a thousand ways": the error arises from the concept of "world".

Paul VI had already raised the problem of the "world": "The fact that we are distinct from the world", he says in *Ecclesiam Suam*, "does not mean that we are entirely separated from it. Nor does it mean that we are indifferent to it, afraid of it, or contemptuous of it. When the Church

distinguishes herself from humanity, she does so not in order to oppose it, but to come closer to it" (cf. No. 63). This opposing position relative to the world was less real in concrete reality than it was said to be. Catholics were very close to others on many different paths, and above all they lived with others: from American society marked by religious pluralism, to cooperation in Western Europe in the areas of politics and unions, to the coexistence with other religions in Lebanon, to cite just a few examples. It was necessary to give reasons for complex paths of coexistence and cooperation that begin well before Vatican II. The word "dialogue" offered a category in which one could think about these paths that continued for decades.

The Constitution had an important significance: the overcoming of contempt for the world, which, more than from an ascetic attitude arising from *de contemptu mundi* of Innocent III, arose from a kind of minority or Manichaeistic flight, as Maritain says: "the pendulum suddenly swung to the opposite extreme, to an almost Manichaeistic contempt for the world professed in the Christian ghetto". Another aspect is found here (which I cannot dwell upon), the use of the world, understood as human and material resources: "Throughout the course of the centuries, men have laboured to better the circumstances of their lives through a monumental amount of individual and collective effort... this human activity accords with God's will"<sup>18</sup>. The reflections on the economy -- which, as Michel Novak noted in 1995, are obviously dated because the economic world has undergone profound change since 1965<sup>19</sup> -- can be ascribed to this chapter. Nonetheless, certain instances (such as the universal destination of the goods of the earth) represent long-term affirmations that come from the far past and are destined to remain. If the Constitution has been criticized because of a certain optimism concerning development, I believe that the value seen in human work must also be attributed to this optimism: the commitment to the prosperity of the human race (far removed from any Manichaeistic contempt) is connected to peace.

Nonetheless, *Gaudium et Spes* does not intend to be a Magna Charta of the social involvement of the Church or of Catholics. It is not a social catechism. We could speak of themes purposely not dealt with by *Gaudium et Spes*: the absolute condemnation of war and nuclear weapons; communism; birth control (an intervention which Paul VI reserved to himself and which he will make three years later in *Humanae Vitae*). We have already said something about the first theme: *Gaudium et Spes* has taken a step forward in limiting the possibilities for war, in line with the twentieth century Magisterium, but it does not espouse the position seeking the abolition of nuclear weapons. With regard to communism, we take into account the condemnations particularly of Pius XI and Pius XII (even if Benedict XV's pragmatic attempt at negotiation between the Vatican and Soviet power, interrupted in 1926, must not be forgotten). Atheism is treated at length in the document, its oppressive forms are condemned ("they vigorously fight against religion, and promote atheism by using, especially in the education of youth, those means of pressure which public power has at its disposal", cf. GS 20). It is considered a serious human problem, it is sometimes also seen as the fruit of the errors of believers; nonetheless, an offer of prudent dialogue with it is made. An explicit condemnation of communism is found only in a note of the text, which cites magisterial documents.

In reality, 454 Council Fathers had asked for the condemnation of communism and their request fell unceremoniously into the Council's endless redtape. This theme is of particular importance. John XXIII had begun a draft of Eastern policies that Paul VI intended to continue. There is the more or less explicit commitment with the Russian Orthodox Church

(which sent observers to Vatican II) to refrain from condemnations that could embarrass the Soviets. There is the desire to avoid a Council of condemnations, as expressed by John XXIII in *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*. The absence of condemnations is a break with the general orientations of the twentieth century, with the 1949 excommunication of Communists, with the denunciation of the persecutions against what was called the "Church of silence". Cardinal Tisserant, a member of the Curia who was very attentive to the danger of communism in the years following the war (he had met with Metropolitan Nikodim to negotiate the Russian presence at the Council), writes to Paul VI: "Anathemas have never converted anyone". In *Ecclesiam Suam*, Paul VI had written: "The voice we raise against them is more the complaint of a victim than the sentence of a judge" (cf. No. 101). In a restricted meeting on the Constitution in the Pope's study, "agreement is made not to renew expressly the condemnation of communism, but to say in the report that the errors of communism have already been condemned... and if the question is explicitly avoided for now, this is to avoid political interpretations"<sup>20</sup>.

In the text we catch a fleeting glimpse -- but I wish to underline it -- of the idea that this is a time of persecution for the Church, almost in the sense of the new martyrs that Karol Wojtyla had already spoken of: "Many martyrs have given luminous witness to this faith and continue to do so"<sup>21</sup>. The statement is added afterwards: "The Church admits that she has greatly profited and still profits from the antagonism of those who oppose or who persecute her"<sup>22</sup>. Karol Wojtyla, preaching Paul VI's 1976 spiritual retreat, observes: "We live in an era in which the whole world proclaims freedom of conscience and religious freedom, and also in an era in which the fight against religion, which is defined 'the opium of the people', is taken up in such a way so as not to create -- as far as possible -- new martyrs". He adds: "It also seems that the means most necessary for creating this 'paradise on earth' is found in depriving man of the strength that he draws from Christ"<sup>23</sup>. For Karol Wojtyla it was important to demand religious freedom, convinced as he was that communism was not humanism.

I cannot touch here upon all the fundamental themes dealt with in the Constitution: it would be sufficient to think of the family, to which a first chapter is dedicated, considering it among the most urgent problems (together with peace, culture, the economy and politics). I underline only the fact that the reflections on the family lead to the affirmation of a specific anthropological point of view of the Catholic Church. In fact, with *Gaudium et Spes* the Church places herself in line with the central themes of world development. The Church -- this emerges from the Constitution -- feels that she has a great contribution to make to the modern world. Mention is made of the economy, solidarity, even human rights (this is a theme that is forcefully repropounded in the first years of John Paul II's pontificate). But, in this perspective, the Church does not become a social agency. Significantly, in a note there is a citation from Pius XI: "We must never lose sight of the fact that the Church's objective is to evangelize and not to civilize. If she civilizes it is by means of evangelization". We read in the Constitution: "The Church, therefore, by virtue of the Gospel committed to her, proclaims the rights of man; she acknowledges and greatly esteems the dynamic movements of today by which these rights are everywhere fostered. Yet these movements must be penetrated by the spirit of the Gospel and protected against any kind of false autonomy"<sup>24</sup>.

*Gaudium et Spes* represents a landing-place for the many questions experienced in the twentieth century, with a text that cannot define everything but that gathers together, makes connections and shines the light of a perspective of the Church's presence in the world. It would be very interesting to see how the Constitution has been received (and this will be

discussed during these days). This is a story that I do not have time to deal with here. Certainly, there was an initial hot season, that of immediate reception permeated also by the movement of 1968, criticized by Maritain as "kneeling down", which nonetheless shows the enthusiasm with which the document was received: *From Anathema to Dialogue*, this was the title of a volume published after the end of the Council, with texts of the theologian Metz and of the Marxist Garaudy. There was a successive period in which the Constitution was considered as not particularly radical or clear (as Dossetti observes), and incapable of offering suitable solutions to the world's great problems; at the same time a traditionalist critique considers it the Magna Charta of the reduction of the Church to an humanitarian agency. With John Paul II, *Gaudium et Spes* becomes a platform on which rests not only part of his teaching but above all the background of his action.

In fact, *Gaudium et Spes* offers an historical perspective, or rather, *the* historical perspective; in the vision of this document the Church declares that she lives within the problems of history, that she is not far-removed but is a companion: history is not only tradition but is also contemporariness. Not everything can be said and *Gaudium et Spes* does not say or resolve everything: "It is an encyclopaedia!", Paul VI said to Hauptmann who showed him the draft in February 1965<sup>25</sup>. The structure of *Gaudium et Spes*, beyond the individual discussions of the various problems, remains a permanent intellectual and pastoral structure of Christian thought and life from the second half of the twentieth century to the twenty-first century. It is no longer possible to speak of the Church without raising the problems, the situations and the contexts of the modern world. It is the life-breath of a great Church that knows she is not a small community closed in on herself, but that is also aware of her duty to live with others who are religiously and culturally different. We cannot speak of the Church without an historical perspective and a modern perspective. There is also an institutional consequence in taking on the perspective of *Gaudium et Spes*: the creation of "Iustitia et Pax" for an activity that is distinct from Vatican diplomacy and different from the pastoral mission of other Curial offices.

The Church has become more actively involved in the modern world under numerous aspects: not only pastorally, but also culturally; not only politically, but also in the perspective of solidarity. She has shown the profound connection between the Gospel and human freedom, but also the real connection between the Gospel and human suffering, in that intermingling of freedom and suffering, of dependence and aspiration for freedom which is the modern world. At the end of 1965, Cardinal Franziskus Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna and eminent active participant in the Council, held a conference in Rome on *The Council and the World's Spiritual Powers* in which he declared: "This Council has moreover been ... an example of spiritual freedom, such as would be sought vainly in this world; also spiritually it was so uniform and well-organized. There were no tabus in this Council; personal agendas were absent; no question was avoided... Where does there exist in the world an institution that can allow itself to engage in such free discussion? Despite the sincerity, even in the tenacious support of opposing concepts, unity was never placed in danger"<sup>26</sup>.

Some have emphasized how the political and social culture of *Gaudium et Spes* are now outdated. There have undoubtedly been transient elements in the language used to describe certain problems, but the decisive backdrop remains: the Church in the perspective of our history. This is a Church that deals with the history of peoples and individuals in the awareness of being the bearer of a message. Maritain understands well the conviction underlying the Pastoral Constitution: "In the era that our civilization has attained, the Church

will become ever more ... the refuge and support (perhaps the only refuge and support) of the person"<sup>27</sup>. *Gaudium et Spes* was considered to be outdated in the course of just a few years; in reality, it is destined to a much longer life than was thought. This is what Paul VI said to Father Hauptmann, on 20 May 1965, when the drafting process of *Gaudium et Spes* was coming to its conclusion: "Much time is needed for things to mature. In the day of the atomic bomb also, the one who gathers is not the one who sows. Sometimes we would like to gather even without having sown. Thus, some observers are more gentle than in the first session, but that's normal; from their contact with us, they become aware of the differences and vice-versa. What we do far surpasses our persons"<sup>28</sup>.

We are here to follow once more the path of this sowing!

---

<sup>1</sup> Turbanti, p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> Laici oggi, 1996, 39.

<sup>3</sup> The Church in the modern world.

<sup>4</sup> "Moving gradually together and everywhere more conscious already of its unity..." (GS 77).

<sup>5</sup> Revue de deux mondes, May 1991, p. 85.

<sup>6</sup> GS 65.

<sup>7</sup> GS 86.

<sup>8</sup> GS 88.

<sup>9</sup> Page 54.

<sup>10</sup> Storia del Concilio, V, p. 188; in this same sense, also the Brazilian Father Larrain, *ibid.*, p. 185.

<sup>11</sup> Chiesa e povertà, 286.

<sup>12</sup> GS 59, note 7.

<sup>13</sup> GS 42.

<sup>14</sup> Potere del Papa, 192.

<sup>15</sup> Storia del Concilio, V, p. 188.

<sup>16</sup> GS 80.

<sup>17</sup> GS 92.

<sup>18</sup> GS 34.

<sup>19</sup> 82.

<sup>20</sup> Turbanti, 774-775.

<sup>21</sup> GS 21.

<sup>22</sup> GS 44.

<sup>23</sup> Segno di contraddizione, 217-218.

<sup>24</sup> GS 41.

<sup>25</sup> Turbanti, p. 558 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Studi Romani, January-March 1966.

<sup>27</sup> Maritain Paysan, 82.

<sup>28</sup> Turbanti, 606.