

# Work as Key to the Social Question

The Great Social and Economic Transformations and the Subjective Dimension of Work



## A Creative Solution to the Challenge of Human Responsibility

---

by John T. Pawlikowski, O.S.M., Ph.D.  
Professor of Social Ethics  
Catholic Theological Union — Chicago, USA

### Abstract

When Pope John Paul issued LABOREM EXERCENS some twenty years ago the notion of human “co-creatorship” quickly became one of the most discussed ideas in this encyclical. Some praised the notion as a genuine breakthrough in Catholic social teaching. Others, such as the noted ethicist Stanley Hauerwas, strongly castigated the Pope for this notion on the grounds that it would open the doors to a Nazi-like glorification of human power.

Despite the trenchant critique of “co-creatorship” by Hauerwas and several other ethicists, the notion has taken hold in a number of subsequent Catholic social documents, including the U.S. and the Canadian Bishops’ statements on the economy. This is quite appropriate because LABOREM EXERCENS has its roots in the struggle for the dignity of workers in Poland during the Solidarity era.

There are two areas where LABOREM EXERCENS’ notion of “co-creatorship” remains a vital concept today. The first is for the understanding of human responsibility today. I have given considerable attention in my work as a social ethicist to the impact of the Nazi Holocaust on human responsibility. The notion of co-creatorship has laid out by John Paul II provides us with a moral context that combines the recognition of new levels of human power with the need for increased human responsibility and realistic curbs on the use of this new power.

The second area has to do with the direction of the global economy today. It is no accident that the U.S. Bishops made the notion of “co-creatorship” central to their Pastoral Letter on the Economy. Pope John Paul II has insisted in many recent statements that shaping the new

global economy is a central moral challenge for the 21st century. The notion of human co-creatorship can provide a moral framework for the involvement of people everywhere in the shaping of the global economy towards dignity and equity. It provides a spiritual basis for understanding the role of the worker, the entrepreneur and the government in a way that is directive and not merely reactive to market forces.

LABOREM EXERCENS concept of human co-creatorship remains an extremely rich and useful notion for the basic challenges facing humanity today. The U.S. Bishops and Pope John Paul II himself have moved it from its original significance in terms of human alienation from work, particularly in Communist-dominated European states, to a basic spiritual framework for addressing the global economy in the new millennium.

## **TEXT**

For over thirty years I have been probing, as a Catholic social ethicist, the implications of the Nazi Holocaust for moral understanding today.<sup>(1)</sup> One of the issues that has become central to my reflections is that of human responsibility. My interest in this regard was generated by constructive engagement with the writings of Victor Ferkiss, a political scientist out of the Catholic tradition, and Hans Jonas, a social philosopher of Jewish background who escaped the Nazis. Both scholars served warning that humankind had reached a new threshold in its evolutionary journey. Humanity was now standing on a threshold between utopia and oblivion as Buckminster Fuller has put it. The human community now faced a situation whose potential for destruction equaled its capacity for reaching new level of creativity and human dignity. What path humanity would follow was a decision that rested with the next several generations. Neither direct divine intervention nor the arbitrary forces of nature would determine the ultimate outcome. Human choice was now more critical than ever in the past for creational survival. And the decision would have lasting impact, well beyond the lifespan of those who are destined to make it. It would, in fact, determine what forms of life, if any, will experience continued viability.

Ferkiss' 1974 volume, *THE FUTURE OF TECHNOLOGICAL CIVILIZATION*, put the current challenge to humankind in these words: "Man has.. .achieved virtually godlike powers over himself, his society, and his physical environment. As a result of his scientific and technological achievements, he has the power to alter or destroy both the human race and its physical habitat."<sup>(2)</sup>

Hans Jonas, in a groundbreaking speech in Los Angeles in 1972 at a gathering of learned societies of religion and subsequently in published writings, conveyed essentially the same

message as Ferkiss. Ours is the very first generation to have to face the question of basic creational survival. In the past, there was no human destructive behavior from which we could not recover. But today, we have reached the point through technological advancement where this principle no longer automatically holds. Humankind now seems increasingly capable of actions that inflict terminal damage on the whole of creation and raise serious questions about the future of humanity itself.<sup>(3)</sup>

For me, the Holocaust represents perhaps the clearest contemporary example of the fundamental challenge now facing humanity as described by Ferkiss and Jonas. In the final analysis I view the Holocaust as inaugurating a new era in human self-awareness and human possibility, an era capable of producing unprecedented destruction or unparalleled hope. With the rise of Nazism the mass extermination of human life in a guiltless fashion became thinkable and technologically feasible. The door was now ajar for dispassionate torture and the murder of millions not out of xenophobic fear, but through a calculated effort to reshape history supported by intellectual argumentation from the best and brightest minds in the society. It was an attempt the philosopher and Holocaust scholar Emil Fackenheim has argued to wipe out the “divine image” in history. “The murder camp,” Fackenheim insists, “was not an accidental by-product of the Nazi empire. It was its essence.”<sup>(4)</sup>

The basic challenge of the Holocaust lies in the need to alter significantly our perception of the relationship between God and humanity. Such a change carries with it profound implications for human moral responsibility. What emerges as a central reality from the study of the Holocaust is the Nazis’ sense of a new Aryan humanity freed from moral restraints previously imposed by religious beliefs and capable of exerting virtually unlimited power in the shaping of the world and its inhabitants. In a somewhat indirect, though still powerful way the Nazis had proclaimed the death of God as a governing force in the universe. In pursuit of their objective, the Nazis became convinced that all the so-called “dregs of humanity,” first and foremost the Jews, but also Poles, Gypsies, Gays and the disabled, had to be eliminated or at least their influence on culture and human development significantly curtailed.<sup>(5)</sup>

The late Uriel Tal captured as well as anyone the basic theological challenge presented by the Holocaust. In his understanding, the so-called “Final Solution” had as its ultimate objective the total transformation of human values. Its stated intent was liberating humanity from all previous moral ideals and codes. When the liberating process was complete, humanity would be rescued once and for all from subjection to God-belief and its related notions of moral responsibility, redemption, sin and revelation. Nazi ideology sought to transform theological ideas into exclusively anthropological and political concepts. In Tal’s perspective, the Nazis can be said to have adopted a kind of “incarnational” ideology, but not in the New Testament sense of the term. Rather, for the Nazis, “God becomes a man in a political sense as a member of the Aryan race whose highest representative on earth is the

hr” (6)

If we accept this interpretation of the ultimate implications of Nazism, we are confronted with a major theological challenge. How does the human community properly appropriate the genuine sense of human liberation that was at the core of Nazi ideology without surrendering its soul to massive evil? However horrendous their legacy, the Nazis were correct in at least one respect. They rightly perceived that some basic changes were underway in human consciousness. The impact of the new science and technology, with its underlying assumption of freedom, was beginning to provide humankind on a mass scale with a Promethean type experience of escape from prior moral chains. People were starting to perceive, however dimly, an enhanced sense of dignity and autonomy that went well beyond what Western Christian theology was prepared to concede.

Traditional theological concepts that had shaped much of the Christian moral perspective, notions such as divine punishment, hell, divine wrath and providence were losing some of the hold they had exercised over moral decision making since biblical times. Christian theology had tended to accentuate the omnipotence of God which in turn intensified the impotence of the human person and the rather inconsequential role played by the human community in maintaining the sustainability of creation. The Nazis totally rejected this previous relationship. In fact, they were trying to turn it upside down.

Numerous Jewish and Christian writers have attempted to respond to the fundamental implications of the Holocaust in terms of human and divine responsibility. Emil Fackenheim, Richard Rubenstein, Arthur Cohen, David Blumenthal, Michael Berenbaum, Johann Baptist Metz, John Roth, Jurgen Moltmann and Zygmunt Bauman are authors who have made significant contributions to the post-Holocaust discussion about human responsibility. One of the responses I still find particularly intriguing in both its theological and practical dimensions has come from Irving Greenberg, currently Chair of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

For Greenberg the Holocaust has destroyed all further possibility of a “commanded” dimension to our understanding of the God-human community relationship. “Covenantally speaking,” he has said, “one cannot order another person to step forward to die.”(7) Any meaningful understanding of a covenantal relationship between God and humanity must now be understood as voluntary. The voluntary nature of the post-Holocaust covenantal relationship unquestionable heightens human responsibility in the eyes of Greenberg: “If after the Temple’s destruction, Israel moved from junior partner to true partner in the covenant, then after the Holocaust, the Jewish people is called upon to become the senior partner in action. In effect, God was saying to the humans: you stop the Holocaust. You bring the redemption. You act to ensure that it will never again occur. I will be with you totally in whatever happens, but you must do it.”(8)

Based on this theological reversal in divine-human responsibility after the Holocaust, Greenberg strongly argues for the assumption of power on the part of the human community that is unprecedented. For Greenberg it would be morally irresponsible to abandon the quest for power today, as some in the religious community have urged. The only option in the post-Holocaust world that will enable us to avoid repetitions of human degradation and evil on the scale of what surfaced during the Nazi era is for the human community to combine the assumption of new power over creation with what Greenberg terms the development of “better mechanisms of self-criticism, correction and repentance.” Only in this way will humankind utilize power “without being the unwitting slave of bloodshed or an exploitative status quo.”[\(9\)](#)

IN recent times Greenberg has further developed this theme, seemingly taking into account some of his critics. He now posits a more co-equal divine-human partnership. In an address in Warsaw earlier this year, he insisted that humans are called to develop their “God-like” qualities, “to become ever more like God”: “*Imitatio Dei* is the central religious path. Humans are to walk in God’s ways by acting and becoming more and more like God. Then we are to use these capacities to upgrade the world, particularly to increase its capacity to sustain and nurture life at its highest dignity. When the perfection is achieved, then the story of redemption will be realized.” He goes on to add: “...God has invited us as humans, the image of God, to enter into a covenantal partnership of committed love--to join fully in the task of perfecting the universe *tikkun olam*.” [\(10\)](#)

I continue to find Greenberg’s remarks compelling even if I am not in total agreement with all that he says about the nature of the divine-human relationship after the Holocaust. I especially concur with Greenberg’s insistence on the human community’s assumption of power. For that reason I find myself at odds as a social ethicist with those of my colleagues who espouse an unqualified pacifist position or what is known as the “deep” ecological perspective which tends to submerge humanity within creation as such, destroying awareness of the enhanced dimensions of human responsibility in our day.

Generally speaking, I feel that Greenberg has carried the theological role reversal too far, though his Warsaw address may indicate some moderation of his original perspective in this regard. Viewing God as the “junior partner” renders God overly impotent in terms of creational responsibility. I would opt for a more co-equal relationship, though with a redefined understanding of divine responsibility.

It is at this point that I find LABOREM EXERCENS’ perspective on human co-creatorship especially helpful. I believe this notion of “co-creatorship,” as advocated by John Paul II in this encyclical (but found as well in other official Catholic documents), represents the most promising paradigm for resolving the issue of human and divine responsibility. Pope John Paul II’s articulation of this notion in LABOREM EXERCENS strikes as good a balance on this question as can be expected. Clearly the immediate goal of his teaching was to provide

new meaning for workers, especially in Eastern and Central Europe during the Communist era. Anyone who had the opportunity to visit the so-called Eastern-bloc countries during the Communist era, as I did on numerous occasions, came to recognize that over and above the usual list of workers' rights abuses that previous social encyclicals had addressed, the overriding question in this part of Europe was in fact the basic meaningfulness of human work. Working within the context of the Solidarity Union's Manifesto in Poland, on which LABOREM EXERCENS is significantly based, Pope John Paul II strove to overcome worker alienation by giving a strong religious motivation for human work in societies most anticipated would remain socialist in political structure for the foreseeable future.

Worker alienation in the contemporary era has been by no means confined to Communist Poland and the other nations of the then Soviet bloc. It has been a genuine problem in Western Europe and North America as well. That is why the United States Bishops, in their Pastoral Letter on the Economy, opened their letter with a consideration of the fundamental meaning of human work in light of the role of humanity in the creation stories of Genesis, a starting point that Greenberg now seems to recognize as well. Unless meaningfulness in human work is overcome, unless the prevalent TGIF ("Thank God It's Friday") mentality that is so prevalent in our culture is scaled back, the delivery of needed goods and services in our global society may be significantly disrupted. The U.S. Bishops, in the spirit of LABOREM EXERCENS, were convinced that all subsequent proposals in their Pastoral Letter on the Economy regarding enhanced economic justice and worker participation would have little change of implementation unless the more basic issue of the spiritual meaning of work was first addressed.

So the notion of co-creatorship helps in the process of giving work a profoundly spiritual dimension that in turn can provide a significant measure of hope for the worker, even "political" hope as it certainly did in Poland. Several people I know who joined the Solidarity Union in Poland from a non-religious background soon became convinced of the indispensable role in sustaining the movement.

While LABOREM EXERCENS may have had as its immediate goal raising the spirit of the workers in Poland as they struggled to redefine Polish society, it has far broader implications. Its understanding of human co-creatorship strikes the balance between the respective role of God and the humanity community in sustaining the continuation of life at all levels. It overcomes the problems with the "senior-junior" paradigm that Greenberg with which Greenberg has been working. It emphasizes that both partners are crucial. Human co-creatorship is indeed a "gift" from God, but a "gift" that had to be given in order to fulfill the dynamics of creation. This model, because of its stress on genuine human creativity, goes beyond the model of "stewardship" commonplace in Protestant ethics where the emphasis is almost exclusively on preserving what God has already set in place. While LABOREM EXERCENS does not explicitly speak of evolution, a notion that John Paul II has viewed as basically constructive in other statements, one gets a sense in reading this

encyclical that the Pope understands that role of the human community is to continue to shape and reshape creation, rather than simply conserve or preserve it, though those too are important goals. That is why human creativity assumes the role in does in this encyclical.

LABOREM EXERCENS recognizes a biblical basis for its notion of human co-creatorship, something that I have also argued in my own writings.<sup>(11)</sup> If there is a weakness in the encyclical's perspective, it is a clear appreciation that with our enhanced understanding of the evolutionary process, co-creatorship, as the Lutheran theologian Philip Hefner has emphasized, has assumed dimensions that the biblical writers could never imagine. For Hefner, co-creatorship, and the new level of human responsibility it implies, emerges as an absolutely decisive notion for our time.<sup>(12)</sup>

There have been critics of the notion of human co-creatorship as advocated by John Paul II among biblical scholars and within ethical circles where a scholar such as Stanley Hauerwas has strong criticized the Pope's use of the term "co-creatorship" in LABOREM EXERCENS <sup>(13)</sup> on the grounds that it will lead to a Nazi-like mentality within the human community. Some ecological activists also reject the notion out of hand on the grounds that it would open the door to creational destruction by intensifying the already existing hierarchical model of society.

Surely any affirmation of human co-creatorship must be tempered by the notion that the Creator God retains a central role, if a somewhat redefined role, in the process of caring for and preserving creation. Hence my rejection above of any "junior status" role for God along the lines suggested by Greenberg. And Hauerwas' call for "humility" in the use of human power in light of the Holocaust sounds an important cautionary note for any co-creatorship paradigm. But to enshrine "humanity" as the cardinal virtue in terms of the human/divine responsibility problematic would very likely prevent humankind from assuming full governance of creation, a failure that might well entail economic, ecological and even nuclear disaster on a global scale.

Unless we recognize that human responsibility has been raised to a new level in consequence of the Holocaust and through our improved understanding of the evolutionary dynamic the human community will likely refrain from taking those decisive steps that will ensure the continuity of life at all levels of creation. To follow Hauerwas or the deep ecologists in terms of envisioning humankind's role in creational governance may well result in people of faith becoming bystanders rather than central actors in human history. Co-creatorship in its immediate Polish context was to turn the Polish workers into agents of a new Polish history, rather than remain bystanders in an oppressive system that rob people of human dignity.

To insure that the notion of co-creatorship does not wind up elevating human power to a new destructive level, we need to reaffirm the role of divine responsibility, but in a refined

sense. The paradigm of an all-powerful God who will intervene to halt human and creational destruction is simply dead after the Holocaust and in light of our contemporary evolutionary consciousness. On this point the Nazi ideologues were perceptive. Where their vision was fatally flawed, and so humanly destructive, was in responding to the “death” of the interventionist God with an assertion, as Michael Ryan once put it, of all-pervasive power for themselves.” [\(14\)](#)

If we are successfully to curb the excessive use of human power within a paradigm of co-creatorship we must reintroduce into human consciousness, especially in our now highly secularized societies parented by the Enlightenment and its revolutionary heritage, a deep sense of what I have called a “compelling” God. This compelling God whom we must come to experience through symbolic encounter that is both personal and cultural will result in a healing, a strengthening, an affirming that will bury any need to assert our humanity, to try to “overpower” the Creator God, through the destructive, even deadly use of human power. This sense of a compelling parent God who has gifted humanity, whose vulnerability for the Christian has been shown in the Cross (as Jurgen Moltmann has well articulated in *THE CRUCIFIED GOD*) [\(15\)](#) is the indispensable foundation for any adequate paradigm of co-creatorship today.

I remain convinced that the notion of a compelling God, a God to whom we are drawn rather than a God who simply imposes upon us, must be sustained both in our personal consciousness and in our societal consciousness. This latter point is especially challenging for those of us who subscribe to the vision of church-state separation enshrined in Western democracies and which, for Catholicism, was raised to a level of theological principle at the II Vatican Council in its Declaration on Religious Liberty. [\(16\)](#) Nonetheless we also need to take very seriously Vatican II’s Declaration on the Church in the Modern World which strongly emphasized the centrality of culture in shaping morality both public and personal. Unless a sense of a compelling God is integrated into Western communal consciousness, not in a fundamentalist or exclusivist way but as a true moral barometer, I fear that personal consciousness of a compelling God by itself will prove ineffective in guarding against the abuse of human co-creatorship. It could easily lead, as the church historian Clyde Manschreck warned some years ago, to “naked state sovereignty.” [\(17\)](#)

To sum up my first point, the Holocaust and our contemporary consciousness force upon us a major reformulation of our understanding of divine and human responsibility. It will have to be a reformulation that takes into account the prophetic words uttered by Catholic philosopher Romano Guardini soon after the Holocaust: “In the coming epoch, the essential problem will no longer be that of increasing power--though power will continue to increase at an even swifter tempo--but of curbing it. The core of the new epoch’s intellectual task will be to integrate power into life in such a way that man can employ power without forfeiting his humanity, or to surrender his humanity to power and perish.” [\(18\)](#) Neither a return to religious fundamentalism nor a paradigm of “junior level” divine agency will

respond adequately to this challenge. Only a vision of human co-creatorship as outlined in LABOREM EXERCENS anchored in a personal and communal sense of a “compelling” God has the possibility of meeting that challenge.

Now to move on to my second major point. Pope John Paul II has spoken extensively on economic matters, both in more philosophical tones in LABOREM EXERCENS and in more practical terms in his many regional statements (e.g. the 1984 addresses at Edmonton and St. Johns, Canada) in which he is strongly critical of specific practices of contemporary capitalism. (19) There is little doubt that John Paul II places considerable emphasis on human creativity and human freedom in his writings on economic matters. He knows quite well from personal experience in Poland how devastating their absence can be for human initiative and productivity in a society. Michael Novak is quite correct in insisting on this dimension of papal thought, especially in LABOREM EXERCENS. And George Weigel is correct when he underlines John Paul’s trenchant criticism of the “social assistance” state in CENTESIMUS ANNUS. (20)

But commentators such as Richard John Neuhaus, Michael Novak, and George Weigel considerably overstate John Paul’s affirmation of capitalism. Though in CENTESIMUS ANNUS he affirms free market mechanisms more strongly and directly than any of his predecessors, he also explicitly warns capitalist nations against any premature euphoria regarding their economic system. John Paul II’s critique undercuts the triumphant language about capitalism in the writings of Novak and Weigel. While the market economy remains the necessary starting point for building a just economic system because in principle it guarantees the right of economic initiative, major structural adaptations are required if it is ever to reach its true potential of sustaining a system of global justice. John Paul II is quite clear that such adjustments are not apt to occur merely as a result of the market’s internal dynamics.

This paper is not the place to present an overall picture of John Paul II’s critique of capitalism, something that is in keeping with the legacy of Catholic papal social teachings. I have done that elsewhere. (21) Here I simply wish to emphasize what I believe is an important connection between the perspective on human co-creatorship laid out in LABOREM EXERCENS and the Pope’s more recent address on global capitalism. John Paul II recognizes global capitalism as the prevailing world ideology with the demise of communism. In itself this situation he emphasizes in an April 2001 address to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences is neither a priori good nor bad. But he strongly argues that since “commerce and communications are no longer bound by borders, it is the universal common good which demands that control mechanisms should accompany the inherent logic of the market. This is essential in order to avoid reducing all social relations to economic factors or in order to protect those caught in new forms of exclusion and marginalization.” (22) Here there is a clear connection with Irving Greenberg’s call for new

mechanism of control in order to humanize the use of power, including economic power.

Pope John Paul II has been sounding this critique of Capitalism since the appearance of CENTESIMUS ANNUS. Soon after its release he attempted to correct some of the misrepresentations of the encyclical that appeared in articles in such publications as the WALL STREET JOURNAL. The same can be said for a major statement on Catholic social teaching which John Paul II delivered on September 9, 1993, at the University of Latvia in Riga in which he offers his own explicit interpretation of how to read SOLLICITUDO REI SOCIALIS and CENTESIMUS ANNUS in terms of capitalism. The Pope emphasized that Catholic social doctrine cannot be viewed as a “surrogate for Capitalism.” While the Church has consistently condemned “Socialisms,” it has likewise “distanced itself from Capitalistic ideology, holding it responsible for grave social injustices.” John Paul II underlined that, even after the collapse of Communism, grave doubts have to be raised about the validity of capitalism. While he believes in the “market economy,” such an economy acquires legitimacy only if it is circumscribed with a strong juridical framework which enables it truly to promote the freedom of all people.” (23) Mention of a “juridical framework” surely implies an ongoing, active role both for government and the wider human community in the management of economic affairs nationally, regionally and globally.

In a 1997 address to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences he repeated this the theme sounded in his Riga address: “History amply demonstrates,” the Pope insist, “the failure of regimes characterized by planning that is harmful to civil and economic freedoms.” But he also insists that “a market economy left to unconditional freedom is far from bringing the greatest possible advantages to individuals and societies.” He regards political activity as critical for a balanced market that incorporates the principles of subsidiary and solidarity. He likewise recognizes that such political activity cannot be restricted to nation-states today in view of the global dimensions of the economy, but must involve regional and global institutions with juridical authority. (24)

Several secular voices have recently articulated a perspective similar to that being advanced by John Paul II. Peter D. Sutherland, Chairman of Goldman Sachs International and of the Overseas Development Council stands in agreement with John Paul II’s contention about the basic inadequacy of market mechanisms in terms of economic solidarity. “I have been personally and deeply committed to promoting the market system through my entire career,” he insists, “yet it is quite obvious to me that the market will never provide all of the answers to the problems of poverty and inequality.” (25) He underlines the need for effective global juridical structures that would be developed through a substantial revamping of existing institutions such as the IMF (International Monetary Fund), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization. Columnist William Pfaff, writing on the 1997 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, highlights some basic changes in that year’s meeting. Referring to the remarks of financier George Soros, organizer of the Forum, Pfaff said that the Forum leadership no acknowledges “the social ravages produced by the last two decades’ elevation

of corporate and individual self-interest over consideration of the common good. The idea that self-interested behavior in the marketplace would automatically advance the common interest now is recognized as naive ideology, or as self-interested self-deception.” Soros, according to Pfaff, now recognizes a “totalitarian tendency” in unregulated market capitalism.” (26) And in an address to a Vatican meeting of scholars and political leaders convened by Pope John Paul II at Castel Gandolfo in August 1998 former American national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski argued along the same lines, calling for an increased sensitivity to social responsibility within our global economic system. “That sensitivity,” he maintained, “has to be as important a consideration as efficiency and performance in the determination of economic decision and guiding economic development.” (27)

All this is to say that in my perspective the notion of “co-creatorship” originally developed in LABOREM EXERCENS has taken on new dimensions in our time in light of Pope John Paul II’s challenge to the ideology of economic globalism. It’s original meaning remains valid. It is a means of instilling hope in the economic sphere. But today it implies as well the absolute necessity for leaders in all sectors of the human community to develop creative “juridical frameworks,” as John Paul II has termed them, to guide our global economic system towards greater equity and justice for all. This in fact may be the supreme “co-creative” task for the foreseeable future. It is no accident, therefore, that the U.S. Bishops’ Pastoral Letter on the Economy begins with an in-depth reflection on co-creatorship in the spirit of LABOREM EXERCENS, something that is also true for the Canadian Bishops’ Statement on their nation’s economy.

Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, now Archbishop of Washington, in an address in his capacity as chairman of the U.S. Bishops’ International Policy Committee sponsored by the U.S. Department of State emphasized John Paul II’s contention that market mechanisms by themselves are not apt to guarantee the common good. He went on to affirm the Pope’s argument in CENTESIMUS ANNUS that economic justice will be realized only in a society “that ensures that the market is appropriately controlled and guided by the forces of society and by government so as to guarantee that the basic needs of the whole society are satisfied.” (28) In light of these remarks by Cardinal McCarrick I remain convinced that LABOREM EXERCENS’ concept of human co-creatorship remains an extremely rich and useful notion for the basic challenges facing humanity today. The U.S. Bishops and John Paul II himself have moved it from its original significance in terms of human alienation from work, particularly in Communist-dominated European states, to a basic spiritual framework for addressing the global economy in the new millennium.

**END NOTES**

1. Cf. John T. Pawlikowski, "Christian Ethics and the Holocaust: A Dialogue with Post-Auschwitz Judaism," *THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*, 49:4 (December 1988), 649-669; "God: The Foundational Ethical Question after the Holocaust," in Jack Bemporad, John T. Pawlikowski, and Joseph Sievers (eds.), *GOOD AND EVIL AFTER AUSCHWITZ: ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR TODAY*. Hoboken, NJ: KTAV, 2000, 53-66; and "Human Responsibility: Contemporary Reflections in light of Nazi Ideology," in John K. Roth and Elisabeth Maxwell (eds.), *REMEMBERING FOR THE FUTURE: THE HOLOCAUST IN AN AGE OF GENOCIDE*, Vol. 2. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave, 2001, 146-161.
2. Victor Ferkiss, *THE FUTURE OF TECHNOLOGICAL CIVILIZATION*. New York: George Braziller, 1974, 88.
3. Hans Jonas, *THE IMPERATIVE OF RESPONSIBILITY*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984; *MORTALITY AND MORALITY: A SEARCH FOR THE GOOD AFTER AUSCHWITZ*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1996; "The concept of God after Auschwitz: A Jewish Voice," *JOURNAL OF RELIGION*, January 1987, 143-157.
4. Emil Fackenheim, *THE JEWISH RETURN INTO HISTORY*. New York: Schocken, 1978, 246.
5. Cf. John I. Pawlikowski, "Uniqueness and Universality in the Holocaust: Some Ethical Reflections," in Linda Bennett Elder, David L. Barr and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (eds.), *BIBLICAL AND HUMANE: A FESTSCHRIFT FOR JOHN F. PRIEST*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1966, 275-289.
6. Uriel Tal, "Forms of Pseudo-Religion in the German Kulturbereich Prior to the Holocaust," *IMMANUEL* 3 (1973-74), 69; *CHRISTIANS AND JEWS IN GERMANY: RELIGION, POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY IN THE SECOND REICH, 1870-1914*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975.
7. Irving Greenberg, "The Voluntary Covenant," *PERSPECTIVES* #3. New York: National Jewish Resource Center, 1982, 15.
8. Irving Greenberg, "The Voluntary Covenant," 17-18.
9. Irving Greenberg, "The Third Great Cycle in Jewish History," *PERSPECTIVES* #1. New York: National Jewish Resource Center, 1981, 24-25.
10. Irving Greenberg, "The Jewish-Christian Dialogue: How Long Yet in the Shadow of the Shoah," Unpublished Address, Conference on DABRU EMET, Sponsored by the Polish Journal WIEZ, Warsaw, Poland, May 2001, 4.

11. John T. Pawlikowski, "Towards an Ecological Ethics: Mutual Challenge for Christians and Jews," *FROM THE MARTIN BUBER HOUSE*, #27 (Spring 2000), 59-65.
12. Philip J. Hefner, *THE HUMAN FACTOR: EVOLUTION, CULTURE AND RELIGION*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993. Also cf. John T. Pawlikowski, "Theological Dimensions of an Ecological Ethic," in Richard N. Fragomeni and John T. Pawlikowski (eds.), *THE ECOLOGICAL CHALLENGE: ETHICAL, LITURGICAL AND SPIRITUAL RESPONSES*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994, 39-51.
13. Stanley Hauerwas, "Jews and Christians Among the Nations," *Cross Currents*, Spring 1981, 34.
14. Michael Ryan, "Hitler's Challenge to the Churches" A Theological-Political Analysis of *Mein Kampf*," in Franklin H. Littell and Hubert G. Locke (eds.), *THE GERMAN CHURCH STRUGGLE AND THE HOLOCAUST*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1974, 160-161.
15. Jurgen Moltmann, *THE CRUCIFIED GOD*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
16. Cf. John T. Pawlikowski, "Catholicism and the Public Church: Recent U.S. Developments," in D.M. Yeager (ed.), *THE ANNUAL OF THE SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS* 1989. 147-165; and "Walking With and Beyond John Courtney Murray," *NEW THEOLOGY REVIEW*, August 1996, 20-40.
17. Clyde L. Manschreck, "Church-State Relations -- A Question of Sovereignty," In Clyde L. Manschreck and Barbara Brown Zikmund (eds.), *THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS EXPERIMENT: PIETY AND PRACTICALITY*. Chicago: Exploration Press, 1976, 121.
18. Romano Guardini, *POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY*. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1961, xiii.
19. Cf. David Byers (ed.), *JUSTICE IN THE MARKETPLACE*. Introduction and Commentary by John I. Pawlikowski. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1985, 353-361.
20. David Byers (ed.), *JUSTICE IN THE MARKETPLACE*, 353-361.
21. Cf. John T. Pawlikowski, "Modern Catholic Teaching on the Economy: An Analysis and Evaluation," in Bruce Grelle and David A. Krueger (eds.), *CHRISTIANITY AND CAPITALISM: PERSPECTIVES ON RELIGION, LIBERALISM AND THE ECONOMY*. Chicago: Center for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1986, 3-24; and

“Government and Economic Solidarity: The View from the Catholic Social Encyclicals,” BRIDGES: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, HISTORY, AND SCIENCE, 7: 3/4 (Fall? Winter 2000), 281-295.

22. John Paul II, “The Ethical Dimensions of Globalization,” ORIGINS 31:3 (May 31, 2001), 44.
23. Cf. Catholic News Service, “Pope, criticizing Capitalism, laments widening rich-poor gap, ecological damage,” NATIONAL CATHOLIC REPORTER 27:31 (May 31, 1992), 8.
24. John Paul II, “What Church Social Teaching Is and Is Not,” ORIGINS 23:15 (Sept. 23, 1993), 257.
25. Peter D. Sutherland, “Beyond the Market, A Different Kind of Equity,” INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, February 20, 1997, 20.
26. William Pfaff, “The World Economic Forum in Davos,” INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, February 20, 1997, 20.
27. Zbigniew Brzezinski, “Global Dilemmas Democracy Faces,” ORIGINS, September 3, 1998, 210.
28. Cf. WOODSTOCK REPORT, Spring 1997, 7.