DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 268 SO 022 039

AUTHOR Gallin, Alice, Ed.; Gallagher, Paul J., Ed.
TITLE Social Teaching, Social Action.
INSTITUTION Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 66p.
AVAILABLE FROM ACCU, Suite 650, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 (1-9 copies, $5 each; 10 or more copies, $4.50 each, prepaid).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education; v11 n1 Sum 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catholics; *Higher Education; Religious Cultural Groups; *Religious Education; *Theological Education

ABSTRACT

In 1976 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops celebrated the bicentennial of the Independence of the United States by sponsoring a national conference on issues of justice. As a result of that conference, a task force was formed and a proposal was made to the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities for a pilot project that would raise consciousness in institutions and help find ways to educate students in the crucial questions of peace and justice. This volume presents a 3-year report and evaluation of the pilot programs. Following a brief introduction by Alice Gallin, 10 papers examine the issues. The papers are: "The Tradition of Peace and Justice and the Bishops' Pastorals on Peace and the Economy" (Thomas A. Shannon); "The Role of the Laity in the World" (Georgia Masters Keightley); "Beyond the Ivory Tower: Some Guidelines for Social Justice Education" (Edward A. Malloy); "Homily, Stonehill College, Chapel of Mary, 1989" (John J. Egan); "Peace with God the Creator, Peace with All of Creation" (John Paul II); "What is Happening to Our Beautiful Land" (a pastoral letter, Phillipines); "Our Relationship wiht Nature" (a pastoral letter, Dominican Republic); "The American College in the Ecological Age" (Thomas Berry); "A Terrestrial Dogmatism?" (Everett Gendler); and "Getting from Here to There" (Betty Reardon). (DB)

Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education

Social Teaching Social Action

Volume 11, Number 1
Summer, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In 1976 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops celebrated the bicentennial of the independence of the United States by sponsoring a national consultation on issues of justice. Under the leadership of Cardinal Dearden, a process was designed whereby parishes and dioceses and organizations met in small groups to identify those injustices still remaining in American society and to suggest possible actions to be taken to overcome such injustices. The process culminated in a conference held in Detroit in October, 1976, known as "A Call to Action." The exhilaration experienced by the 900 or so delegates to this conference as they voted (one person-one vote, regardless of rank or office) on recommendations for the reform of both church and society was defused in the aftermath of the conference. The will to make the needed changes was weak, and the unrealistic nature of some of the recommendations combined to halt the process.

Nevertheless, horizons had shifted. The subsequent pastoral letters on war and peace, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, and on the economy, *Economic Justice for All: Catholic Social Teaching and the United States Economy*, prove that the insights of the conference were valid in many instances and that the call to action did not go unheard.

One of the most immediate consequences of the 1976 conference was the movement within the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. A task force on peace and justice education was formed and a proposal made to the ACCU board for a pilot program that would raise consciousness in our institutions and would help us find ways of educating students in the crucial questions of peace and justice The winter, 1978, *Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education* (Vol. IV, Number 2) was devoted to a description of these pilot programs as well as to contextual essays by Rev. William Byron, SJ, Rev. Brian Hehir, Rev. Laurence Murphy, MM, and Rev. David Burrell, CSC. By the winter, 1981, *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education* (Vol. I, No. 2), we were able to present a three-year report and evaluation on the pilot programs. In addition, there were reflective pieces by Marjorie Keenan, RSHM, Rev. William McInnes, SJ, and Rev. Peter Henriot, SJ. We come now to the third issue of our journal specifically devoted to justice and peace education.

We have learned much over this period of time. Crucial to the focus on justice and peace issues in the total educational mission of the university has been the participation of so many faculty in our programs. We have sponsored seven summer seminars in which we have continued to press for the union of social teaching and social action. That became the actual title for the most recent workshop, that at Stonehill College in the summer of 1989. We have continued to stress the three-point program that is the essence of ACCU's effort: curriculum modification to include peace and justice issues, experiential learning in community service, and theological reflection. As we move into the decade of the nineties, the justice issues associated with environment have drawn us from a global vision to a planet earth perspective. Pope John Paul II took note of this in his New Year's address for 1990.

All that has been accomplished by ACCU in promoting of justice and peace education has been greatly facilitated by an Advisory Council. The current list of members follows this introduction. Created to bring together representatives of the colleges and those who work in different "social action" organizations, this group has been the backbone of all our plans and, even more, of the carrying out of those plans. The spirit of generous service that animates the men and women on the council is typified by the response of Bill Osterle, long-time member of the group, when we asked if he would be willing to serve as guest editor of this issue. He responded with enthusiasm although handicapped by Parkinson's disease. He died on July 5. Therefore we dedicate this issue to him.

Alice Gallin, OSU
Executive Director

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON JUSTICE AND PEACE EDUCATION

Peter H. Beisheim — Stonehill College

Loretta Carey, RDC — Fordham University

John Carr — United States Catholic Conference

Anthony J. Cernera — Sacred Heart University

Margaret Comfrey, CSJ — National Office of Jesuit Social Ministries

Joseph J. Fahey — Manhattan College

Mildred Haipt, OSU — College of New Rochelle

Mary Hayes, SND — Trinity College

James E. Hug, SJ — Center of Concern

Philip S. Land, SJ — Center of Concern

Donald McNeill, CSC — University of Notre Dame

Nicole E. Mendoza — Catholic Relief Service

Joseph Nangle, OFM — Conference of Major Superiors of Men

David J. O'Brien — College of the Holy Cross

William H. Osterle — University of Scranton

James R. Price, III — The Catholic University of America

Daniel Regan — Villanova University

John Spagnolo — Iona College

David Suly — Bread for the World

Nancy Sylvester, IHM — Network

Kathleen Maas Weigert — University of Notre Dame

The Tradition of Peace and Justice And The U.S. Bishops' Pastorals On Peace and the Economy

Thomas A. Shannon

My agenda in this paper is somewhat complicated because while there are some overlaps in the tradition of peace and justice, the teachings are also distinct. Thus, my plan is to present first, a brief summary of the background out of which both traditions developed; second, a review of the teachings on peace, with special emphasis on the pastoral letter; third, a review of the justice tradition, with emphasis on the pastoral; and, finally, some conclusions regarding the option for the poor and non-violent democratic patience.

I think it is also important to note that this paper is as much about the methodology used to resolve ethical dilemmas as it is about the specific traditions themselves. Thus, one of the background questions one might think of is how the methodology of these traditions relates to the seamless garment orientation and to sexual ethics.

THE CONTEXT: ROMAN CATHOLIC SOCIAL ETHICS

Since Roman Catholic Christianity became the official religion of the Holy Roman Empire, it has adopted a distinct style of relating to the larger secular society. This style set the tone for the context in which the social teachings of Catholic Christianity have been articulated. And it is in this shift and its implications that the teachings on peace and justice are located and take their shape.

Clearly, the biblical ethical tradition put a distinctive mark on Christian social ethics. The great themes of the Covenant, the prophetic tradition of justice and the Beatitudes of Jesus, combined with the eschatological hope grounded in the Resurrection, led Christian social ethics to see the world through a particular lens. This biblical orientation, combined with the disenfranchised situation of early Christianity led to its development of an ethic of withdrawal from the world, an ethic of direct charity of philanthropy. This world-rejecting attitude was augmented by the expectation of the imminent return of Jesus and the establishment of the Kingdom. This orientation set a tone of disengagement from the world and an acceptance of an heroic ethic which looked to individual perfection within a community whose eyes were turned upward.

When the early Christians realized that Jesus was not returning on their timetable, when the persecutions stopped, when their numbers increased both by conversion and through marriage, they realized that a new *modus vivendi* was called for. While an exclusively biblical ethic served well a small group who did not expect to be in the world very long, the need now was to establish an ethic for a church, not a sect, for a community which was faithful to Jesus Christ but which also had civic and familial responsibilities. Thus began the great task of the creation of a social ethic to determine proper Christian living in a new age: the in-between time.

The philosophical tradition of the natural law adapted from Stoic and Roman traditions was the vehicle used to bridge the gap between the Christian church and the society in which it existed. An assumption that there was enough congruence between a biblical ethic and the natural law principles allowed Christians to develop principles of moral accountability for life in the world, while yet having the biblical vision as an ultimate check on the imperfection of reason and self-interest stemming from original and personal sin.

The ensuing history of the task of balancing fidelity to God in Jesus and the responsibilities of civic life has been an interesting one, to say the least. Many identify this time as the fall of the church. Others see it as the salvation—in a secular sense—of the Roman Empire. In any event, the development of a social ethic for a church as opposed to an heroic ethic for the individual or sect dramatically changed the social expression and role of Christianity.

Dr. Shannon is a professor of religion and social ethics in the Department of Humanities at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Worcester, MA. *The original version of this paper was the text of his keynote address as delivered at the 1989 ACCU Summer Conference on Justice and Peace Education held at Stonehill College.*

One of the first challenges to the newly developing community was the question of participation in the life of the empire, especially with respect to joining the army, and by implication, participating in state sanctioned killing. This section will look at this teaching from three broad perspectives: First, the development of the just war theory; second, the articulation of the theory in modern society by John Courtney Murray; and third, the peace pastoral.

The dominant position in the early community was that of pacifism, following from the general position of non-involvement in society indicated above. Christians appeared to stay out of the army, in part because of their refusal to take an oath to Caesar and mainly because of their following the Beatitudes, with a consequent refusal to kill. As far as can be determined, this position remained dominant until the end of the second century. Records of Christians in the army begin appearing in the lists of the legions of Marcus Aurelius, of soldier martyrs, and from Galerius' efforts to eliminate Christians from his army. Also the closer one lived to the borders of the empire, the more likely Christians were to be found in the army, particularly since it had the primary function of police force.

A series of critical moments were soon to come. The first of these was the formation of the Holy Roman Empire under Constantine. In three centuries, Christianity passed from being a marginal Jewish reform sect to being the official religion of the new empire. An alliance with the state had been formed which was to give the remainder of the history of Christian social ethics a distinct shape.

Second, Ambrose, previously the pretorian prefect of northern Italy but now the bishop of Milan, developed an ethic of warmaking as a way for the empire to respond to the beginning barbarian invasions. Drawing from the justification of war in the Jewish scriptures appended to the Gospel and from Cicero's natural law ethics, Ambrose formulated the outlines of a just war ethics.

Third, Augustine developed a full theory of justifiable war. Educated in the best schools of his time and under the tutelage of Ambrose, Augustine represented the flowering of a mature Christianity, but a Christianity at a time of peril, for only the power of the Roman army stood between the empire and its imminent destruction by the Vandals.

Augustine was persuaded that order and the empire were preferable to chaos and destruction by the barbarians. He also saw that in many ways the fate of Christianity was linked with the survival of the empire. Were the empire to continue to exist and to remain Christian, the church might continue to give guidance and achieve some sense of justice in the society. Therefore, the empire could be defended and Christians could participate in its defense. The goods of justice and social order took priority over individual ethics and private goods. A critical moment had been reached in the development of a social ethic which articulated the responsibilities of the Christian who was also a citizen.

While many refinements of the just war theory were carried forward by Aquinas and the other Scholastics, the key ethical issues had been articulated and accepted. Christians could participate in the defense of the state to restore justice, protect an innocent neighbor, or preserve the good of social order.

I would like to jump now several centuries of development to John Courtney Murray because he represents the best summary of the tradition after World War II and thus sets the stage for the Vatican II discussion and the American development. Among Murray's many other accomplishments was a coherent bringing together of the received tradition of the just war theory from Scholasticism and its practical implementation, particularly in light of the papacy of Pius XII. The following four principles represent Murray's interpretation of the received tradition.

1. All wars of aggression are prohibited. The two reasons for this are that the violence or war is a disproportionate means of achieving justice, and international structures to resolve disputes will be more difficult to achieve if nations continue to take such matters into their own hands.

2. A defensive war to redress injustice is morally possible provided four criteria are met: the nation must be attacked; the war is the last resort; there is a proportion between the harm suffered and the violence released by war; and there is a limitation on force with respect to noncombatants and no use of weapons which would destroy all life within their radius.

3. Preparations for defense are legitimate because there is no international authority which controls arms and because the right to self-defense cannot be denied any nation.

4. Once a state legitimately declares war, conscientious objection is not an option.

These criteria formed the basic context in which the morality of the use of violence was justified. And they were the major operative norms by which conscience was to be formed. They represented the best of the tradition as it made its first encounters with the nuclear nightmare of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In the light of this nuclear reality, pressure to reevaluate the tradition began to build. The main pressure came from the call of Vatican II to examine war with an entirely new attitude. In the wake of the spirited argument begun there, together with the beginnings of the legitimation of pacifism as a valid Christian option, I would offer five other specific forms of such

pressure. The first is empirical, relating to the development of more and even deadlier nuclear weapons, more accurate delivery systems, the cost of the development and maintaince of such weapons, and increasing awareness of the consequences of the use of such weapons. The second is a growing peace constituency within the church. Beginning in the early 1950's, pacifism began to exert a strong hold on the moral imagination of many individuals: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement, Gordon Zahn and his criticisms of the capitulation of the church to Nazism and the inadequacies of the just war theory in the nuclear age, the brothers Berrigan, and even some bishops. Third is the methodological shift from a narrow interpretation of natural law abstractly considered to Vatican II's orientation to a reading of the signs of the times, focusing on an empirical analysis of the situation, the discernment of the community's reading of the situation, and the affirmation of solidarity with the human community and the world. Fourth, within the strategic community, there was a questioning of the wisdom of a first strike posture by the United States. This questioning was all the more significant because it was done by the ones who previously had put it in place. Finally, many bishops were beginning, in pastoral letters to their dioceses, to question the appropriateness of the use of nuclear weapons and the overall nuclear strategy of the United States. Thus, ordinaries such as Hunthausen, Mahoney, Pilla, Quinn, and Mathiesen wrote influential letters, while others, such as Gumbleton and Sullivan, frequently spoke out in favor of pacifism and were strong critics of the status quo.

All of these pressures came together in a remarkable way in the lengthy process that culminated in the peace pastoral. While there are many genuinely unique features of this letter that deserve extended commentary—such as the consultative process used to develop it, the empirical nature of the document, and the explicit willingness to both tolerate and accept dissent from it, I will focus on the main contours of the teaching of the letter. I will highlight three areas: the main teachings, deterrence, and the conclusions.

1. There are three main teachings that set the content and tone of the letter. First is the principle that "under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used to destroy population centers or predominantly civilian targets." Second, the bishops say that they "do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear war, on however limited a scale, can be morally justified. Non-nuclear attacks must be resisted by other than nuclear means." Finally, because of the inclusive nature of the policy debate concerning a limited exchange of nuclear weapons, the bishops remain skeptical about such use and place the burden for its justification on those who choose to use such weapons. To help do this the bishops provide a set of very focused and detailed questions.

2. The discussion of deterrence is the most complex section of the pastoral. But it offers some of the most concise and clear statements of the major issues of deterrence one can find. Thus even if one disagrees with the conclusions the bishops draw, the section is still extremely useful for setting up the moral questions.

The morality of deterrence is approached in two related ways. The first acknowledges that while there is indeed a need for deterrence, not all forms of deterrence are morally acceptable. The second moral issue comes from the general moral tradition and provides the basis for determining acceptability. It is wrong to intend to do what is wrong to do. Thus, simply stated, if it is immoral directly to target civilian population or indirectly cause massive and unacceptable civilian causalities while aiming at an acceptable military target, then it is equally wrong to intend to do this as part of a deterrence strategy. Thus the moral conclusion hinges on an analysis of not only the act but also the intention, and this is why the moral evaluation presents so many problems. To be credible, for example, the enemy must be convinced that you will use your deterrent. But in so communicating this, you may be intending the death of large numbers of civilians in addition to significant ecological disasters. A strict analysis would argue that even if one never actually does this, the deterrence is still immoral because of the intention.

Yet, and this the other horn of the deterrence dilemma, quickly to back out of all the existing deterrent forces, treaties, and other relations with nations around the world may be so destabilizing as to cause the outbreak of war. Additionally, one side or the other might think that they had a momentary advantage, and a conflict could break out.

The bishops conclude with a strictly conditioned moral acceptance of deterrence and provide a framework for such a moral analysis. Three major criteria are: Any deterrence proposals beyond preventing the use of nuclear weapons exceed the purpose of deterrence and are objectionable; sufficiency of deterrence force precludes an adequate strategy; deterrence must be seen as a way station to disarmament.

3. Although the pastoral letter was hailed as a major step forward and one of the most significant contributions to the question, the resolution of the deterrence issue was problematic for many. Gordon Zahn suggested, for example, that based on their criteria the bishops could just as easily have given a deferred condemnation. And in the light of the Reagan administration's commitment to Star Wars, the deterrence issue remained on the front burner. Eventually an episcopal commission was set up to review the new situation in light of the criteria. Again, after several meetings and

prolonged discussions, the committee reluctantly returned the same verdict as before. Thus, we still have the nagging problem of how to apply critically the criteria in a pluralistic church and community. Yet the letter marked a significant advance and brought to the discussion of nuclear war a new clarity and clear criteria.

THE MAGISTERIAL TRADITION OF JUSTICE

Let us now turn to the other dimension of the discussion: justice. Let me note again the sectarian, otherworldly background referred to at the beginning of the paper as the context also for the beginning of our social ethical tradition. In this section I want to focus on three aspects of the justice question. First is a general orientation to some thematic issues. Second is a review of some of the magisterial teachings on justice. Third is a discussion of some of the themes in the economics pastoral.

Two themes are important in this general orientation. First is the teaching on private property. Augustine taught that private property was a human convention and that property was to held in common. In his *Decretals*, Gratian repeated this teaching, basing it on the teachings of the strange bedfellows of Plato and the *Acts of the Apostles*.

This teaching was modified canonically by the assertion that only in necessity was property to be held in common, presented as a formulation of what Gratian really meant to say. Theologically, among the Scholastics a distinction was made between property before the Fall of Adam and after, reflecting the distinction Aquinas made between the Absolute Law of Nature and the Relative Law of Nature. Before the Fall, property was held in common; after the Fall, because of sin, private property was allowed as a way of maintaining peace and order, and encouraging human industry. Thus, private property was allowed, but with a residue of the teaching that originally property was held in common.

The second theme relates to the teaching on usury, a practice which was originally prohibited. I wish briefly to highlight this teaching because it provides a model of the interaction between the good of society and a developing moral tradition.

The teaching on usury, brilliantly described by John Noonan, was based on a concept of money derivative from a natural law perspective developed by Aquinas. This orientation argues that money is essentially a measure and, therefore, changes which may affect the purchasing power of money are only accidental changes which do not affect its essence. Also money is assumed to have one fixed, stable value: its legal face value. Therefore, and this is at the core of the usury teaching, since it is formally or essentially a stable measure of all goods, money itself cannot be sold and a profit made from it. Consequently, as Noonan notes, "If money is a measure, with a fixed value, deliberately to value it differently at different times is to distort unnaturally its formal character." Thus money becomes the mean between the two terms of a sale and cannot itself be the term of a sale for this would give it the two different evaluations simultaneously. Therefore, usury, the act or intention of taking a profit on a loan, was both unnatural and a sin against justice.

Yet after the 12th century, this prohibition on usury was revised and modified. Noonan identifies three key issues in this reevaluation. The first issue is the changed economic circumstances, most importantly a commercial revolution which required credit to support it. Second is a different analysis of the fact of economics. This includes an introduction of the concept of risk, a different view of the concept of money, and a new view of different credit transactions. Third is a different attitude toward finance which includes a willingness to accept the good intentions, honesty and social utility of financiers and finding practices acceptable when the people most affected by them do not complain. Thus, as Noonan notes, "If practices flourish and bring prosperity and are accepted by the common conscience, it is generally reasoned that there must be some objective foundation for the profits gained by them."

This formal reevaluation, which took place over several centuries, permitted a profit on money loans. In 1917, the Code of Canon Law created a presumption in favor of the legal rate of interest. While there was a recognition that some interest rates might be excessive, profit on credit transactions became the norm and usury the exception.

While the story of this development is much more complicated that I have hinted at here, what is important is the way in which the church interacted with a developing economic system and sought to influence it. A critical part of this story is the gradual change of the teaching from a condemnation to an acceptance of a practice based on the good of society and the conscientious acceptance of a practice by church members. Thus the tradition was not static, but developed in relation to new insights and practices.

Another part of this story is the development of the magisterial teaching on social justice, and it is to this tradition that I now wish to turn. The focus will be on the hierarchical response to any number of developing socio-economic issues. Again, I jump several centuries and pick up the story with the papacy of Leo XIII, which marks the beginnings of the use of the encyclical as a means of developing and promoting social teaching.

This seventy-year period marked a formative and critical phase in the development of magisterial social teaching. While proclamations had been made previ-

ously by members of the hierarchy, the pontificate of Leo XIII marks the development of a distinctive orientation within hierarchical teaching: the use of the encyclical to enunciate principles of social justice and their relations to the social order. Given Leo XIII's situation it is remarkable that he even addressed the question of social justice. The impact of the French revolutionary spirit was still being felt across Europe; the temporal power of the pontificate had been lost; and there was general fear about the suspicious proposition that governments rested on the will of the governed and not on divine authority.

Nonetheless, Leo recognized the plight of the poor and the workers and responded to them in *Rerum Novarum*. Here he argued that labor was not a commodity to be bought and sold at market prices determined through supply and demand. To do so was to deny the workers the dignity due them as persons and to reduce them to the status of things. He also argued that the workers had the right, through the use of lawful means, to escape their state of poverty. Finally, because of their powerlessness, workers were entitled to state assistance.

The justice that Leo proposes for the workers is a justice which is respectful of authority, augmented by charity, and restrained by the heavenly rewards to come.

> For just as religion requires the worship and fear of God so also it demands submission and obedience to lawful authority; it forbids any kind of seditious activity and wills that the property and the rights of everybody be safeguarded; and those who are more wealthy should magnanimously help the poor masses. Religion cares for the poor with every form of charity; it fills the strickened with the sweetest comfort by offering them the hope of very great and immortal good things which are all the more plentiful in the future in proportion to the extent to which one has been weighted down more heavily or for a longer time. (*Quod Multum, 1886*).

Also, in a comment relevant to contemporary discussions, Leo states the limits to which people can go in seeking justice.

> Should it, however, happen at any time that in the public exercise of authority rulers act rashly and arbitrarily, the teaching of the Catholic Church does not allow subjects to rise against them without further warranty, lest peace and order become more and more disturbed, and society run the risk of greater detriment. And when things have come to such a pass as to hold out no further hope, she teaches that a remedy be sought in urgent prayer to God. (*Quod Apostolici Muneris, 1896*).

Pius XI continued this concern for the poor in his contribution to the discussion of social justice, *Quadragesimo Anno*, written in 1931. His primary motivation for the letter, in addition to celebrating the 40th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, was the tremendous increase in the number of the poor in both urban and rural areas. The economic depression spreading around the world was causing massive unemployment and social dislocation, and simultaneously wealth and power were being concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people. To re-establish justice, Pius rejected a major premise of capitalism: the regulation of the economy by the market. He did this because he saw that the market was not a free market, but rather was controlled by special interests and by the powerful. Such concentrations of wealth and power in the hands of a few argued against the market as a just means of distributing goods and services. Consequently, Pius argued that workers ought to be able to form unions to help them secure their rights and that the state ought to ensure that competition be kept within just and definite limits.

But Pius went even further. He disagreed with Leo XIII and argued that justice ranks higher than order. In the third of a trilogy of encyclicals commenting on major social issues—*Mit brennender Jorge* on Nazism, *Divine Redemptoris* on communism, and *Firmissimum* on Catholics in Mexico—Pius said:

> . . . the Church . . . condemns every unjust rebellion or act of violence against the properly constituted civil power. On the other hand, . . . if the case arose where the civil power should so trample on justice and truth as to destroy even the very foundations of authority, there would appear no reason to condemn citizens for uniting to defend the nation and themselves by lawful and appropriate means against those who make use of the power of the state to drag the nation to ruin. (*Firmissimum, 1937*).

Since later in the encyclical Pius argues that the means used should not be intrinsically evil and that they must not bring about greater harm than the evils they are to remedy, it is safe to assume that he is talking about using the power of the vote to effect this reform. The replacement of order as the highest social value gives a new vision of social reform and the means by which it is to be established: justice.

Pope Pius XII, who brings this era to a close, is interesting in that while he spoke and wrote on almost every topic, he never wrote a major work on social issues. *Mystici Corporis*, of course, has social overtones and the liturgical movement to which it gave rise facilitated a new awareness of the organic unity of the human community.

Two observation of his are important for this overview of justice in papal documents. First, Pius XII was concerned about social stability. World War II had effected many crises, and the reorganization of society was an important consideration for all. Within this

context, Pius argued that the prosperity of a country was not to be measured exclusively by materialistic or quantitative means. The standard of living and the modes of distribution of goods and services must be factored into the well-being of the country. Thus the desire for order was to be guided by the needs of justice. Second, in line with his predecessors, Pius affirmed the right of private property. However, he departed from them in that he gave priority to the right of all people to use the goods of the earth. Thus the right of private property was subject to and qualified by the demands of the common good.

At the end of this first major phase of the development of a magisterial teaching on justice, we see several themes emerge. First, justice takes priority over order. Second, justice must be factored into considerations of the quality of life within a state. Third, the right to private property is qualified by the demands of the common good. Pius XI's justification of the defense of the nation by the non-violent overthrow of an unjust regime, while having its precedents in the natural law tradition, will re-emerge in later documents and occasion much debate.

The death of Pius XII and the election of John XXIII was the end of an era in many ways. The image of the rotund, smiling Pope John contrasted significantly with the ascetic, thin Pius. John also seemed to move more easily with people, to be at home with them. He did not convey the image of a recluse as Pius often did. But it was John's calling of the Vatican Council that defined his papacy and marked a new era in Catholicism.

While John's encyclicals *Pacem in Terris* and *Mater et Magistra* were characterized by the use of natural law as the key methodology, John brought to that method a new openness and style that liberated it from the static assumptions it had accumulated over the years. Also, in contradistinction to Pius XII, John shared the liberal assumption that new wealth could be created and that the first task of justice was to enlarge the pie of national income. Thus, for John, the task of justice was the generation of new wealth, not the equitable distribution of what was available. He also assumed that a wider distribution of property would narrow the gap between rich and poor. In many ways, John's assumptions were the assumptions of his age: an acceptance of the Western economic order, reforms which would adjust—but not disrupt—the status quo, and an increase in the role of the state.

Two features of his teaching are significant. The first is his emphasis on socialization, by which John meant an increase in the network of relations by which individuals are connected to each other. John recognized that this interconnectedness of all peoples, brought about by modernization and urbanization, would change how we think of each other and would necessitate the establishment of new modes of interaction. Thus, justice takes on even greater significance as we work our way into even more complex social relationships. The second is his argument for state intervention to ensure that property achieve its social function. He expected, as a requirement of justice, that individuals could be compelled by law to utilize their property for the common good. Thus John combined some of Pius XII's priorities with his own liberal assumptions.

Vatican II was the vehicle through which many of Pope John's ideas were actualized, although the council also represented the overflowing of ideas that had been damned up within the church for many years. The council was also the culmination of the transition between the styles of church represented by Pius XII and John XXIII respectively.

While the process of the council tempered somewhat the optimism of John, it also solidified the consensus on the liberal orientation of social teaching that had been simmering in the church for several decades. Thus the theological orientation of the council provided the basis for the developments that were to follow in its wake.

Several themes of the council are important in our consideration of justice. First, the council linked peace and justice. Such linkage requires the putting right of political grievances. Peace cannot be established if injustice reigns in a country or between countries. Continuing a tradition of long standing, the council recognized that the economic order must be rectified as a precondition of peace. Peace cannot be achieved until there is a social order to support it. The achievement of this order is the work of justice.

The second justice theme that the council articulated dealt with our obligations to the poor. On the one hand, the council presented a strong moral warning to the wealthy nations. It suggested that if the wealthy nations did not share their goods with the poor of the world, then the poor would rise up and take them. The council recognized that the poor would be justified in so doing because of their absolute need. This orientation is not new in Roman Catholic social ethics, but it is unusual to see it so starkly stated by a council.

On the other hand, the council argued that this assistance to the poor must not merely be from the superfluous wealth of the developed nations. Such donations, while obviously helpful, do not provide enough money to solve the problems of the poor. Perhaps more importantly, such a method of assistance maintains the status quo. That is, those who were poor would remain poor, and those who were wealthy would become wealthier. Assistance would be provided, but everything would stay the same.

By arguing that assistance to the poor must go beyond philanthropy, the council recognized that the economic system itself was a problem to be dealt with. Until substantive adjustments were made, everything would stay the same. Thus justice requires assistance

to the poor that does not merely replicate the status quo. The status quo must be changed to effect a redistribution of wealth. Only in that way will justice be served.

The third theme related to justice is the call for a new relation between the church and power—or a new way for the church to respond to its social position. In a very dramatic passage, the council calls upon the church to give up the exercise of legitimately acquired rights in situations where the possession or exercise of such rights calls into question the sincerity of its witness. The council explicitly calls on the church to relinquish privilege—and the power and status that go with it—so that it can witness to the truth in freedom. Only by being independent of social structures can the church see them for what they are, and only through such freedom will the church have the capacity to speak its vision of justice.

By emphasizing these themes, the council carried forward developments in justice that had been brewing in the church for several decades. While remaining within the liberal tradition, the council also provided room for the prophetic tradition. In calling for service to the poor, a reorganization of the economic structure, and a deprivilegization of the church, the council called for a new standard of justice.

The work of the council and of John XXIII was carried out by his successor, Paul VI. Although often portrayed as an enigmatic or Hamlet-like figure, Paul inherited a church enlivened by an ecumenical council and by the strong winds of reform. Much of Paul's efforts were directed to implementing the reforms of the council and also to mediating the different forces that were developing in the church. Paul had to succeed "Good Pope John," a task difficult enough in itself. But he also had to deal with the release of forces that had been pent up in the church for decades.

1967 saw the publication of *Populorum Progressio*, Paul VI's first social encyclical. His contribution to the development of a theology of justice was located in an analysis of the causes of poverty. He identified and analyzed three: colonialism, neo-colonialism, and the imbalance of power between nations. Colonialism caused injustice by making the colony dependent on only one cash crop and this in turn subjected the colony to an economy that was dependent on price fluctuations out of its control. Neo-colonialism caused injustice by creating a privileged elite, disenfranchising the native population, and maintaining economic domination from abroad. The resulting power imbalances gave rise to injustices in trade because the colonies or underdeveloped nations could not approach the market as equals.

Justice requires a rectification of this situation. Paul saw a need for international planning which would help shift the balance of power so that the developing nations would be able to gain entry to the market on more equitable terms. He also argued that market competition must be kept within the limits of justice. Finally, he reminded us that the poor have rights and that if they continue to be marginalized, they may be justified in seizing what is theirs in justice. And while Paul did not encourage revolution, neither did he see it as a moral impossibility.

In *Octogesima Adveniens* in 1971, Paul continued to develop several of his themes but also branched out into new areas and, interestingly enough, engaged in self-criticism. *Populorum Progressio* was, obviously, a strong endorsement of development theory. In fact, the slogan from the encyclical was that development was the new name for peace. However, after observing the theory in action for several years, it became apparent that the gap between the rich and poor could not be explained simply by the fact that the poor had not yet developed. In addition to the economic dimension, there was the political dimension. And one had to look to the political dimension and its inter-relation with the economic dimension to understand the causes of injustice.

The growing awareness of the historical, political, and economic causes of injustice led Paul to see the need for a pluralism of approaches to resolve problems of injustice. Two strong arguments for pluralism emerged from this. First, there was the fact of diversity of potential solutions to injustice arising from differences in regions, cultures, and the political and economic situation of a country. Second, because of these factual differences and legitimate responses to them, Paul argued, in a rare display of papal modesty, that local churches needed to assume a greater responsibility in evaluating the regional situation and proposing responses to it. The papal office was to provide leadership and inspiration, but the initiative and solutions must come from below.

Paul VI contributed to the growing concern for justice in several ways, then. His willingness to see the global causes of injustice in terms of the consequences of centuries of colonialism and neo-colonialism, his willingness to critique his own methodology, and his emphasis on the empowerment of the disenfranchised helped to promote the cause of the poor and to establish a growing sense of the justice of their cause.

Three other sources need to be addressed before turning to the contemporary scene. First is the Medellin Conference of 1968. This conference, attended by Paul VI, defined the tone and context in which the Latin American church would begin to address its problems. The conference distinguished between a spiritual poverty with its opening to God—a poverty of commitment which leads to solidarity with the poor—and material poverty which results from injustice. The conference argued that the church should denounce such material poverty while becoming a church that is poor and a church of the poor. Thus the

church needs to live a life of spiritual poverty so it can achieve solidarity with the poor and be free to condemn the injustices in society. As the church realizes more the extent to which its members live in material poverty, it should provide the service of pressuring public officials in the areas in which people live. This service will thus aid in the liberation of the oppressed and will set the church on the path of justice. The conference saw the goal of liberation as a goal for the whole person: liberation from physical oppression of material poverty as the context in which the liberation from sin can be experienced.

Second, the 1971 Synod of Bishops made a strong statement on justice which complemented many of the themes addressed by Paul VI and the Medellin Conference. This synod gave a strong mandate for the church to work for the transformation of the world, to denounce violations of human rights, and to stand for the rights of humans in all societies. The synod summarized its orientation as well as the developing emphasis on justice in the church in this way:

> The Church has received from Christ the mission of preaching the Gospel message, which contains a call to man to turn away from sin to the love of the Father, universal brotherhood and a consequent demand for justice in the world. This is the reason why the Church has the right, indeed, the duty to proclaim justice on the social, national, and international level, and to denounce instances of injustice when the fundamental rights of man and his very salvation demand it.
>
> Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation.

The third source is the 1979 Conference at Puebla. This Latin American conference is important not only for what it said but also because this is the first major use of the term "option for the poor" in a magisterial document. By using the phrase and having it as a chapter title, the Latin American church signaled a shift in its priorities, a shift in its relation to the state, and indeed to its position of privilege which had been held for centuries. This orientation is in harmony with the mandate of Vatican II to surrender privilege so the church could be free to witness to its mission.

The intent of the adoption of the phrase "option for the poor" is to indicate the mission of the church to proclaim and work for social justice. It is to put the church in solidarity with the biblical theme of concern for the poor, the marginal, the outcast. The following quotation indicated both the personal and structural reforms demanded by conversion to this rich biblical theme of justice.

> We affirm the need for conversion on the part of the whole Church to a preferential option for the poor, an option aimed at their integral liberation.
>
> This option, demanded by the scandalous reality of economic imbalances in Latin America, should lead us to establish a dignified, fraternal way of life together as human beings and to construct a just and free society.

Thus the intent of the option for the poor is not to engage in class warfare or to abandon the universal mission of the church but to call the church to return to its origins, to its vision of liberation from sin and injustice so that all can live in harmony.

Since the deaths of Paul VI and John Paul I and the election of the first non-Italian pope in centuries, much has happened in the church. Pope John Paul II has clearly impressed the world with his charismatic personality, his gesture of forgiveness and reconciliation with his would-be assassin, his desire to chart a course for a church that seemed to be adrift, his commitment to justice, and his desire to keep the church free of political entanglements.

It is difficult, frankly, to keep up with the pope. He seems to be constantly in motion, speaking to any and all groups. He has issued encyclicals, given major addresses, traveled almost everywhere, and called for a synod of bishops to re-evaluate Vatican II. Although pope for a decade, John Paul is still in the process of defining the style of his papacy. Obviously his contributions are far from finished, but some themes seem to appear more frequently than others.

A major link with the theology of Vatican II and the Latin American church is John Paul's deep commitment to humanism or to a type of theological anthropology. He roots the dignity of the human in Christ and sees the Christ as the locus for discovering our deepest human aspirations. As the pope says in his first encyclical, *Redemptor Hominis*:

> Man in the full truth of his existence, of his personal being and also of his community and social being—in the sphere of his own family, in the sphere of society . . . and in the sphere of the whole of mankind—this man is the primary route that the Church must travel in fulfilling her mission: he is the primary and fundamental way for the Church, the way traced out by Christ himself.

Here the pope indicates that the deepest aspirations of being human are linked with the mission of the church. Both look to human liberation in its broadest dimensions. Both seek to help humans plumb the depths of their being. The continued affirmation of the dignity of human beings and the full realization of their potential in the Christ provide the basis for the church's action to achieve social justice.

The theme of justice is carried forward in an impor-

tant but unique way in *Dives in Misericordia*, published in 1981. Here John Paul links, in an important way, the virtues of justice and mercy. In our quest to rectify the injustices of society, we have frequently forgotten other virtues of the Christian life. Mercy, in the pope's judgment, does not cancel the obligation of justice. Rather it sets up a reciprocal relation which deepens the mutuality of the two parties involved. The critical insight that comes from this is that justice is not achieved when only the material conditions of life have been rectified. Also required is mutuality between and among humans which will perfect their dignity. Justice without mercy brings only material equity; justice with mercy liberates humans and makes them one.

The pope has continued to refer to the option for the poor in many of his speeches and tours. The recently completed Latin American tour will keep yet another generation of commentators busy in trying to figure out exactly what he means when he uses the term. However, some dimensions seem to be reasonably clear.

John Paul certainly rejects any meaning of the term that suggests class warfare or any narrowing of the universal mission of the church to offer salvation to all. He also firmly rejects any use of the term which will support the use of violence to achieve social justice. He does intend the term to be a call to solidarity with the poor to work with them in achieving their dignity. This requires a sharing of one's goods with the poor, and it also requires that one work to transform the social structures that keep the poor from achieving their rightful dignity.

Donal Dohr, summarizing several themes in *Laborem Exercens*, published in 1981, describes the option for the poor in this way.

> What it implies is a dedicated and consistent effort to disentangle oneself from the unjust structures, practices and traditions that help to keep the poor in poverty; and a serious commitment to building alternatives that will be just and truly human. The reason why it should be done is that we cannot evade responsibility for the injustices that mark our world. Almost everybody has some degree of complicity in these injustices—the well-off who protect their own interest at the cost of the poor and the poor themselves who often remain sunk in apathy.

Finally there remains the delicate and problematic issue of how the church acts out its mission to achieve social justice in the world. That it has a mission to do so is clear from its commitment to an integral humanism. How it is to do this is being debated at all levels of the church. From his perspective, John Paul seems to have eliminated three means of achieving justice: the use of violence, the promoting of class divisions, and the direct involvement of clergy and/or religious in the political process. Recent speeches and events in Latin America and the United States have made this much fairly clear, although one does need to keep in mind the image of the pope, on his visit to Poland, leading huge crowds in the singing of nationalistic folk songs and religious hymns with their own nationalistic overtones. While not direct political action, the pope's message could quite clearly be inferred from his actions.

How this debate will resolve itself is quite unclear at the present moment. There are powerful forces at work in the church now, and many options are being examined in theory and practice. Under debate are the relation of the local hierarchy and the Vatican, competing visions of the church, the role of the clergy and religious in seeking social justice, and the church's relation to the state and the established order of society.

These traditional but contemporary issues are being debated in light of a continuing and deepening commitment of the church to social justice, to the rectification of the great gaps in our world between the rich and the poor, and to the establishment of human dignity in all dimensions of life. The commitment of the church to human dignity and social justice also mandates an examination and debate over the means of achieving this goal. The difficulty of that debate should not, however, weaken the commitment of the church to its vision, but it will require that we follow John Paul's advice and blend justice and mercy in our debates and actions.

JUSTICE AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

Considerations of justice and the U.S. economy are difficult because the topic under examination is so complex. After all, the issue is the economic structure of a country and its relation to the international economic system. In addition, there is no one particular problem that is being examined. Rather a complex set of relations, together with their causes and consequences, or projected consequences, is being examined. As difficult and complex a topic as nuclear war is, it is a precisely definable problem with an historical tradition of reflection and a specific agenda. Such is not the case with ethical considerations of the economy. Thus, application of a theory of justice will be difficult and problematic. Let us consider how the bishops evaluate this significant area of social concern.

Briefly, the biblical considerations focus on the themes of creation, covenant, and community. Within this context, the themes of reciprocal responsibility, the communality of the good of the earth, and social solidarity are elaborated. From the perspective of these themes, particular orientations to justice are derived: a rejection of idolatry—the replacement of God with created things; a relativization of all human structures because of our eschatological hope; and the protection and assistance of the weak—expressed as

an option for the poor. The picture that emerges from this overview of the biblical perspective on justice presented in the pastoral is that of a community characterized by discipleship, by an emptying of self, by an awareness and concern for the dispossessed. Importantly, wealth is seen in the context of idolatry, whereby" . . . it so dominates a person's life that it becomes an idol claiming allegiance and giving security apart from God, or when it blinds a person to the suffering and needy neighbor." Consequently we have a vision which calls us to examine the structures of the world in which we live and to measure them against this image and to present alternatives by which our hopes can be expressed and actualized.

The bishops move from this biblical perspective to a consideration of the traditional philosophical and moral theological themes of justice, using these as a lens by which to focus the biblical perspective in our contemporary socio-economic situation.

Since economic activity is to be at the service of people—for otherwise it would be idolatry—it has a three-fold moral significance: as an embodiment of the capacity for self-expression and self-realization; as a means of self-fulfillment; and as a means of contributing to the human community. Following the lead of Vatican II, the moral measure of the economic system is the dignity of the human person.

> It [the economy] should enable persons to find a significant measure of self-realization in their labor; it should permit persons to fulfill their material needs through adequate remuneration; and it should make possible the enhancement of unity and solidarity within the family, the nation and the world community.

Given that the economic system is to promote and protect human rights, what is the ethical vision of justice by which we can evaluate this? The pastoral answers this question by specifying the ethical norms of economic life. I will first present these norms and then comment on them, especially in the light of the previously mentioned authors.

First, the bishops call for the development of a cultural consensus that places economic rights in the same position of honor enjoyed by other social rights such as civil rights, the rights of free speech, and the right to privacy. The issue is the establishment and acceptance of the reality of such rights, not the precise means of their social realization. This aspect of justice seeks to create an economic order that protects human dignity by ensuring adequate participation in the resources of the community.

Second, such economic rights see justice as demanding "the establishment of minimum levels of participation by all persons in the life of the human community." Justice is realized when individuals and groups actively participate in the life of the community. Justice seeks to give people voice and choice to prevent or diminish as much as possible social, political, and economic marginalization.

Third, justice as requiring the minimum level of participation highlights the theme of reciprocity. Justice is achieved not only by fulfilling individuals' needs, but by enabling them to be productive and active. This enables people to share in the economic life of the community by contributing to the common good as well as by receiving from it what is required to maintain a life of human dignity.

Fourth, while this orientation to justice focuses on participation and production, the measure of production is not exclusively quantitative. Because of the centrality of human dignity and the vision of the economy as a means of enhancing human dignity, patterns of production must also be measured qualitatively, that is, with respect to how the economic structures relate to human needs, including standards of living, patterns of distribution, environmental impacts, and so forth. Justice does not simply evaluate the production of goods and services; it also evaluates the sources of production, the means of production, and the patterns of distribution with respect to their impact on human dignity.

Fifth, the themes of participation and production lead to evaluations of distribution. The criteria of distributive justice proposed by the bishops include:

> the basic moral equality of all human beings rooted in their dignity as images of God; the different needs of different persons; the level of effort, sacrifice and risk that people have undertaken in their economic activity; the relative scarcity or abundance of the goods to be distributed as well as the different talents and skills of the recipients; and finally the overall human welfare of all persons in society considered individually and collectively.

Finally, given these criteria, as well as the realities of human variability and sinfulness, various distributions are possible. The bishops recognize the possibility of unequal distribution and provide the criteria for evaluating them.

"First, unequal distribution must be evaluated particularly in terms of its effects on those persons whose basic human needs are unmet." This creates a presumption against inequities in income or wealth while there are poor, hungry and homeless people. The bishops argue that this presumption can be overridden "... only if an absolute scarcity of resources makes the fulfillment of the basic needs of all strictly impossible or if unequal distribution stimulates productivity in a way that truly benefits the poor."

"Second, unequal distribution of income, education, wealth, job opportunities or other economic goods on the basis of race, sex or any other arbitrary standard can never be justified." The bishops base this rejection

of discrimination on the worth of the human being as a person having a unique value in his or her own self and also as a special creation of God. Racial and sexual discrimination have been among the most destructive forms of injustice in our country and the bishops here firmly reject them.

These elements, which form an outline of the theory of justice that the bishops develop, serve as the moral framework for the policy analysis that the bishops carry out in the concluding section of their letter.

Between this outline of a theory of justice and the policy analysis stand what the bishops describe as priority principles. These appear to me to serve the function of middle axioms or as means of ordering procedurally the abstract principles of justice in relation to social policy.

1. "The fulfillment of the basic needs of the poor is of the highest priority."

2. "Increased economic participation for the marginalized takes priority over the preservation of privileged concentrations of power, wealth and income."

3. "Meeting human needs and increasing participation should be priority targets in the investment of wealth, talent and human energy."

The bishops state clearly that these are not policies, but rather are the lens through which an understanding of justice ought to be focused on society. They are to mediate between the theory and practice and help in establishing what social policies ought to be examined and from what perspective.

The biblical and ethical perspectives on justice presented in the pastoral bring together a broad range of concerns and highlight a number of themes that have been discussed over the centuries. The letter also examines several emerging trends in social ethics. Let me highlight a few of these before moving to a more thematic consideration of several issues in the conclusion.

First is the centering of the theory of justice on the concept of the dignity of the person. This aspect of the theoretical dimension of the pastoral fits well with the magisterial and ethical tradition of past decades.

Second, the pastoral sees justice as participatory and reciprocal. Such a vision of justice focuses on the bonds that connect people in a society and stresses the mutuality of rights and duties that come from such membership. This orientation focuses as much on what citizens owe a society as on what a society owes citizens.

Third, the pastoral sees justice as demanding that we pay attention to the poor in our midst. While not a document in the style of liberation theology, the theology of the letter is clearly influenced by the option for the poor and the implications that option has for how wealth and power are allocated.

As such, the pastoral incorporates several traditional themes of Catholic social justice teaching. It also assimilates many developing themes and uses these to shape the vision of justice by which the American economic system can be evaluated.

CONCLUSIONS

The first area I wish to discuss is the vision of rights underlying the pastoral. If one looks at the theory of rights in medieval Catholicism, one can make the argument that this is really a theory of duties that one owes society and its members, as well as a specification of the corresponding obligations that society owes its members. These duties are derived from one's social position or role which was determined by one's birth into an hierarchically organized society. This network of social relations between citizen and community specified by one's social roles constitutes what Catholics understood as human rights. One had rights only in relation to duties and each was determined and specified through one's role in an hierarchical and organically unified society.

The theory of rights that emerged out the Enlightenment, the British libertarian tradition, and the French democratic tradition saw rights as claims of the individual against the state or as a means of creating a zone of privacy around the individual so he or she was protected from the interests of other individuals. This theory of rights sees the individual as separate from society, as an isolated unit with a set of idiosyncratic interests. The function of rights is to allow the individual to pursue those interests without or with as little outside interference as possible. These rights inhere in the individual as an individual and protect the individual from the potentially conflicting interest of others or the state.

The vision of rights alluded to but not clearly defined in the pastoral attempts to avoid either extreme. On the one hand, it is clear that our society is an heir more of the Enlightenment than of feudal social structures. We simply do not have a society that is organically or hierarchically structured the way feudal Europe was. On the other hand, we are experiencing the consequences of the atomistic individualism of the Enlightenment in that we seldom assume that individuals have anything in common, other than the desire to pursue self-interest. Autonomy, seen as the capacity for self-interested decision-making, is prized as the highest social and personal good.

The operative understanding of rights in the pastoral is an attempt to mediate between the medieval primacy of the community and the Enlightenment primacy of the individual. I use the term "operative understanding" because I do not think this view of rights is clearly articulated or, perhaps, even self-conscious. The theory of rights is, in the tradition of Vatican II, located within the person, as opposed to being a social role of the self-interested individual. This allows the theory to maintain a social dimension

while holding on to personal liberties. As a person, one needs a social context in which to mature. By being in a community of persons—as opposed to being in an aggregate of individuals—one can be nourished because there is a communality of needs. But precisely because one is a person, one transcends—but does not abandon—the community.

Such a vision of rights, centered as it is on the person in community, coheres well with an understanding of justice as reciprocal and participatory. People receive their empowerment to become persons through participation in the life of the community. Through the creation of structures which make such participation possible in the first place, persons return to others what they themselves have been given. By active participation in the development of a society that nurtures the majority of persons, one ensures a society that seeks the good of all while protecting the rights of each.

This is a vision that I sense is present in a beginning way in the pastoral. The pastoral is evidently attempting to overcome some of the failures of atomistic individualism, but it cannot solve this problem simply by imposing a feudal framework of hierarchically established duties on modern society. A vision of justice as participatory and reciprocal and of rights as centered in the category of the person is the beginning of the articulation of a position that can mediate between an exaggerated individualism and a suffocating communalism.

The theme of the option for the poor calls us to examine society from the category of marginalization. As noted above, if one is actively participating in society, one does not need a protector. One has experienced one's dignity and the empowerment that comes from that. Thus the pastoral notes that the first function of the option for the poor is to serve as a "prophetic mandate to speak for those who have no one to speak for them, to be a defender for the defenseless who, in biblical terms, are the poor."

From the perspective of the pastoral, the duty of justice and the vision of rights associated with it mandate that we look at the dimension of access to life in community. Access to community requires the right to work, to be a productive member of that society. The bishops approvingly quote John Paul II, who said in *Laborem Exercens* "Human work is a key, probably the essential key, to the whole social question." Work is the key to dignity because through work persons achieve self-realization, find self-fulfillment and self-identity and can contribute actively to society.

This religious orientation to this aspect of human dignity is caught well by Bellah who says: "Undoubtedly, the satisfaction of work well done, indeed the pursuit of excellence, is a permanent and positive human motive. Where its regard is the approbation of one's fellows more than the accumulation of great private wealth, it can contribute to what the founders of our republic called civic virtue. Indeed, in a revived social ecology, it would be a primary form of civic virtue."

Thus, the option for the poor, seen as the economic right of participation in community, is not warmed-over liberalism. It is the *sine qua non* of civic life. It is the means by which the minimal right of active participation in the community can be guaranteed.

Second, the option for the poor demands developing a vision which will help the church "to see things from the side of the poor, to assess lifestyle as well as social institutions and policies in terms of their impact on the poor." This aspect focuses on the dimensions of responsibility and reciprocity that run through the pastoral. One cannot simply take from the community and do nothing in return. This is an inadequate vision of rights and human dignity and has led to much disparity in our society. But an equally inadequate view of community is one which denies access to its resources to individuals and then wonders why they do not participate in social life.

The option for the poor rejects this type of victim blaming and asks that we leave our own personal achievements of human dignity and the power which it has helped us achieve and consider life from the perspective of the marginalized. The option for the poor requires that we ask how we can provide access to society for marginalized individuals and thus ensure their active participation.

This second dimension of the option for the poor helps us understand that justice requires that both society and the individual understand the responsibilities each has, but that we recognize that society is larger and more powerful than the individual. consequently, the option for the poor requires us to start an analysis of justice from the perspective of ensuring participation in society rather than wondering why people do not participate in the life of the community.

The third dimension of the option for the poor is the most radical for it requires an emptying of self, an experiencing "of the power of God in the midst of poverty and powerlessness." This is related to the previous point which requires us to abandon any position of privilege we have attained through no inherent merit of our own and to consider life from that perspective. This perspective can help us perceive and understand the impact different familial, cultural, ethnic, religious, racial and sexual starting points have on an individual's ability to participate in the life of the community.

This dimension of the option for the poor also helps us recall one of the most ancient of biblical traditions on property: it is social in nature and, consequently, the goods of the world exist for the good of all. This social understanding of property can help us enter into that emptying of self called for by the option for

the poor and will also help us avoid the idolatry of property by calling us to life in "faithful stewardship rather than selfish appropriation or exploitation of what was destined for all." This aspect of the option for the poor can help us re-establish an understanding of the common good.

Understanding property as the common trust of all can lead us to collaborative ventures in sharing and preserving it. Such a call to the emptying of self through a divestiture of an exclusive right to private property may be the most radical feature of the pastoral, for this dimension of the option for the poor does not ask, "Are you better off than you were four years ago?" It asks the much more difficult question, "Is your neighbor better off than he or she was four years ago?"

In its theory of justice and its three priority principles, the pastoral letter places concern for the poor at the heart of a theory of justice. It does this because the bishops—together with many others—realize that only by ensuring active participation in the life of a community can a society provide that level of engagement necessary to promote human dignity and to ensure the promotion of the rights of all. This is not liberalism; it is the best of the Catholic theory of social justice and the best of our American vision of civic responsibility.

This economic challenge we all face today has many parallels with the political challenge that confronted the founders of our nation. In order to create a new kind of political democracy they were compelled to develop ways of thinking and political institutions which had never existed before. Their efforts were arduous and imperfectly realized, but they launched an experiment in the protection of civil and political rights that has prospered through the efforts of those who came after them. Say the bishops:

> We believe the time has come for a similar experiment in economic democracy: the creation of an order that guarantees the minimum conditions of human dignity in the economic sphere for every person. By drawing on the resources of the Catholic moral-religious tradition, we hope to make a contribution to such a new "American experiment" in this letter.

Even though the dominant mode of the evaluation of the moral legitimacy of violence in the Catholic Christian tradition has been the just war theory, this theory carries with it the assumption that violence is to be justified. That is, one must start the moral analysis with the assumption that peace is to be preferred. This moral assumption has been given a new legitimacy in our day with the Vatican II assertion that we must approach the evaluation of war with an entirely new attitude. Additionally, the peace pastoral of the American bishops recognized the co-equality of pacifism with the just war tradition as a legitimate response to violence. Such orientations set loose a more critical look at the reality of war and the weapons required to conduct it.

Yet there remain the nagging comments that non-violence will never work, the enemy will crush the people and the will to resist cannot be sustained.

I propose that we may find a response to these comments in the decade of remarkable events in Eastern Europe that reached a graphic conclusion in Berlin in the final months of 1989. In particular we might look at Poland and the Solidarity movement as a specific example of the power of non-violence and what I call the exercise of democratic patience.

The victory of Solidarity did not come overnight, and it did not come without struggle, suffering, setbacks, and near despair. The flowering of Solidarity was halted, first gradually, then abruptly, when the movement was seen as getting out of hand, too popular, too powerful. The movement was banned for ten long, painful years. But during these years of repression, harassment, and dissent within Solidarity itself, the movement kept itself alive and engaged in acts of resistance and dissent. Secret printing presses were used to keep information in circulation. Secret radio and television transmitters cut in on official programs. The people continued to act as if they were free.

Such acts were hard and dangerous. People were arrested, people lived in fear, and invasion was a viable option, for the Russian army was there and quite visible. Resistance required daily acts of courage, daily acts of freedom, and daily acts of resistance.

Resistance also required what I call democratic patience. Recall that during the Vietnam War it was Ho Chi Minh who spoke of revolutionary patience as the foundation on which continuous acts of rebellion and revolution were grounded. He knew that revolution did not occur overnight, and so he preached patience.

Neither does democracy occur overnight. It must be planned for, it must be prepared for, it must be worked for in thousands of ways in the daily life of a people and each individual person. The people must be patient.

It is interesting to think of Panama in the light of the decade of democratic patience of Poland. Changes of enormous magnitude occurred in Poland with almost no shedding of blood. A new government was established which has the consent of the people. There is no occupying army. The cities and their buildings are intact.

Of course Poland does not have the promise of the US government to rebuild the cities it destroyed and to rebuild the economy. But the Poland with all its economic problems, I suspect, does not want to be a colony of the USA.

The USA could not wait for Noreiga to fall of his own internal corruption. It could not wait for the people to resist Noreiga. It could not wait for democracy to seize the imaginations of the people and lead them to resist. The USA did not exercise democratic patience.

Consequently almost every country in the world has condemned our actions, we have invaded another country and weakened our credibility, we have set up a government, we have destroyed a city, we have killed the innocent, and we continue to think that might makes right.

But look at the world united behind eastern Europe, look at the almost totally intact cities, look at—with the sole exception of Romania—the almost totally peaceful transfer of power. Decades of patience were required, and during those decades the seeds of freedom were being nurtured, the flame of freedom being kept alive, a people being prepared. Again with the exception of Romania, it has been utterly remarkable to see new governing structures spring into place almost instantly. Where did they come from; where were they hiding; where did they learn to lead?

Such groups were in jail, were in hiding, were moving among the people, were running clandestine organizations, were living as if free. And in the cauldron of democratic patience a free people was forged who were ready to assume their destiny.

Do not make the mistake of assuming that democratic patience is passive, is unengaged, is waiting around. Anything but. Democratic patience requires strenuous action, daily courage, active participation in the life of the country. What, also requires, though, is a cunning and a sense of timing, knowing when to push and when to wait, when to stand and when to bend. It accepts as equally valuable all the diverse acts of its people, those which may be more public and those which may be more private, for democratic patience knows that all acts make way for democracy to lay hold of the imagination of people and to prepare them for its presence.

The theory of rights outlined here, the option for the poor, and non-violent democratic patience all take us to a new way of being in society and provide us with a new method of social analysis. They will not change anything soon, but adopting their vision will transform us and make us people able to see when a new reality is present, a reality which has been growing within us and has now become ready to transform our society.

The Role of the Laity in the World

Some Reflections on *Christifideles Laici*

Georgia Masters Keightley

A central theme of the 1987 Synod on the Laity was the church's mission to the world. And as the papal exhortation *Christifideles Laici*—whose publication brought the synod to its official close—makes clear, the present situation is such that this task depends more than ever upon the committed and active participation of all the members of the church. To this end, the synod proposed to address the special and indispensable contribution of the Catholic laity.

As Vatican II reminded us, the church does not exist simply for itself. Although there have been periods in its history where self-interest and self-preservation have appeared to predominate, the council clearly taught that for the church to be the church, all of the baptized must constantly be about the work of evangelization. Individually and collectively, the church is obliged to be a potent sign of the salvation to which God calls men and women as well as the very instrument and means to this achievement.

Once again, a concern for mission has acquired new urgency because of the church's changed time and circumstance. Here one need only cite the declining number of vocations to the priesthood and religious life. At the same time and in addition to the task of taking the gospel to new people and territories, it has now become necessary to re-evangelize those parts of the world once Christian. In our context, this means that the church must seek to recapture the allegiance of those whom sociologists call "cultural Catholics." Furthermore, evangelization itself is recognized to be a far more complicated affair. To be effective, there is need to inculturate the gospel's meaning and values into the particular social context within which individuals live and work so as to enable their response to God's Word. And, finally, with the opening up of ministries within the church to the non-ordained, the hierarchy grows increasingly fearful that lay people have subsequently abandoned any interest in transforming the temporal sphere. This is of real concern because as Vatican II and *Christifideles Laici* observe, in most areas of contemporary life, the church has a presence virtually and only by means of its laity.

It is not hard to understand, then, why a major emphasis of *Christifideles Laici* is that responsibility for the church and its mission belongs to laity no less than to clergy and to stress that this obligation has its origins in the rite of Christian initiation. For this reason, *Christifideles Laici* reiterates Vatican II's claim that "with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in baptism and confirmation, the baptized share in the same mission of Jesus as the Christ, the Savior-Messiah" (#24). Like the former, *Christifideles Laici* also describes this responsibility in terms of the baptized's share in the threefold mission of Christ as priest, prophet and king (#14). According to most ancient tradition, the lay faithful are a priestly people in that their offering of self and the daily witness of their lives are conjoined to Christ's own offering. And thus, as worshippers whose every deed is holy, the world itself is consecrated by them to God. The laity also share Christ's prophetic mission: Not only are they active in the work of teaching and catechesis but also their faith is proclaimed in the very evidence of their lives. And, as participants in Christ's kingly mission, laity work for the spread of God's Kingdom in history. This they do not only by struggling against the reign of sin in themselves; they also seek renewal of the created order so that it might more fully benefit human life and well-being.

There are two things to note about the baptismal priesthood besides the central place *Christifideles Laici* gives it. First of all, the document takes care to note that participation in the three-fold office accrues to the individual because of his/her union with Christ. On this basis, the obligation to Christian mission is clearly not optional. Neither may it be perceived as being either deputed or derived; it comes directly from union with Christ himself. Secondly, and like Vatican II before it, *Christifideles Laici* uses the three-fold office as the model of what it means to be the church *in* the world. By this means, it underscores that the church takes historical shape, becomes a concrete presence, in

Dr. Keightley is an assistant professor of theology at Trinity College in Washington, DC. *The original version of this paper was delivered at Stonehill College for the 1989 ACCU Summer Conference on Justice and Peace Education.*

the activity of the baptized as they respond to the encounter with Word and Spirit as this is realized in the activity of worship, witness and service. Accordingly, the church comes to be what God intends for it, precisely in and through its efforts on behalf of the world. Implicit to this view, then, church and world are thoroughly relational concepts; one is constitutive of the other.

When *Christifideles Laici* moves on to look more closely at the nature of the lay task and at what the faithful's participation in church mission involves, the discussion comes up short. It does so in my view because what it has to say on this subject is not in keeping with what has already been said about the baptismal priesthood, its exercise and authority. A substantial factor here is the way in which lay life and experience are construed and interpreted: Many of *Christifideles Laici's* presuppositions as well as its conception of lay life and experience are either inappropriate or inadequate to the reality. This must be attributed to the essentially clerical standpoint from which the document was written and whose perspective it mainly reflects. Because of the fundamental importance of its subject and because I believe the document intends to invite dialogue and response from members of the lay church, I would like to indicate how from the vantage point of the lay theologian *Christifideles Laici's* examination of the church's activity in the world and especially its analysis of the laity's contribution in this regard misses the mark. Mainly I wish to call attention to the several ways in which the discussion is inadequate to or does not coincide with lay experience. This discrepancy is of no little consequence because how one views the world will determine the sort of praxis one adopts.

Consequently, a misreading here can seriously impede the church's carrying out of its divine charge.

THE RIGID SEPARATION OF CHURCH/WORLD

First of all, an assumption implicit throughout *Christifideles Laici* is that church and world are two quite separate, independent realities. Thus we see statements to the effect that laity, as "members of the church and citizens of human society," have two different sets of responsibilities. On the one hand, there are those duties pertaining to the "spiritual life and its demands"; on the other, there are those tasks associated with "secular life, that is, life in a family, at work, in social relationships, in the responsibilities of public life and in culture" (#59). Here it is suggested that on this account lay life risks taking the form of "two parallel lives" (#59). In another section, however, instruction is given that the lay faithful ought "to respect the autonomy of earthly realities." But especially, care must be exercised that a clear distinction is made between "the activities of Christians acting individually or collectively in their own name as citizens guided by the dictates of a Christian conscience and their activity in communion with their pastors in the name of the church" (#42).

Besides the inherent ambiguity of such statements, it is highly questionable that, because of its essential complexity, life today is or could be apprehended in so compartmentalized a fashion. Not only is it true that what happens in the workplace affects what goes on at home; private life itself can be dramatically affected by events occurring in remote points of the globe. Certainly we increasingly come to appreciate the radical interdependency of all persons and cultures. Thus, that a fundamental divorcement of church and world is the average lay person's experience must be challenged. Theologically, of course, this view conflicts with *Christifideles Laici's* own description of the baptismal priesthood; in these texts it seems understood that by virtue of regeneration and the Spirit's anointing, everything that the Christian does has implications either for or against the Kingdom. And, certainly a rigid separation of church/world conflicts with Vatican II's deliberate attempt to place the church not just *in* the world but at the very heart of the human enterprise, this for the purpose of bringing to light the world's very meaning and value.

In reality, this classic approach to church and world provides a way to identify what the hierarchy cites as being a major problem for the laity since the Vatican II; i.e., the unwarranted separation of faith from life. This is a theme sounded repeatedly through *Christifideles Laici*, and Section #59 is entirely devoted to the general failure of Catholics to exhibit any deep commitment for the public, socio-political order. Because of the dualistic framework upon which this charge is based, the impression is given here that one could have a very rich spiritual life on the one hand and yet be completely unfeeling, oblivious as far as humanity's social ills are concerned on the other. But, besides being at odds with the basic precepts of Christian tradition, i.e., that one could be Christian and ignore one's neighbor, Catholic moral theology has consistently taught that persons always act out of their passions, commitments, and values. More to the point, the presumption has been that such motivations ultimately derive from one's overarching beliefs about God, world, neighbor, and self.

On this score, then, if one finds Catholic praxis wanting, one must seek an explanation elsewhere. One must, for instance, consider that something essential may well be lacking in an individual's understanding of the faith, in his/her overall commitment to the full demands of Christian discipleship. On the other hand, one could also see this supposed lack of concern to be a direct result of the fact that traditionally, the moral stipulations placed on the laity have been rather minimalistic and relate to personal salvation almost entirely. Practically speaking, such demands have tended to

be defined narrowly and almost exclusively in terms of sexual morality. Indeed, it would not be inaccurate to say that for laity the litmus test for orthodoxy has consistently been the observance of correct sexual practices.

In this case what is needed is a vastly improved catechesis, a sustained effort by pastors and laity alike to make all the members of the church aware of the responsibilities that come with being the People of God; more importantly perhaps, what is wanted is not a carping criticism but a joyful reminder that effort on behalf of the Kingdom is a possibility at every moment of the Christian's life, in projects that are both great and small.

Perhaps what is needed most is a theological perspective that is able to address lay experience in a realistic way. What is necessary is a construal of experience that reflects the sure insight of feminist theory; i.e., that reality is best perceived in terms of a complex network of interlocking, interconnecting relations linking persons, systems, things. When considered in this light, the task of the church's teachers is not only to help individuals become aware of the multitude of relations that constitute their lives; priority will then be given to helping Christians see that the moral life involves a constant attending to the quality of these relations. On this basis, the goal of praxis is to see that that complex of networks upon which our lives depend supports and contributes to the well-being of every man and woman.

THE DISTORTED VIEW OF CHURCH MISSION

The rigid separation of church and world raises questions about their proper relation. How this is understood has implications for one's view of church mission as well as for one's ideas about the particular responsibilities of clergy and laity.

First of all, because the category of world is regularly defined over and against that of church, all that is identified as "worldly" tends to be cast in negative terms. Here one only need recall the longstanding belief that life in the world was inferior to that of the clerical state, that attainment of Christian perfection simply exceeded the possibilities of the laity because of their situation. Recently, and despite the emphasis given to the theology of creation by Vatican II, there seems to be a return to the pessimistic vision of the past. Thus we see *Christifideles Laici* reading the "signs of the times" in terms of religious indifference and atheism, radical secularism, continued violation of human rights and dignity, materialism, consumerism, threats to life, etc. (#s 3-6).

I would guess that most lay people, no matter what their situation, would prefer to assess their lives in terms of the good things, e.g., the simple pleasures associated with the community of family and friends, and to see the signs of the times in terms of the progress humanity has made against disease, the hard-won achievement of human rights and liberties, an improved standard of living, or perhaps some struggled-for personal success. Not only would laity tend to be more hopeful about the world than is evidenced in most recent church documents; some laity might even go so far as to argue that life in the world is far less oppressive than life within the church!

Because of this ambiguity about the world, two schools of thought eventually emerged in respect to the object of church mission. On the one hand, there were those of the belief that everything temporal must ultimately be brought into and made church. On the other hand, there were those who, convinced that the world is a source of sin and distraction, held that it was something that the Christian ought to avoid and/or ignore. Social injustice in this case was simply attributed to God's mysterious plan; it was also seen to be a way of testing the sturdiness of the believer's faith. But in both cases, church mission was seen to center on the effort to bring individuals into the economy of salvation by incorporating them into the church.

Coalescence of Vatican II's positive assessment of the world, rediscovery of New Testament eschatology and the critical efforts of libertion theologians, however, have served to underscore the fact that the gospel also commits the church to other equally indispensable forms of service. As indicated above, evangelization is seen to require not only the incarnation of Christian meanings and values into history and culture as a *preparatio evangelium*. It also demands attention to the concrete situation of men and women, it requires the church to secure justice and liberation on their behalf.

But practically speaking—and due in part to the continuing influence of an old ecclesiology and to notions associated with a neo-scholastic theology of grace, a distinction has informally been made between a specifically religious, "official," mission which belongs to the clergy—i.e., that associated with proclamation and celebration of the sacraments—and the "unofficial" mission of daily witness and social outreach which belongs to the laity. Vatican II, in fact, defines the laity as those who seek "the Kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God." The church's ministers, on the other hand, are described as those endowed with sacred power who "preach the gospel, shepherd the faithful and celebrate divine worship as true priests of the New Testament" (LG #28).

Controversy in the post-Vatican II era over the degree to which involvement by clergy and religious in projects clearly social or political in nature is consistent with their own charism has served to make the laity's unofficial mission more explicitly and exclusively theirs. John Paul II has been especially adamant that practical responsibility for the secular is to be restricted to laity. However, such a division of responsibility, giving clergy exclusive care of the church and laity care for the world, not only seems to contradict the teach-

ing about the baptismal priesthood but also creates a widening gap between clergy and lay, both in terms of status and task. At minimum, it creates severe difficulties for a genuine collaboration between the two, and nowhere does this become more obvious than at the parish level. One might also ask what assigning the church's social outreach primarily to laity says about the importance, the status, of this work, particularly in light of the laity's own ambiguous place within the church, in light of the paucity of ecclesial resources and authority they can command, and in light of their virtual inability to act collectively and publicly in the name of the church?

Christifideles Laici does allow that clergy have a legitimate public role, but this is essentially limited to a prophetic, critical stance *vis a vis* society and culture. Nonetheless, a closer reading reveals that while laity are assigned the actual work of transforming systems and structures, final discernment and judgment as to how this should proceed is, in the end, a right zealously guarded and reserved to the church's pastors. In this, *Christifideles Laici* appears to depart quite dramatically from that attitude prevalent at Vatican II. That is to say, some council documents appeared quite content to assign development of an authentic Catholic praxis to the laity, this in recognition of their expertise and superior knowledge of secular affairs.

Such considerations, surprisingly, are scarcely to be found in *Christifideles Laici*, and the overall impression is given that the laity's basic charge is to enact a social agenda devised by the magisterium, an agenda valid for local churches everywhere because what is proposed is based on eternal principles deduced from the gospel and tradition. In *Christifideles Laici*, in other words, there appears to be a subtle return to the old Catholic Action model as the ideal for lay/clergy collaboration. Such an approach seems problematic, however, in that it ignores the fact that, realistically, praxis takes shape in the decisions of the moment and these tend to be culturally and socially bound. Too, it ignores that in most sectors of experience, laity are far more expert than clergy, that Catholic identity itself is articulated—albeit informally—in the day-to-day witness and example of laity before the world. Furthermore, it has been traditionally recognized that this witness of lived faith itself has a distinct authority of its own, that it too represents a significant *locus theologicus*.

In respect to its overall view of church mission, about the nature of the task and the specific roles and responsibilities of church members, *Christifideles Laici* not only leaves many questions unanswered; it generates significant new ones.

THE MISREPRESENTATION OF LAY LIFE AND EXPERIENCE

There are several ways in which *Christifideles Laici* misrepresents lay life and experience. For example, the tendency to explain reality in dichotomous terms carries over into *Christifideles Laici's* description of lay existence. Hence, the latter is described rather simplistically and by way of such pairs as man/woman, public/private, home/work, the person/society. Again, while modern experience is pluralistic and diverse, it is debatable that most individuals apprehend it in such either/or terms or by way of such isolated, unconnected fragments. As indicated above, a relational paradigm seems far better able to grasp the lived reality of contemporary Catholics.

A second misconception has to do with *Christifideles Laici's* failure to recognize the fact that in many ways, the lay struggle is simply to find any identifiable religious meaning in the routine business of the everyday, let alone understand the relevance of this activity for church mission. Yet the truth is, it is precisely in the service of the everyday that laity fulfill the church's missionary purpose. Unfortunately, because *Christifideles Laici* uses such general categories to describe the reality of lay existence (it speaks of lay life in such broad terms as politics, economics, culture, marriage and family), the document somehow fails to make the point that it is actually in the way we go about our daily business that the Kingdom is duly served.

A third way in which *Christifideles Laici* misrepresents lay experience is in its tendency to identify human creativity almost exclusively with the physical capacity to reproduce sexually. In its dogged effort to promote its preferred vision of marriage and family, *Christifideles Laici* unfortunately misses the opportunity to affirm that it is in the creativity of mind and imagination that men and women also share in God's own image, the divine power. This neglect seems a particular irony in light of the fact that much of this document is really about how human ingenuity must be put to work creating more inclusive structures, better forms of social life, in order to create a more humane world—and for the Christian, a world that testifies to the truth that behind it is a beneficent power that upholds and sustains it.

Mainly, however, *Christifideles Laici* completely misses lay life's essential character of "in-between-ness," of existing in the "now-not-yet" between time of the Kingdom. In other words, there does not seem to be an appreciation that for the church's lay members Christian existence is riddled with ambiguity since it is a matter of living in a less than perfect, sinful, and sin-filled world. For one thing, there are decided limits as to what each of us may or may not do. The daily business of existence itself simply dominates our lives. For another, we commonly find ourselves obliged to make discomfiting compromises. Thus, while the magisterium teaches that we must be ardent peacemakers, some of us support our families by working in defense industries or at the Pentagon. And so while *Christifideles Laici* urges lay women to accept humbly their Christian voca-

tion to motherhood, many of us—for what in our judgment are extremely good reasons—opt to control fertility by means of artificial contraception. Many of us as we go about our business as financial managers, brokers, and bankers wonder what an "option for the poor" really means for someone in our situation. Neither can our political decisions be as clearcut as we would like. Sometimes we find we must decide in favor of a candidate who does not support the church's teaching on life issues but who does have an impressive record on such fundamental human issues as housing for the homeless, civil rights, and affirmative action.

Because we do live in this period of the in-between and because of the ambiguity of the situations that confront us, Catholic laity are in need of a supportive, interim ethic to help shape our lives in an authentically Christian way. What is wanted is an ethic that holds us to the basic values of our tradition on the one hand but on the other is also flexible enough to help us confront the new challenges life in this world continually presents. In short, it must be an ethic that takes for granted that we are sinners and that most decisions about our lives tend to be messy, imperfect ones. Above all, it must be an ethic that allows that compromise itself can oftentimes be a means to the Kingdom's growth.

To facilitate the lay effort for the Kingdom then, *Christifideles Laici* might have been better advised to take a more practical, realistic approach to life in the world. Instead, what it does set out is a rather clear agenda for the lay church as well as the moral principles deemed necessary to its implementation. In doing so, however, *Christifideles Laici* seems not to recognize that the priorities it espouses do not always coincide with those that life thrusts upon individual laity. And too, laity, because of their context and particular experience, may not see either the issues or the priorities in the same way as these may be seen from the hierarchy's own limited standpoint. Likewise, *Christifideles Laici* gives no indication that Christian values can indeed come into conflict, that hard decisions about these inevitably must be made. Neither does the text seem to appreciate that values/virtues are themselves radically socially and culturally bound; they will not only take on shades of meaning implicit to a specific context, but they will also be determined by the character of the individual lives that incarnate and uphold them.

And so, despite *Christifideles Laici's* claim that the hierarchy must have virtual control over the articulation of Catholic identity and praxis, it is evident that this realistic, interim ethic must be developed for the most part by laity who have knowledge and expertise in such areas as science, technology, economics—and of course, theology—and who simply have the experience of living the life of the world. At the same time, and certainly in the American context, such ought to be the charge of Catholic professionals who would gather regularly for dialogue and exchange in order to elaborate moral criteria to facilitate both the creation and evaluation of the systems that regulate our life in community. On the other hand, discussion about what constitutes a suitable Catholic praxis in today's world, whether in terms of family issues or public policy, ought to be an on-going part of the life of each local church. A goal here would be to identify how the lives of the individual members actually contribute to the parish's witness; here too, a major effort would be to foster and support the unique charisms with which the Spirit has gifted the local community.

One very important task of Catholic laity, and one about which *Christifideles Laici* seems almost silent, is the submission of new areas of experience to moral scrutiny. A ready example is the growing presence today of what is called the "New Class," a rising class of individuals that earns its livelihood from the manipulation of knowledge. The emergence of this new social elite with its power base in the knowledge industry brings with it distinctive ideological commitments and perspectives. And, as sociologist Barbara Hargrove suggests, the church cannot afford simply to ignore this phenomenon or decry its appearance. Rather, theologians must take care to identify and then affirm those positive values (e.g., the developed social interests, the concern for personal growth and freedom) that are implicit to this worldview at the same time as they seek to temper New Class emphasis on technical rationality, the disproportionate attention given to skill and efficiency. Certainly this dialogue seems a necessary effort in light of the fact that Catholic educational institutions—by means of their business and professional schools—contribute to the growth of this class with each generation of students they produce.

FAILURE TO TAKE SERIOUSLY THE CHURCH'S CATHOLICITY

While *Christifideles Laici* is addressed to the entire body of the laity, its discussion of their role in church mission pays little heed to the fact that the church—as essential to its unity—is a community of pluralism, that indeed the local churches are quite diverse, that this is a result not only of the variety of the charisms each has received but also a product of the differences created by their special cultural, historical, and social circumstance. Avery Dulles defines catholicity as "that quality of being universal, complete or all-embracing"; in this regard, Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium* asserts that each part of the church "brings its particular gifts to the other parts and to the whole Church, so that the whole and the individual parts are enriched by the mutual sharing of gifts and the striving of all for fullness in unity . . ."(LG#13). While *Christifideles Laici*

duly acknowledges the Spirit's manifold gifts, there is here no real effort to consider or explore the rich resources available for the church's mission to the world by way of the charisms present within the body of the world by way of the charisms present within the body of the laity. While appreciation of the possibilities here was expressed at the synod itself, *Christifideles Laici*, strangely, neglects the opportunity to explore the personal and collective resources, the skills, aptitudes, ingenuity, talents, the proficiencies obtained through education, cultural experience, and history that are in plentiful supply throughout the church. Of course, if one does take the theology of charisms seriously, one would be obliged to admit that priests and religious too may be called to the worldly work of transforming the public systems by which we all live.

More to the point, a reflection on the diversity of gifts would highlight the fact that laity are not called to a single type of service, that Catholics will carry out their baptismal commitment in many different forms of activity, and at all different levels—all because of their different abilities and their diverse circumstances. Thus, some Third World laity may contribute to the common good as bankers, lawyers, and government workers while First World laity may do so as farmers, clerks, day laborers, and babysitters. The point to be observed here, of course, is that church praxis will not nor need not be uniform, that realistically, the praxis developed by First World laity will differ from that praxis appropriate to or even possible for the laity of the Third World. On the other hand, it should not go unremarked that Catholic energy expended in each context will inevitably seek convergence so as to become the source of an improved and more just national/international order.

By taking the church's diversity seriously, the significance of context for understanding—and hence, for reforming—social systems themselves would also become evident. For example, Christian values will take shape differently in democratic societies than in Marxist societies. But this is to be expected of a praxis that is authentically Catholic. Furthermore, the inherent relatedness of all social systems will better be seen and taken into account. As Michael Novak has well argued about democratic capitalism, because it is actually comprised of "three dynamic and converging systems functioning as one," if one system becomes skewed, the other two will be necessarily and proportionately affected. On this basis, if the economic system is judged to be in need of correction so as to bring about a more equitable distribution of its benefits, then the other components of democratic capitalism—the polity and the moral-cultural order—need adjustment as well.

In this way catholicity, besides being a fact of the church's life, has significant implications for the understanding of church mission and, in particular, for delineating the laity's contribution in this regard. Successful praxis then, will not only take into account the interrelatedness, the contextual character of all experience it will also presume that every praxis is necessarily partial and limited in scope. To this end, the task of looking after the structures of existence will require a correct analysis of the situation, an honest assessment of the resources available, and an effective collaboration between the different sectors of the church.

Again, by not taking seriously the church's unity in diversity, *Christifideles Laici* has missed the opportunity to deepen the entire community's appreciation of what the laity bring to the Body of Christ. More importantly perhaps, the document has missed an opportunity to ponder the meaning of catholicity and, in this way, to advance the self-understanding of the entire church.

THE COLLABORATIVE CHARACTER OF CHURCH MISSION

That the church's outreach to the world is a collaborative venture is a premiss of the baptismal priesthood. All those who are united in Christ are understood to share responsibility for both the community's institutional life and its mission. Collaboration is also a premiss of the ecclesiology of communion which is the fundament upon which *Christifideles Laici's* entire teaching rests. Confirmation of this is to be found in the tersely worded statement of paragraph #32: "Communion gives rise to mission and mission is accomplished in communion."

Furthermore, one of the most interesting texts of *Christifideles Laici* (Section #52) reads: "The coordinated presence of both men and women is to be pastorally urged so that the participation of the lay faithful in the salvific mission of the church might be rendered more rich, complete, harmonious." By way of emphasis, the relation existing between man and woman, husband and wife, is then described as being the ideal form of human collaboration. Not only does this ideal find support in the social argument: "it is natural for man and woman to share life together." *Christifideles Laici* further testifies that this arrangement has sound theological ground. That is, this state of affairs is said to be part of the Creator's original plan. It was the divine intent that man and woman be the "prime community of persons, the source of every other community"; it was also His plan that the relation between the two be a "sign" of that "interpersonal communion of love which constitutes the mystical, intimate life of God, Three in One."

While in context, the point of this statement is to allay fears that efforts to promote women's increased involvement in ecclesial life has brought about a proportionate decline in men's participation and perhaps, then, even to suggest that pastors make sure that such imbalance, where it exists, be carefully rectified.

Nonetheless, this text raises a rather obvious question: why shouldn't the model of collaboration recommended for the laity be equally applicable for life throughout the church? If a spirit of collaboration is natural to the human condition, if indeed it is part of God's plan, why then shouldn't church structures themselves be based on this same *modus operandi*?

This seems a worthwhile question to ask because the notion of collaboration presupposed in this instance—even though it derives from the vision of married life thoroughly identified with western culture—intimates a spirit of cooperation, mutuality, generosity, accommodation, service, charity, and friendship. The service of Christians, if carried out in such a way, would not only make an impressive witness to the gospel but would also be an effective means of carrying out the church's worldly charge. But while recently there has been considerable interest in establishing a greater degree of collegiality among the hierarchy, as for example in the recent debate over the status of bishops' conferences, it is not apparent that there is a like concern that a spirit of collegiality be operative at all levels of church life. But why shouldn't this be the case?

Other texts of *Christifideles Laici* suggest a quite different definition of collaboration. For instance, and as we have already seen, there are texts implying that while clergy bear responsibility for the church, laity take charge of the world. In this case, collaboration appears to mean being faithful to one's explicit obligation, to be depended upon to carry out one's prescribed task. There are other texts too that suggest collaboration means that laity simply carry out the instructions provided them by the hierarchy. But in neither case is collaboration understood to require any degree of mutuality and sharing such as the first definition presupposes.

One way in which *Christifideles Laici* marks an advance in the hierarchy's thinking is its advocacy and support for groups founded on lay initiative. It is recognized that not only can such group efforts provide a more effective form of Christian service; they are also seen as a means of creating a spirit of solidarity and strengthening of bonds among the laity. Associations initiated by laity also give convincing testimony to the church's own *communio*. But here too, while *Christifideles Laici* extols the collaborative effort among the laity—it is said to be a natural way to operate because we are inherently social beings—it is also emphasized that all such efforts must in the end be subject to clerical review and judgment. The question is: doesn't such control by clergy actually take away from the specifically lay character of such initiatives? Doesn't this involvement by pastors betray an unwarranted paternalism? Finally, is such an attitude consistent with the authority that comes with the baptism into Christ and the ordinary priesthood?

CONCLUSION

With this brief discussion of collaboration, this reflection on the role of the laity in the world comes to a close. If my remarks have appeared overly critical, it is simply because I believe *Christifideles Laici* to be an important document and one that certainly deserves to be read and taken seriously by the lay church. The subject of church mission itself is a significant one and one that has potent implications for lay Catholic existence, both now and in the future. But as it stands, this document does little to deepen our understanding of all that is at stake here. The fundamental point I have wished to make is that ultimately, a successful and/or meaningful Catholic praxis depends upon the correctness of the community's vision of the world and, subsequently, to this analysis, its understanding of what the Catholic community's contribution must be. To this end, it would have been a distinct advantage if *Christifideles Laici* had been the product of a truly collaborative venture undertaken by people, priests, religious, bishops and pope together.

But that perhaps, is the whole point!

Beyond the Ivory Tower: Some Guidelines for Social Justice Education

Edward A. Malloy, CSC

Some time ago, a futurologist writing in *The Christian Science Monitor* listed six great issues facing humanity at the turn of the millennium. He had compiled the list based on interviews with leading personalities in the United States and abroad. The first great issue—and the most prominent—was the dilemma of nuclear war, because it calls into question the very survival of the species. The next four issues were as you might imagine—for example, the relationship between the First and the Third Worlds. But the last one was the most curious. This group of national and international leaders felt that one of the most troubling issues to be faced in the 1990s and beyond was the breakdown of public and private morality. Their fear was that we could not even begin to address some of the other pressing issues unless we first could agree on common values with which to build public consensus. These commentators felt that we desperately needed an operative framework within which we could address basic questions like the nature of a healthy family, the role of women, ecological sensitivity, world hunger, and other planetary crises.

Higher education can contribute to the solution of these problems in a number of ways, including the research carried on at our institutions and the open forum we provide for discussion and debate on the foremost issues of the day. Our principal contribution, however, is our preparation of students—in the classroom and beyond—to be both able and willing to tackle these issues.

The education that comes beyond the classroom is my focus here, in particular the idea of experiential education, the university as the setting for this kind of education, and some related theses of my own.

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION

I don't know, of course, how particular individuals first become involved in matters of ethics, of social justice and of peace. I suppose all of us have our own stories, anecdotes that we can tell about our past, about our upbringings, about the encounters that we had in our neighborhoods and in our educations and afterwards. All I know is that some people are more acutely aware than others of questions of social justice. Trying to account for that, and, more importantly, trying to stimulate it in the next generation, is, I think, a central element of our collective mission.

Let me tell my story of becoming "involved." As an undergraduate student at Notre Dame, I had come from a city, Washington, DC, in which I had known and had some exposure to the whole question of race and its significance. I had observed in the District a certain measure of the poverty that exists in any major urban setting. And I had come from a family that took religious values seriously and, therefore, when major issues were debated in the newspapers or on television and radio, my sisters and I had only to ask to learn what our parents' opinions were. As a family we were urban Catholics in a city with a majority black population which was also the nation's Capital.

My first two years at Notre Dame were relatively uneventful. However, one day during my junior year I overheard a conversation in the hall concerning a group of students who were going to Mexico. Because I was a scholarship athlete, I had a certain amount of economic flexibility in the summer, and this allowed me to consider being part of the project myself. The idea came completely "out of the blue." All I can say is that I happened to hear a conversation and my curiosity was aroused. As it turned out, however, that summer venture was for me the opening of a whole new world. I learned during that and subsequent trips to Peru and to other parts of Mexico that the kinds of questions I took back to the classrooms of Notre Dame were radically different from those I was accustomed to asking. I began to have a real awareness of inequality, of inequitable distribution of wealth, of cultural discrimination, and of many other conditions I had read about in books and heard about in lectures, but which until then had not sunk in in quite the same way. A

Father Malloy is president of the University of Notre Dame. This paper was first delivered as an address at Loyola Marymount University for the 1987 ACCU Summer Conference on Justice and Peace Education.

liveliness and an intense curiosity toward the educational opportunities available to me in the university setting flowed naturally from the experiences that I had in the summer.

Twenty years later, I was provided another opportunity to broaden my perspective of justice and peace matters when I participated in a two-week Maryknoll program for university educators which in some ways replicated what I had been through as a student. However, now I brought a different kind of vision. Now the relevant question was what could I do as a teacher to communicate this intellectual experience in ways appropriate to the classroom and the pulpit.

Finally, under the auspices of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, several years ago I went to Costa Rica to explore what the relationship might be between the United Nations' University of Peace and various Catholic institutions. This time it was not so much a coming to grips with the reality of poverty, but rather exploring a related question—was there an intercultural context in which the question of peace could be explored more effectively than just within national boundaries?

On the basis of these personal encounters over some 25 years, I see two kinds of experiential education—one a brief immersion and the other a sustained, long-term commitment. Both have a place in education, for often the second flows out of the first.

An example of the brief immersion is a program called the Urban Plunge—a 48-hour exposure to a side of American life with which most university students are not personally acquainted. It has the following qualities: It's *raw*, i.e., it's a disjunctive situation; it doesn't conform to what the typical student has known firsthand before. It's *concentrated*: Students see a great deal more than they can absorb. And it's *personally unprecedented*. Part of the impact is that the students have not had that kind of opportunity before. The rawness, I think, makes a huge difference. If you are going to structure something to jog or stimulate someone's consciousness, it's got to be poignant enough to be different from what people are accustomed to.

A second feature of the brief immersion is that it must be *structured*. If a program is going to make maximum use of little time, students can't spend it in cars or buses or walking around with no sense of what they are seeing. Also crucial is the question of who supervises the experience. People who work day after day in these same settings are the best guides. In fact, one of the major problem's we've faced as a national school with Urban Plunges set up in more than 60 sites around the country is ensuring that there are enough willing and qualified supervisors.

A third component of the brief immersion is what happens when the students return to campus. To reinforce their experiences, students should be asked to write about them and also should be given the opportunity to compare notes with fellow students who have had similar experiences.

Whether one calls it an Urban Plunge or a Rural Plunge or an Appalachian Experience, there is great value to these brief immersions—and because of the modest demand on students' time, these programs offer fewer excuses for not participating. Our experience at Notre Dame suggests that this seemingly minimal activity often is the beginning of a real commitment by students to assume a substantial, long-term role in the pursuit of social justice.

This second stage of experiential learning has its own necessary elements. The first is *meaningful work* sustained long enough (Here is the importance of summers.) that one can become part of the rhythm of life of a people and place, can allow the sights, the smells and the sounds to get into your soul, in a sense. Even now, for example, I can call to mind some of the places that I've been in Peru and Chile and Mexico and still can almost smell the garbage dumps that one walks by, the sewage, the dust in the air. I can see the bloated stomachs and the dilapidated housing and all the consequences of the lack of water. The unemployed sitting around, the neighborhood drunks making a scene at night keeping everybody awake, the dogs yapping, the cats yowling—whether in this country or abroad, becoming part of the rhythm of life is essential to having a real experience of poverty.

Time for discussion and reflection, both with experts and with the local people, is readily available in these longer-range projects and can help reveal the underside of things. For example, I am an "urban freak." I like to give tours of cities. On occasion I have taken people to a street corner in a major city and said, "I would like you to stand here for forty-five minutes, and then I would like you to tell me what you see. Then we'll talk about it, and I'll tell you what I see since I may have a little more experience and background." The same can be done on a trip to an urban park to watch the dynamics, or by having people explore the same setting in the morning, at lunchtime, at dinnertime and at night. All of this is to get people to begin to appreciate the different worlds of the same site, to give them new perspectives on what's really going on. The panhandlers and the pickpockets, the sexual overtures, the drugs—all those things are there, but people often cannot see them.

The final component of the semester or summer project is debriefing. What happens when people return from long-range projects? Who engages them in conversation and reflection? What do they read? If they have kept a diary or a journal, who helps them sort out their experiences? This is the essential component that universities and colleges can provide to make experiential learning a pedagogically sound experience. Once students have had these opportunities, what they

bring to the books and to the classroom or into the laboratories is considerably enhanced.

THE UNIVERSITY SETTING

From my vantage point—as a person who's been a teacher and lived in a dorm (and still does) and now as an administrator entrusted with responsibility for the institution as a whole, including social justice and peace education—at this particular moment of American Catholic history, the question of institutional self-definition is critical. Institutional survival and well-being are a direct function of our preservation of a meaningful self-definition. What does it mean to be a Catholic college or university? We all know that debate; it goes on endlessly. (I am always amused to hear people not in Catholic education asking each other what it means to be a secular institution. Anyway, we are not the only people who go through this.)

Institutional self-definition—for us, what it means to be a Catholic school—encompasses, I think, these requirements: serious regard for the range of courses students take (including, for many institutions, requirements in philosophy and theology); the provision of opportunities for worship; concern for pastoral care; and (and I stress the equal importance of this) the inculcation of a commitment to social responsibility as citizens and as members of the church. Because this last objective can only be accomplished if students have come to grips in some organized way with the major issues of the day, social justice education is crucial and necessary for Catholic colleges and universities.

Administrators must thoroughly integrate social justice education into institutional priorities. This means structuring the common life to provide maximum opportunities for students and others to grapple in some organized way with the great issues. It means looking closely at both our sources and uses of funds. If social justice is used as a goad to interest people in the university, but if the money raised in that way is spent for other purposes, then our actions obviously are inconsistent with our stated mission.

And administrators must serve as models—inside and outside the university community. What the president and the provost do, what the deans and other administrators do with their time—the issues and the programs they are interested in—all of this makes a significant difference in how people view the university. At Notre Dame we have organized an Urban Plunge for administrators and local community leaders. Fifteen of us participated in a recent one. We went to about twelve agencies—the welfare department, the county jail, the state prison. We visited alternate treatment programs for prisoners. We went to the county prosecutor's office and to an institution that takes care of the physically and mentally handicapped. We stopped at a house where students and ex-cons live together and try to form a community. We did all of this with the president of a local bank, with two corporate CEOs, with a local politician and others from the university. It was a very healthy interaction, one that established a momentum for the years ahead.

Faculty involvement with and support of justice and peace education is essential to the full integration of these subjects into the academic life of the university. Curriculum structuring is the first hurdle to overcome. A number of years ago during his presidency of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh attempted to establish a values seminar for seniors. Arts and Letters people nodded, "Wonderful idea"; most of the rest of the faculty sighed, "Who's going to teach this material?" Beset by faculty fears of stepping outside their areas of professional training and by faculty indifference, the seminar never got off the ground. Since then, proposals have been made to require all students to investigate social justice issues either through an experiential learning project or through particular courses, but the closest we've come to that has been an improvement of our course offerings combined with many extracurricular activities.

Why are such proposals for a curricular base for social justice issues resisted by the faculty? Partly, I think, the reluctance stems from the absence of a preparatory graduate school specialization, partly it reflects our habit of passing along responsibility for social justice education, and partly it reveals a real fear on people's parts that if they are forced to do this, they are going to be so noticeably incompetent that their careers will be somehow damaged. There also are people, of course, who are just totally uninterested in social justice. We have to admit that. But the larger problem has more to do with specialization and fear than with lack of interest.

A second faculty concern is whether justice and peace education is soft or hard reflection. Is there room, they ask, for analysis and criticism or will it be just a recitation of soft-hearted and idealistic progressivism. Answering this question makes it evident that scholarly consideration of social justice must engage the very best minds, and that faculty who teach in this area full-time must be respected among their peers as teachers and scholars who can hold their own with anyone. Quality, that is essential.

That said, the question of hard or soft reflection still is not an easy one to sort out, much like the question of quantitative versus qualitative analysis in economics or political science. Is all knowledge distilled in computer programs or are the real questions about social values unearthed in the research and writing we do? My instinct as an ethicist is always to beware the temptation of the "quick fix" and to see complexity rather than simplicity. Give me any issue or problem, and I'll usually identify 25 variables that must be taken into account and perhaps seven alternative courses of

action. That's the way I've been trained, the way I think, and when someone steps up to tell me there is only one way to see a particular issue and only one course to follow, my every instinct bristles and says, "That's just not true." Part of what people mean by the distinction between hard and soft analysis is the recognition that reality is much more diverse and complex than simple schemes of amelioration often allow for.

The third area of faculty involvement in social justice education is ethics. We must continue to push across the boundaries, not to allow faculty to relegate all consideration of ethics to the College of Arts and Letters. The inclination to consider these issues generally is stronger in the humanities, the social sciences and the fine arts and may not be so prevalent elsewhere in the university.

Ethics actually is a growth business right now. In recent academic history, it began with the Hastings Institute, which focuses on biomedical ethics. Hastings was followed by the Kennedy Institute at Georgetown and then a number of other centers and institutions devoted to ethical discussion. The topics taken up have ranged from war and peace to business ethics.

More recently, all of the major professions have been subject to intense scrutiny. When a prominent denizen of Wall Street gives $20 million to the Harvard Business School to solve the profession's problems, that would appear to signal a general malaise. In law, in medicine, in government service, in education, in the ministry, in fact throughout the so-called classic professions, there are symptoms of failure—not in terms of the rigor of preparation, not in terms of the difficulty of entry, not in terms of existence and communication of codes of ethics, but in terms of adherence to and enforcement of those codes by members of the professions. This is the persistent dilemma of professional life in our time, and its solution must involve educational institutions. But what of students? How can they be motivated to become interested and involved in social justice education? I have suggested experiential education as the first step. But what will prompt them to volunteer in the first place? It's not enough to trust to chance—to imagine that they, as I did, will overhear someone talking down the hall when they happen to have a summer free and adequate financial support to permit them to participate. First, we have to be better at public relations. The leaders among our students must be identified and cultivated, which means confronting head-on the premature professionalization of our students and their prepackaged career paths, i.e. "I'm pre-med; I don't have any time for that stuff" or "Engineering takes every hour that I have." One approach is to give increased prominence and visibility to students who already have participated in social service projects and can be effective spokespersons among their peers.

Another fact to be met head-on is the financial need of many individuals. Students who otherwise would eagerly participate in a summer service project, for example, may simply not be able to forego the income from a summer job. At Notre Dame a program underwritten by our alumni clubs and by the James F. Andrews Scholarship Fund (established in memory of the Notre Dame alumnus who cofounded Universal Press Syndicate) addresses this problem by providing Social Concerns Tuition Scholarships of $1,400 to eligible students who spend eight weeks as part of a project assisting the poor in an alumni club city. Aside from solving students' financial problems, this program provides all the other benefits of interaction I mentioned earlier. Before, during and after the experience, the students have regular opportunities to discuss social concerns with the members of the sponsoring alumni club, with the social service professionals involved in the programs, and with the people being assisted.

So successful has this program been, in fact, that Yale and Stanford now are establishing their own programs based on ours.

One concern at Notre Dame which I suspect also applies to other schools is how to increase participation in these programs by men, who—at least proportionately—are far less likely than women to become involved. One of the healthy characteristics of the American Catholic Church, compared with the church in Europe, has been the widespread involvement of men in every facet of church life, including voluntary associations. That image, however, is called into question when it comes to male student involvement in social justice matters. It's a situation that needs to be publicly aired and addressed.

Minority student participation in social justice work also lags. Many who have lived or live close to the raw experience in their own lives are reluctant to revisit such situations. They are striving to be part of the success story, the elite who have broken out. To be too quickly thrust back into an all too familiar situation can be a very frightening and unpleasant experience. Ironically, then, those students with the most relevant personal experiences don't want to relive them, although if they would, they could be great interpreters and bridge builders.

SOME THESES

By way of conclusion, I offer the following assorted theses—all apropos to education for justice and peace.

Experience enlivens consciousness.

This is not a new nor a dramatic claim. Experience cannot, however, always be firsthand. The direct, immediate experience of poverty or violence or conflict is only one vehicle for involving people in matters of justice and peace. There is also the way of the imagination, of symbol, of story. In my personal reading on questions of war and peace, for example, Walter Miller's novel *A Canticle for Lebowitz* intensely moved

me. Similarly, in Stanley Kubrick's film *Barry Lyndon* there is a striking image of the insanity of war—troops marching across a field into intense cannon fire, never ducking but marching upright in classic 19th century military style. The same film examines the irony of dueling with its code of honor and rubrical niceties. Novels and films such as these, as well as thematic art, certainly have enhanced my ability to engage in sophisticated and subtle discussion about war and its alternatives.

Universities and colleges are particularly well suited to promote this artistic stimulation. Readings, film series and art displays ought to be an integral part of our efforts to enliven the consciousness of our communities.

Reality is complex, and progress toward justice and peace is usually slow and difficult.

If one is fully reflective and reads the literature and works with the people in the front lines, it is easy to become discouraged and lose hope. That's why it's so difficult to sustain people's interest in these issues. To recognize signs of progress, to celebrate even minor victories, is crucial to the process of developing a lifetime commitment to social justice and peace.

The worst alternative is to lose hope.

We need stories of success. We need heroic figures. We need to repeat again and again the stories of individuals like Martin Luther King, Jr., and Dorothy Day and others of their calibre who persisted in protest against injustice, even sacrificing their lives, either directly or more slowly over time. On the other hand, how many individuals have taken on an impressive agenda of service activities only to be emotionally overwhelmed in the process, either from lack of support or because their understanding of the burden they had assumed was too naive. The worst alternative is to lose hope.

Colleges and universities as institutions are better at analysis than at advocacy.

This is perhaps a controversial theory, but, I believe, accurate. Colleges and universities are best suited to dissect problems, describe their components and organize alternatives. There is always pressure on institutions, however, to advocate movements, causes or prophetic stances. When institutions and their leadership refuse to become formal advocates of various causes, accusations of weak will and lack of courage inevitably follow. My response is that the way we structure ourselves is in itself a kind of advocacy, but with regard to particular causes, I continue to counsel great caution. Advocacy is best left to the various concerned organizations that flourish within the university or college community.

Colleges and universities are and should be places where the church does its thinking.

Father Ted Hesburgh insisted on this point throughout his career, and I wholeheartedly agree. One of the great achievements in Catholic history is the system of higher education in this country. Not to appreciate the success and the influence that our institutions have had on the well-being of the church as well as the nation is, I think, very short-sighted. The church indeed does its thinking in our institution. Our institutional self-definition, our mission, our role, is indispensable to the church as a community of thinking and discourse as well as of service.

Homily

ACCU Conference on Justice and Peace Education
Chapel of Mary
Stonehill College — July 8, 1989

John J. Egan

Each of us hearing the readings today may be thinking to himself or herself—how do I measure up in my life and work to what is required? What is the level and quality of my mercy, kindness, patience, forgiveness? Am I true to His word? Do I think and act as a "true believer"?

We know, of course, that Jesus' words were spoken to *a community*—His small band of disciples. Paul was successful—to my mind—because he had the genius *to organize* local churches. His letters were written not to individuals, except in a few instances, but to *communities* of Christians.

As a faith community, we continue to explore the meaning of life and the complexity of motivation in our lives—what is the framework for meaning—and how far do we walk, work and suffer for the other?

What we are about in justice and peace education programs in our colleges and universities, it seems to me, must be the building of those tough and committed *communities of conscience*, as Father Bryan Hehir terms them—groups committed to the proposition that the justice issue is not an extra-curricular activity, but at the heart of the total Gospel, which is thoroughly social.

It is our task, as Pope John Paul declared to the educators in his first U.S. visit, "to train young men and women of outstanding knowledge, who, having made a synthesis of faith and culture, will be both capable and willing to assume tasks in the service of the community . . . and to bear witness to their faith before the world."

Today, our personal lives, social organizations and institutions, including the church, and even humanity itself, all are bound up in a bewildering process of social and cultural change which place the future in our own hands.

The Lord has given each of us that special call to be among His people in the midst of life. We announce the Good News that history does have meaning and life has purpose, that there are promises still to be realized, promises which will, in God's time, bring all of us to a Kingdom that will be ours because it will be His.

The community of scholars in the Catholic college or university—students, faculty, administrators, yes, and alumni and friends—should create for students that model of respect for the dignity of all and of learning how people live and work together. Students expect more from their professors than professional competence. They expect from them a shared vision of what is worthy of attention as they search for their own arenas of commitment and dedication.

The Catholic college or university worthy of the name must train students and faculty that their mission as Christians is to love and sacrifice for the people with whom they work and live, in the neighborhoods, the cities and towns, the nation.

Our concern—and indeed enmeshed in the very fabric of every dimension of the college and university—must be empathy with the impoverished parent struggling to feed children, with handicapped persons who strive to rise above their disabilities, with the elderly, the homeless, the unemployed, the disenfranchised. Rooted deeply in our Gospel values, the Catholic college and university must always fight for justice for those caught at the outskirts of our society.

Will our graduates be signs of the presence of Christ in the family, in their workplaces, in their neighborhoods? We labor to help them understand and carry out their responsibilities in the areas where life fashions salvation. We struggle to encourage their collective reflection on daily ethical issues which arise on the job. We urge their growth in a well honed ability to examine their work in the light of faith in the searing concrete settings in which they will continually find themselves.

The Catholic college and university must help them ask the critical questions. What does it mean in a pluralistic society to combine authentic faith with contemporary questions and peer pressures? What is the relationship between medicine and health in this community? Is there an enviable relationship between law and justice in the courtrooms, jails and parole systems of our city?

Msgr. Egan is assistant to the president for community affairs at DePaul University.

How can people who work in these systems—and others—combine experience, values and skills to help each other make those systems function for the common good?

The American bishops' voices stir us to ask: What is our economy, national and international, doing *to* people and *for* people and how do people participate more fully in it?

We know at the very least we need a dramatic revival of concern for the common good, for commitment to the public interest. We know that we must inspire and motivate for the required shared sacrifices which will be demanded of us all. Most of all we need a revival of hope and of intelligence, of willingness to face our problems honestly, the imagination to develop new ideas and the courage to test them through experimentation.

Beware of the tragic "seven last words" from the faint of heart: "We never did it this way before."

The road to justice at home, and ultimately to justice and peace in international relations, lies through a revival of dedication to the public life of our local communities, states and nations.

"The laity are the key social action agents of the church in the world. They are the critical point of insertion in transforming Christian action in the arenas of economics and politics," writes Jesuit John Coleman in his *An American Strategic Theology*.

Therefore, we have to ask: Are our justice and peace education programs aimed at helping lay people prepare themselves to play their own autonomous role as Christians in the temporal order? Are we personally and our programs stimulating and adequately oriented toward the formation of authentic lay leaders who will exercise their apostolate, not in and through church organizations, but in their secular occupations?

I come from the generation that was fashioned on the philosophy and apostolate of "like to like"—lawyer to lawyer, teacher to teacher—but we lacked the ecclesiology and courage to make it a dynamic reality.

In former days, we referred to some of our number as "labor priests" and, therefore, they were treated as outside the mainstream of Catholic life. We must not let this happen with justice and peace education.

Unless our justice and peace education programs move beyond theory—*while* the students are in college, and yes, in high school—and into involvement in communities, our students will not learn the principles or organization and commitment to the "long haul."

As Father Ferree told us four decades ago: The *act* of social justice *is* organization.

So much of our concern has centered on justice and peace on the international scene— and with much justification. So a great many of our students are more exercised, if at all, about China, Panama, Guatemala and Afghanistan than they are about the new robber barons in our stock exchanges, the practices of discrimination in the workings of real estate boards, or the racial exploitation of corporations, and the corruption of our city councils.

A quarter of a century ago, Father James Burtchaell of Notre Dame chaired a conference of men and women concerned about religiously committed higher education.

"Those who share in the work," he said, "should ask how they can become more flexible yet effective, proud and explicit rather than bashful or devious about their religious commitment, more aggressive in their critique of an unquestioned American way of life."

At the conclusion of their days together, the conference participants published a statement which read in part: "(The task of the Christian college) is to develop a community of scholars through which Jesus Christ is witnessed to the in world by their persistent pursuit of further truth, no matter how discomfiting, by the spirit of comradeship they share among themselves, and by their resolution to offer whatever wisdom is theirs for the service of their brothers and sisters."

If we do our work well in justice and peace education, it is our graduates, as Christians, as workers, as citizens, as a caring community, as a community of conscience, informed and inspired and supported by the church, who will act on behalf of justice and participate in the transformation of the world.

Then . . .
Kindness and truth shall meet;
justice and peace shall kiss.
Truth shall spring out of the earth,
and justice shall look down from heaven.
The Lord himself will give his benefits;
our land shall yield its increase.
Justice shall walk before him
and salvation, along the way of his steps.

Peace with God the Creator
Peace with All of Creation

Pope John Paul II

Message for the January 1, 1990, World Day of Peace

INTRODUCTION

1. In our day there is a growing awareness that world peace is threatened not only by the arms race, regional conflicts and continued injustice among peoples and nations, but also by a lack of due respect for nature, by the plundering of natural resources and by a progressive decline in the quality of life. The sense of precariousness and insecurity that such a situation engenders is a seedbed for collective selfishness, disregard for others and dishonesty.

Faced with the widespread destruction of the environment, people everywhere are coming to understand that we cannot continue to use the goods of the earth as we have in the past. The public in general as well as political leaders are concerned about this problem, and experts from a wide range of disciplines are studying its causes. Moreover, a new ecological awareness is beginning to emerge which, rather than being downplayed, ought to be encouraged to develop into concrete programs and initiatives.

2. Many ethical values fundamental to the development of a peaceful society are particularly relevant to the ecological question. The fact that many challenges facing the world today are interdependent confirms the need for carefully coordinated solutions based on a morally coherent worldview.

For Christians, such a worldview is grounded in religious convictions drawn from revelation. That is why I should like to begin this message with a reflection on the biblical account of creation. I would hope that even those who do not share these same beliefs will find in these pages a common ground for reflection and action.

I. "AND GOD SAW THAT IT WAS GOOD"

3. In the book of Genesis, where we find God's first self-revelation to humanity (Gn. 1-3), there is a recurring refrain: "And God saw that it was good." After creating the heavens, the sea, the earth and all it contains, God created man and woman. At this point the refrain changes markedly: "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good" (Gn. 1:31). God entrusted the whole of creation to the man and woman, and only then— as we read—could he rest "from all his work" (Gn. 2:3).

Adam and Eve's call to share in the unfolding of God's plan of creation brought into play those abilities and gifts which distinguish the human being from all other creatures. At the same time, their call established a fixed relationship between mankind and the rest of creation. Made in the image and likeness of God, Adam and Eve were to have exercised their dominion over the earth (Gn. 1:28) with wisdom and love. Instead, they destroyed the existing harmony by deliberately going against the Creator's plan, that is, by choosing to sin. This resulted not only in man's alienation from himself, in death and fratricide, but also in the earth's "rebellion" against him (cf. Gn. 3:17-19; 4:12). All of creation became subject to futility, waiting in a mysterious way to be set free and to obtain a glorious liberty, together with all the children of God (cf. Rom. 8:20-21).

4. Christians believe that the death and resurrection of Christ accomplished the work of reconciling humanity to the Father, who "was pleased . . . through (Christ) to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (Col. 1:19-20). Creation was thus made new (cf. Rv. 21:5). Once subjected to the bondage of sin and decay (cf. Rom. 8:21), it has now received new life while "we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pt. 3:13). Thus, the Father "has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery . . . which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, all things in heaven and things on earth" (Eph. 1:9-10).

5. These biblical considerations help us to understand better the relationship between human activity and the whole of creation. When man turns his back on the Creator's plan, he provokes a disorder which has inevitable repercussions on the rest of the created order. If man is not at peace with God, then earth itself cannot be at peace: "Therefore the land mourns and all who dwell in it languish, and also the beasts of the field and the birds of the air and even the fish of the sea are taken away" (Hos. 4:3).

The profound sense that the earth is "suffering" is also shared by those who do not profess our faith in God. Indeed, the increasing devastation of the world of nature is apparent to all. It results from the behavior of people who show a callous disregard for the hidden, yet perceivable requirements of the order and harmony which govern nature itself.

People are asking anxiously if it is still possible to remedy the damage which has been done. Clearly, an adequate solution cannot be found merely in a better management or a more rational use of the earth's resources, as important as these may be. Rather, we must go to the source of the problem and face in its entirety that profound moral crisis of which the destruction of the environment is only one troubling aspect.

II. THE ECOLOGICAL CRISIS: A MORAL PROBLEM

6. Certain elements of today's ecological crisis reveal its moral character. First among these is the indiscriminate application of advances in science and technology. Many recent discoveries have brought undeniable benefits to humanity. Indeed, they demonstrate the nobility of the human vocation to participate responsibly in God's creative action in the world. Unfortunately, it is now clear that the application of these discoveries in the fields of industry and agriculture have produced harmful long-term effects. This has led to the painful realization that we cannot interfere in one area of the ecosystem without paying due attention both to the consequences of such interference in other areas and to the well-being of future generations.

The gradual depletion of the ozone layer and the related "greenhouse effect" has now reached crisis proportions as a consequence of industrial growth, massive urban concentrations and vastly increased energy needs. Industrial waste, the burning of fossil fuels, unrestricted deforestation, the use of certain types of herbicides, coolants and propellants: All of these are known to harm the atmosphere and environment. The resulting meteorological and atmospheric changes range from damage to health to the possible future submersion of low-lying lands.

While in some cases the damage already done may well be irreversible, in many other cases it can still be halted. It is necessary, however, that the entire human community—individuals, states and international bodies—take seriously the responsibility that is theirs.

7. The most profound and serious indication of the moral implications underlying the ecological problem is the lack of respect for life evident in many of the patterns of environmental pollution. Often the interests of production prevail over concern for the dignity of workers, while economic interests take priority over the good of individuals and even entire peoples. In these cases, pollution or environmental destruction is the result of an unnatural and reductionist vision, which at times leads to a genuine contempt for man.

On another level, delicate ecological balances are upset by the uncontrolled destruction of animal and plant life or by a reckless exploitation of natural resources. It should be pointed out that all of this, even if carried out in the name of progress and well-being, is ultimately to mankind's disadvantage.

Finally, we can only look with deep concern at the enormous possibilities of biological research. We are not yet in a position to assess the biological disturbance that could result from indiscriminate genetic manipulation and from the unscrupulous development of new forms of plant and animal life, to say nothing of unacceptable experimentation regarding the origins of human life itself. It is evident to all that in any area as delicate as this, indifference to fundamental ethical norms or their rejection would lead mankind to the very threshold of self-destruction.

Respect for life, and above all for the dignity of the human person, is the ultimate guiding norm for any sound economic, industrial or scientific progress.

The complexity of the ecological question is evident to all. There are, however, certain underlying principles which, while respecting the legitimate autonomy and the specific competence of those involved, can direct research toward adequate and lasting solutions. These principles are essential to the building of a peaceful society; no peaceful society can afford to neglect either respect for life or the fact that there is an integrity to creation.

III. IN SEARCH OF A SOLUTION

8. Theology, philosophy and science all speak of a harmonious universe, of a "cosmos" endowed with its own integrity, its own internal, dynamic balance. This order must be respected. The human race is called to explore this order, to examine it with due care and to make use of it while safeguarding its integrity.

On the other hand, the earth is ultimately a common heritage, the fruits of which are for the benefit of all. In the words of the Second Vatican Council, "God destined the earth and all it contains for the use of every individual and all peoples" (*Gaudium et Spes*, 69). This has direct consequences for the problem at hand. It is manifestly unjust that a privileged few should continue to accumulate excess goods, squandering available resources, while masses of people are living in conditions of misery at the very lowest level of subsistence. Today the dramatic threat of ecological breakdown is teaching us the extent to which greed and selfishness—both individual and collective—are contrary to the order of creation, an order which is characterized by mutual interdependence.

9. The concepts of an ordered universe and a common heritage both point to the necessity of a more internationally coordinated approach to the management of the earth's goods. In many cases the effects of ecological problems transcend the borders of individu-

al states; hence their solution cannot be found solely on the national level. Recently there have been some promising steps toward such international action, yet the existing mechanisms and bodies are clearly not adequate for the development of a comprehensive plan of action. Political obstacles, forms of exaggerated nationalism and economic interests—to mention only a few factors—impede international cooperation and long-term effective action.

The need for joint action on the international level does not lessen the responsibility of each individual state. Not only should each state join with others in implementing internationally accepted standards, but it should also make or facilitate necessary socio-economic adjustments within its own borders, giving special attention to the most vulnerable sectors of society. The state should also actively endeavor within its own territory to prevent destruction of the atmosphere and biosphere by carefully monitoring, among other things, the impact of new technological or scientific advances. The state also has the responsibility of ensuring that its citizens are not exposed to dangerous pollutants or toxic wastes. The right to a safe environment is ever more insistently presented today as a right that must be included in an updated charter of human rights.

IV. THE URGENT NEED FOR A NEW SOLIDARITY

10. The ecological crisis reveals the urgent moral need for a new solidarity, especially in relations between the developing nations and those that are highly industrialized. States must increasingly share responsibility, in complementary ways, for the promotion of a natural and social environment that is both peaceful and healthy. The newly industrialized states cannot, for example, be asked to apply restrictive environmental standards to their emerging industries unless the industrialized states first apply them within their own boundaries. At the same time, countries in the process of industrialization are not morally free to repeat the errors made in the past by others and recklessly continue to damage the environment through industrial pollutants, radical deforestation or unlimited exploitation of non-renewable resources. In this context, there is urgent need to find a solution to the treatment and disposal of toxic wastes.

No plan or organization, however, will be able to effect the necessary changes unless world leaders are truly convinced of the absolute need for this new solidarity, which is demanded of them by the ecological crisis and which is essential for peace. This need presents new opportunities for strengthening cooperative and peaceful relations among states.

11. It must also be said that the proper ecological balance will not be found without directly addressing the structural forms of poverty that exist throughout the world. Rural poverty and unjust land distribution in many countries, for example, have led to subsistence farming and to the exhaustion of the soil. Once their land yields no more, many farmers move on to clear new land, thus accelerating uncontrolled deforestation, or they settle in urban centers which lack the infrastructure to receive them. Likewise, some heavily indebted countries are destroying their natural heritage, at the price of irreparable ecological imbalances, in order to develop new products for export. In the face of such situations it would be wrong to assign responsibility to the poor alone for the negative environmental consequences of their actions. Rather, the poor, to whom the earth is entrusted no less than to others, must be enabled to find a way out of their poverty. This will require a courageous reform of structures as well as new ways of relating among peoples and states.

12. But there is another dangerous menace which threatens us, namely war. Unfortunately, modern science already has the capacity to change the environment for hostile purposes. Alterations of this kind over the long term could have unforeseeable and still more serious consequences. Despite the international agreements which prohibit chemical, bacteriological and biological warfare, the fact is that laboratory research continues to develop new offensive weapons capable of altering the balance of nature.

Today, any form of war on a global scale would lead to incalculable ecological damage. But even local or regional wars, however limited, not only destroy human life and social structures, but also damage the land, ruining crops and vegetation as well as poisoning the soil and water. The survivors of war are forced to begin a new life in very difficult environmental conditions, which in turn create situations of extreme social unrest, with further negative consequences for the environment.

13. Modern society will find no solution to the ecological problem unless it takes a serious look at its lifestyle. In many parts of the world, society is given to instant gratification and consumerism while remaining indifferent to the damage which they cause. As I have already stated, the seriousness of the ecological issue lays bare the depth of man's moral crisis. If an appreciation of the value of the human person and of human life is lacking, we will also lose interest in others and in the earth itself. Simplicity, moderation and discipline, as well as a spirit of sacrifice, must become a part of everyday life, lest all suffer the negative consequences of the careless habits of a few.

An education in ecological responsibility is urgent: responsibility for oneself, for others and for the earth. This education cannot be rooted in mere sentiment or empty wishes. Its purpose cannot be ideological or political. It must not be based on a rejection of the modern world or a vague desire to return to some "paradise lost." Instead, a true education in responsibility entails a genuine conversion in ways of thought and behavior.

Churches and religious bodies, non-governmental and governmental organizations, indeed all members of society, have a precise role to play in such education. The first educator, however, is the family, where the child learns to respect his neighbor and to love nature.

14. Finally, the aesthetic value of creation cannot be overlooked. Our very contact with nature has a deep restorative power; contemplation of its magnificence imparts peace and serenity. The Bible speaks again and again of the goodness and beauty of creation, which is called to glorify God (cf. Gn. 1:4ff; Ps. 8:2; 104:1ff; Wis. 13:3-5; Sir. 39:16, 33; 43:1, 9). More difficult perhaps, but no less profound, is the contemplation of the works of human ingenuity. Even cities can have a beauty all their own, one that ought to motivate people to care for their surroundings. Good urban planning is an important part of environmental protection, and respect for the natural contours of the land is an indispensable prerequisite for ecologically sound development. The relationship between a good aesthetic education and the maintenance of a healthy environment cannot be overlooked.

V. THE ECOLOGICAL CRISIS: A COMMON RESPONSIBILITY

15. Today the ecological crisis has assumed such proportions as to be the responsibility of everyone. As I have pointed out, its various aspects demonstrate the need for concerted efforts aimed at establishing the duties and obligations that belong to individuals, peoples, states and the international community. This not only goes hand in hand with efforts to build true peace, but also confirms and reinforces those efforts in a concrete way. When ecological crisis is set within the broader context of the search for peace within society, we can understand better the importance of giving attention to what the earth and its atmosphere are telling us; namely, that there is an order in the universe which must be respected, and that the human person, endowed with the capability of choosing freely, has a grave responsibility to preserve this order for the well-being of future generations. I wish to repeat that the ecological crisis is a moral crisis.

Even men and women without any particular religious conviction, but with an acute sense of their responsibilities for the common good, recognize their obligation to contribute to the restoration of a healthy environment. All the more should men and women who believe in God the Creator, and who are thus convinced that there is a self-defined unity and order in the world, feel called to address the problem. Christians, in particular, realize that their responsibility within creation and their duty toward nature and the Creator are an essential part of their faith. As a result, they are conscious of a vast field of ecumenical and inter-religious cooperation opening up before them.

16. At the conclusion of this message, I should like to address directly my brothers and sisters in the Catholic Church, in order to remind them of their serious obligation to care for all of creation. The commitment of believers to a healthy environment for everyone stems directly from their belief in God the Creator, from their recognition of the effects of original and personal sin, and from the certainty of having been redeemed by Christ. Respect for life and for the dignity of the human person extends also to the rest of creation, which is called to join man in praising God (cf. Ps. 148:96).

In 1979, I proclaimed St. Francis of Assisi as the heavenly patron of those who promote ecology (cf. apostolic letter *Inter Sanctos*: AAS 71 (1979), 1509f). He offers Christians an example of genuine and deep respect for the integrity of creation. As a friend of the poor who was loved by God's creatures, St. Francis invited all of creation—animals, plants, natural forces, even Brother Sun and Sister Moon—to give honor and praise to the Lord. The poor man of Assisi gives us striking witness that when we are at peace with God we are better able to devote ourselves to building up that peace with all creation which is inseparable from peace among all peoples.

It is my hope that the inspiration of St. Francis will help us to keep ever alive a sense of "fraternity" with all those good and beautiful things which almighty God has created. And may he remind us of our serious obligation to respect and watch over them with care, in light of that greater and higher fraternity that exists within the human family.

What is Happening to Our Beautiful Land

A 1988 Pastoral Letter of the Episcopal Conference of the Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The Philippines is now at a critical point in its history. For the past number of years we have experienced political instability, economic decline and a growth in armed conflict. Almost every day the media highlight one or other of these problems. The banner headlines absorb our attention so much so that we tend to overlook a more deep-seated crisis which, we believe, lies at the root of many of our economic and political problems. To put it simply; our country is in peril. All the living systems on land and in the seas around us are being ruthlessly exploited. The damage to date is extensive and, sad to say, it is often irreversible.

One does not need to be an expert to see what is happening and to be profoundly troubled by it. Within a few short years brown, eroded hills have replaced luxuriant forests in many parts of the country. We see dried up river beds where, not so long ago, streams flowed throughout the year. Farmers tell us that, because of erosion and chemical poisoning, the yield from the croplands has fallen substantially. Fishermen and experts on marine life have a similar message. Their fish catches are shrinking in the wake of the extensive destruction of coral reefs and mangrove forests. The picture which is emerging in every province of the country is clear and bleak. The attack on the natural world which benefits very few Filipinos is rapidly whittling away at the very base of our living world and endangering its fruitfulness for future generations.

As we reflect on what is happening in the light of the Gospel, we are convinced that this assault on creation is sinful and contrary to the teachings of our faith. The Bible tells us that God created this world (Gen. 1:1); that He loves His world and is pleased with it (Gen. 1: 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, and 31); and that He created man and woman in His image and charged them to be stewards of His creation (Gen. 1: 27-28). God, who created our world, loves life and wishes to share this life with every creature. St. John tells us that Jesus saw His mission in this light. "I have come that they may have life and have it to the full" (Jn. 10:10).

We are not alone in our concern. Tribal people all over the Philippines, who have seen the destruction of their world at close range, have cried out in anguish. Also men and women who attempt to live harmoniously with nature and those who study ecology have tried to alert people to the magnitude of the destruction taking place in our time. The latter are in a good position to tell us what is happening since they study the web of dynamic relationships which supports and sustains all life within the earthly household. This includes human life.

A CALL TO RESPECT AND DEFEND LIFE

At this point in the history of our country it is crucial that people motivated by religious faith develop a deep appreciation for the fragility of our islands' life systems and take steps to defend the Earth. It is a matter of life and death. We are aware of this threat to life when it comes to nuclear weapons. We know that a nuclear war would turn the whole earth into a fireball and render the planet inhospitable to life. We tend to forget that the constant, cumulative destruction of lifeforms and different habitats will, in the long term, have the same effect. Faced with these challenges, where the future of life is at stake, Christian men and women are called to take a stand on the side of life.

We, the Catholic bishops of the Philippines, ask Christians and all people of goodwill in the country to reflect with us on the beauty of the Philippine land and seas which nourish and sustain our lives. As we thank God for the many ways He has gifted our land we must also resolve to cherish and protect what remains of this bounty for this and future generations of Filipinos. We are well aware that, for the vast majority of Filipinos, the scars on nature, which increasingly we see all around us, mean less nutritious food, poorer health and an uncertain future. This will inevitably lead to an increase in political and social unrest.

WE SEE THE BEAUTY AND THE PAIN OF THE EARTH

As you read this letter or listen to sections of it being read, scenes from your barrio may come to mind. In your mind's eye you may see well laid out rice pad-

dies flanked by coconuts with their fronds swaying in the breeze. Or you may hear the rustle of the cogon grass on the hills behind your barrio. These scenes mean so much to us and are beautiful. Yet they do not represent the original vegetation with which God has blessed our land. They show the heavy hand of human labor, planning and sometimes short-sightedness.

For generations the hunting and food gathering techniques of our tribal forefathers showed a sensitivity and respect for the rhythms of nature. But all of this has changed in recent years. Huge plantations and mono-crop agriculture have pitted humans against nature. There are short-term profits for the few and even substantial harvests, but the fertility of the land has suffered and the diversity of the natural world has been depleted. So our meditation must begin by reflecting on the original beauty of our land, rivers and seas. This wonderful community of the living existed for millions of years before human beings came to these shores.

THE FORESTS

When our early ancestors arrived here, they found a country covered by a blanket of trees. These abounded in living species—over 7,500 species of flowering plants, not to mention animals, birds and insects. These were watered by the tropical rains which swept in from the seas and gradually seeped down through the vegetation and soil to form clear flowing rivers and sparkling lakes which abounded in fish and aquatic life before completing the cycle and returning to the sea. An incredible variety of insects lived in the forest and were busy with all kinds of tasks from recycling dead wood to pollinating flowering plants. The community of the living was not confined to creatures who walked on the Earth. Birds flew through the air, their bright plumes and varying calls adding color and song to the green of the forests. Birds are also the great sowers. They contributed greatly to the variety of plant life which is spread throughout the forest. Finally, small and large animals lived in the forest and feasted on its largesse. Our land born out of volcanic violence and earthquakes brought fourth a bounty of riches. We stand in awe at the wisdom of our Creator who has fashioned this world of life, color, mutual support and fruitfulness in our land.

OUR SEAS

The beauty did not end at the shoreline. Our islands were surrounded by blue seas, fertile mangroves and enchanting coral reefs. The coral reefs were a world of color and beauty with fish of every shape and hue darting in and out around the delicate coral reefs. *Perlas ng Silanganan* was an appropriate name for this chain of wooded islands, surrounded by clear seas, studded with coral reefs.

CREATION IS A LONG PROCESS

You might ask: Why is it important to remember the original state of our land? First of all, it reminds us of how God, in his wisdom and goodness, shaped this land in this part of the world. It did not happen over night. It took millions of years of care and love to mould and reshape this land with all its beauty, richness and splendor, where intricate pathways bind all the creatures together in a mutually supportive community. Human beings are not alien to this community. God intended this land for us, his special creatures, but not so that we might destroy it and turn it into a wasteland. Rather, He charged us to be stewards of his creation, to care for it, to protect its fruitfulness and not allow it to be devastated (Gen. 1:28, 9:12). By protecting what is left of the rainforest we insure that the farmers have rain and plants for the food that sustains us.

OUR FORESTS LAID WASTE

How much of this richness and beauty is left a few thousand years after human beings arrived at these shores? Look around and see where our forests have gone. Out of the original 30 million hectares there is now only 1 million hectares of primary forest left. Where are some of the most beautiful creatures who used to dwell in our forests? These are God's masterpieces, through which he displays his power, ingenuity and love for his creation. Humans have forgotten to live peacefully with other creatures. They have destroyed their habitat and hunted them relentlessly. Even now many species are already extinct and the destruction of species is expected to increase dramatically during the next decade as the few remaining strands of forest are wiped out by loggers and *kaingineros*. What about the birds? They used to greet us each morning and lift our spirits beyond the horizons of this world. Now they are silenced. In many places all we hear now are cocks crowing. Where is the soaring eagle circling above the land or the colorful kalaw?

THE HEMORRHAGE OF OUR LIFE BLOOD

After a single night's rain look at the chocolate brown rivers in your locality and remember that they are carrying the life blood of the land into the sea. Soil, instead of being the seed bed of life, becomes a cloak of death, smothering, retarding and killing coral polyps. Soil specialists tell us that we lose the equivalent of 100,000 hectares of soil one meter thick each year. We are hardly aware of this enormous loss which is progressively eroding away our most fertile soil and thus our ability to produce food for an expanding population. Any comprehensive land reform must address this most serious threat to our food supply.

DESERT IN THE SEA

How can fish swim in running sewers like the Pasig and so many more rivers which we have polluted? Who has turned the wonder world of the seas into underwater cemeteries bereft of color and life? Imagine: Only 5% of our corals are in their pristine state! The blast of dynamite can still be heard on our coastal waters. We still allow *muro-ami* fishing methods which take a terrible toll both on the young swimmers and the corals. Mine tailings are dumped into fertile seas like Galancan Bay in Sta. Cruz, Marinduque, where they destroy forever the habitat of the fish. Chemicals are poisoning our lands and rivers. They kill vital organisms and in time they will poison us. The ghost of the dreaded Minamato disease hangs over towns in the Agusan river basin and the Davao gulf.

RECENT DESTRUCTION CARRIED OUT IN THE NAME OF PROGRESS

Most of this destruction has taken place since the beginning of this century, a mere wink of an eye in the long history of our country. Yet in that time we have laid waste complex living systems that have taken millions of years to reach their present state of development.

We often use the word progress to describe what has taken place over the past few decades. There is no denying that in some areas our roads have improved and that electricity is more readily available. But can we say that there is it real progress? Who has benefitted most and who has borne the real costs? The poor are as disadvantaged as ever and the natural world has been grievously wounded. We have stripped it bare, silenced its sounds, and banished other creatures from the community of the living. Through our thoughtlessness and greed we have sinned against God and His creation.

One thing is certain: We cannot continue to ignore and disregard the Earth. Already we are experiencing the consequence of our shortsightedness and folly. Even though we squeeze our lands and try to extract more from them, they produce less food. The air in our cities is heavy with noxious fumes. Instead of bringing energy and life it causes bronchial illness. Our forests are almost gone, our rivers are almost empty, our springs and wells no longer sparkle with living water. During the monsoon rain, flash-floods sweep through our towns and cities and destroy everything in their path. Our lakes and estuaries are silting up. An out-of-sight, out-of-mind mentality allows us to flush toxic waste and mine tailings into our rivers and seas in the mistaken belief that they can no longer harm us. Because the living world is interconnected, the poison is absorbed by marine organisms. We in turn are gradually being poisoned when we eat seafood.

WE CAN AND MUST DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT

It is already late in the day and so much damage has been done. No one can pinpoint the precise moment when the damage becomes so irreversible that our living world will collapse. But we are rapidly heading in that direction. Even now there are signs of stress in every corner of our land. As we look at what is happening before our eyes, and think of the horrendous consequences for the land and the people, we would do well to remember that God, who created this beautiful land, will hold us responsible for plundering it and leaving it desolate. So will future generations of Filipinos. Instead of gifting them with a fruitful land, all we will leave behind is a barren desert. We, the bishops, call on all Filipinos to recognize the urgency of this task and to respond to it now.

As Filipinos we can and must act now. Nobody else will do it for us. This is our home; we must care for it, watch over it, protect it and love it. We must be particularly careful to protect what remains of our forests, rivers, and corals and to heal, where ever we can, the damage which has already been done.

The task of preserving and healing is a daunting one given human greed and the relentless drive of our plunder economy. But we must not lose hope. God has gifted us with creativity and ingenuity. He has planted in our hearts a love for our land, which bursts forth in our songs and poetry. We can harness our creativity in the service of life and shun anything that leads to death.

SIGNS OF HOPE

Despite the pain and despoliation which we have mentioned, there are signs of hope. Our forefathers and our tribal brothers and sisters today still attempt to live in harmony with nature. They see the Divine Spirit in the living world and show their respect through prayers and offerings. Tribal Filipinos remind us that the exploitative approach to the natural world is foreign to our Filipino culture.

The vitality of our Filipino family is also a sign of hope. Parents share their life with their children. They protect them and care for them and are particularly solicitous when any member of the family is sick. This is especially true of mothers; they are the heartbeat of the family, working quietly in the home to create an atmosphere where everyone is accepted and loved. No sacrifice is too demanding when it comes to caring for a sick member of the family. The values we see in our families of patient toil, concern for all and a willingness to sacrifice for the good of others are the very values which we must now transfer to the wider sphere in our efforts to conserve, heal, and love our land. It is not a mere coincidence that women have been at the forefront of the ecological movement in many countries. The tree planting program of the

Chipko in India popularly known as the "hug a tree" movement, and the Green belt movement in Kenya spring to mind.

We call to mind that, despite the devastation which has taken place in our forests and seas, we Filipinos are sensitive to beauty. Even in the poorest home, parents and children care for flowers. We are also encouraged by the growth in environmental awareness among many Filipinos. Small efforts which teach contour ploughing, erosion control, organic farming, and tree planting can blossom into a major movement of genuine care for our Earth. We are happy that there have been some successes. Both the Chicho dam project was suspended and the Ratnan nuclear plant mothballed after massive local resistance. This year the people of San Fernando, Bukidnon and Midslip, Zamboanga del Sur defended what remains of their forest with their own bodies. At the Santa Cruz Mission in South Cotabato serious efforts are underway to reforest bald hills and develop ecologically sound ways of farming. The diocese of Pagadian has chosen the eucharist and ecology as its pastoral focus for this year. These are all signs for us that the Spirit of God, who breathed over the waters, and originally brought life out of chaos is now prompting men and women both inside and outside the church to dedicate their lives to enhancing and protecting the integrity of Creation. In order that these drops will join together and form a mighty stream in the defense of life we need a sustaining vision to guide us.

OUR VISION

We will not be successful in our efforts to develop a new attitude towards the natural world unless we are sustained and nourished by a new vision. This vision must blossom forth from our understanding of the world as God intends it to be. We can know the shape of this world by looking at how God originally fashioned our world and laid it out before us.

This vision is also grounded in our Faith. The Bible tells us that God created this beautiful and fruitful world for all his creatures to live in (Gen 1: 1-2:4), and that He has given us the task of being steward of His creation (Gen. 2:19-20).

The relationship which links God, human beings, and all the community of the living together is emphasized in the covenant which God made with Noah after the flood. The rainbow which we still see in the sky is a constant reminder of this bond and challenge (Gen. 9:12). This covenant recognizes the very close bonds which bind living forms together in what are called ecosystems. The implications of this covenant for us today are clear. As people of the covenant we are called to protect endangered ecosystems—like our forests, mangroves and coral reefs—and to establish just human communities in our land. More and more we must recognize that the commitment to work for justice and to preserve the integrity of creation are two inseparable dimensions of our Christian vocation to work for the coming of the kingdom of God in our times.

CHRIST OUR LIFE (COL. 3:4)

As Christians we also draw our vision from Christ. We have much to learn from the attitude of respect which Jesus displayed towards the natural world. He was very much aware that all the creatures in God's creation are related. Jesus lived lightly on the earth and warned his disciples against hoarding material possessions and allowing their hearts to be enticed by the lure of wealth and power (Matt. 6:19-21; Lk. 9:1-6). But our meditation on Jesus goes beyond this. Our faith tells us that Christ is the center point of human history and creation. All the rich unfolding of the universe and the emergence and flowering of life on Earth are centered on him (Eph. 1:9-10; Col 1:16-17). The destruction of any part of creation, especially, the extinction of species, defaces the image of Christ which is etched in creation.

MARY, MOTHER OF LIFE

We Filipinos have a deep devotion to Mary. We turn to her for help and protection in time of need. We know that she is on the side of the poor and those who are rejected (Lk. 1:52). Our new sensitivity to what is happening to our land also tells us that she is on the side of life. As a mother she is pained and saddened when she sees people destroy the integrity of creation through soil erosion, blast-fishing, or poisoning land. Mary knows what the consequences of this destruction are. Therefore as Mother of Life she challenges us to abandon the pathway of death and to return to the way of life.

Taken together, the various strands of our Christian vision envisage a profound renewal which must affect our people, our culture, and our land. It challenges us to live once again in harmony with God's creation. This vision of caring for the Earth and living in harmony within can guide us as, together, we use our ingenuity and many gifts to heal our wounded country.

THIS IS WHAT WE SUGGEST

In the light of this vision we recommend action in the following areas.

a) What each individual can do:

Be aware of what is happening in your area. Do not remain silent when you see your environment being destroyed. Use your influence within your family and community to develop this awareness. Avoid a fatalistic attitude. We are people of hope, who believe that together we can change the course of events. Organize

people around local ecological issues. Support public officials who are sensitive to environmental issues. Become involved in some concrete action. There is much that can be done by individuals to reforest bald hills and prevent soil erosion.

b) What the churches can do:

Like every other group, the church as a community is called to conversion around this, the ultimate pro-life issue. Until very recently many religions, including the Catholic Church, have been slow to respond to the ecological crisis. We, the bishops, would like to redress this neglect. There is a great need for a Filipino theology of creation which will be sensitive to our unique living world, our diverse cultures and our religious heritage. The fruits of this reflection must be made widely available through our preaching and catechetical programs. Our different liturgies must celebrate the beauty and pain of our world, our connectedness to the natural world and the on-going struggle for social justice. We would like to encourage the administrators of our catholic schools to give special importance to the theme of peace, justice and the integrity of creation in their schools.

Since programs, however laudable, will not implement themselves, we suggest the setting up of a Care of the Earth ministry at every level of church organization, from the basic Christian communities, through the parish structure and diocesan offices right up to the national level. This ministry could help formulate and implement policies and strategies which flow from our new and wider vision. The idea is not so much to add another activity to our pastoral ministry, but rather that this concern should underpin everything we do.

c) What the government can do:

We ask the government not to pursue short-term economic gains at the expense of long-term ecological damage. We suggest that the government group together into an independent department all the agencies which deal at present with ecological issues. This department should promote an awareness of the fragility and limited carrying capacity of our islands' eco-systems and advocate measures designed to support ecologically sustainable development. Obviously the department should have an important contribution to make to related departments like education, health, natural resources and agriculture. There is also a need to encourage research into the eco-systems of our land and the problems they face in the future. The department should publish a state of the environment report for each region and for the country as a whole each year. Above all, the department needs legislative teeth to insure that its policies and programs are implemented.

d) What non-governmental organizations can do:

Non-governmental organizations have a very important role to play in developing a widespread ecological awareness among people. They can also act as a watch-dog to ensure that the government and those in public offices do not renege on their commitment to place this concern at the top of their list.

CONCLUSION

This brief statement about our living world and the deterioration we see all around us attempts to reflect the cry of our people and the cry of our land. At the root of the problem we see an exploitative mentality, which is at variance with the Gospel of Jesus. This expresses itself in acts of violence against fellow Filipinos. But it is not confined to the human sphere. It also infects and poisons our relationship with our land and seas.

We reap what we sow; the results of our attitude and activities are predictable and deadly. Our small farmers tell us that their fields are loss productive and are becoming sterile. Our fishermen are finding it increasingly difficult to catch fish. Our lands, forests and rivers cry out that they are being eroded, denuded, and polluted. As bishops we have tried to listen and respond to their cry. There is an urgency about this issue which calls for widespread education and immediate action. We are convinced that the challenge which we have tried to highlight here is similar to the one which Moses put before the people of Israel before they entered their promised land.

"Today I offer you a choice of life or death, blessing or curse. Choose life and then you and your descendants will live" (Dt. 30:19-20).

Our Relationship with Nature

A 1987 Pastoral Letter of the Episcopal Conference of the Dominican Republic

1. On August 10, 1982, on the eve of the installation of the new government, we stated:

We can't keep on being careless with the preservation and improvement of our living environment. The ecological balance cannot be violated with impunity. Man's sin against nature always comes home to roost. To mention just one example, the stripping of the forests without an efficacious program for replanting the trees is already bearing fatal consequences for our rivers, our soil, and our climate. There is an urgent need for an exigent, well planned poli about this serious national problem (Pastoral letter, August 10, 1982, n. 2). The situation not only hasn't improved, but has worsened.

2. In his first encyclical, *Redemptor Hominis*, (1979), Pope John Paul II affirmed: "Sometimes it seems that we aren't aware of other significant aspects of our natural environment, but only those which serve our immediate use and consumption. However, it was our Creator's will that we enter into relationship with nature as an intelligent, noble 'master' and 'guardian' and not as a conscienceless 'exploiter' and 'destroyer'" (*Redemptor Hominis, 15*).

3. In the Dominican Republic, this isn't just a possible future danger that must be avoided, but is already a sad reality we must confront and drastically remedy. This situation demands that we no longer postpone fulfilling the promise we made some time ago to write about our relationship with nature, or on the national ecological problems, as is said today.

4. We are encouraged by the countless other voices raised recently calling our attention to this very serious problem and inviting the whole community to responsible action in this area. There have been the voices of experts in the field, voices of serious, conscientious persons, voices of those moved and indignant at the specific crimes against nature which they have witnessed with their own eyes.

5. There have been five points where these voices have been in agreement:

- Instead of being resolved, the ecological problems have grown more serious.
- The determining factor in this serious situation has been the impunity with which nature's aggressors have been able to act.
- Another important factor is the situation of poverty which forces many Dominicans to destroy nature.
- There must be some superior organism with authority to enforce, coordinate, and orientate.
- Above all, there is a great need for a national political will to channel funds, human resources, legal and educational decisions and actions as high priority goals in defense of this basis of our existence, the physical nation.

6. The growing awareness of the ecological problem, the sincere preoccupation of many people and certain concrete initiatives which have been put into practice and are progressing in the midst of all kinds of difficulties, fills us with satisfaction and hope. Church personnel have been present in some of these initiatives.

7. There is no doubt that the scientific and technical aspect of this subject is important. That aspect doesn't come within the competence of the bishops, though it interests us enormously and we should keep it in mind. But, besides this aspect, there is the ethical, moral dimension of the problem which surely is part of our mission and function. That is the aspect we most wish to develop here.

I. THE NATIONAL REALITY IS DISTURBING AND DANGEROUS

The Soil

8. There are many of us who continually repeat that we are an agriculturally blessed land. The truth is somewhat different, and all we Dominicans should be very conscious of this.

9. According to data contributed by technicians, less than 13 percent of our territory is land good for agriculture. Another 8 percent can be cultivated, but with

serious limitations, demanding able and specialized management. Almost 25 percent is land suitable only for pasture, and a little more than half the country is adequate only for forest. We also know that a great part of our land is thirsty, waiting for a sound irrigation system.

10. The country has a population of almost 125 inhabitants per square kilometer, and approximately half live in rural areas.

11. These statistics indicate that our soil is a very scarce resource when it comes to feeding our population and giving productive work to so many Dominicans who live in rural areas. So, the soil is a resource which should be used with the greatest possible wisdom if we are to obtain from it the produce to fulfill present and future needs.

The Forests

12. The technicians inform us that of the 53 percent adequate for forest and needed to protect our water resources, barely 14 percent is still woods today.

13. The stripping of the forests has extended its demolishing activity to the national parks - Jose de Carmen Ramirez, El Este, the Sierra de Neiba, the Sierra de Bahoruco, the Haitises - and it has just been possible to stop its depredations in the vital Park J. Armando Bermudez on the Nothern slope of the Central Range. There is an urgent need for reforestation to diminish the erosion of the land, provide wood for firewood, reduce future importation of wood, and protect our river basins.

14. The farmers who strip and burn, those who burn wood to produce charcoal, and other unscrupulous persons, have decimated our remaining forests. They have already levelled the majority of our hydrographic basins, leaving the soil seriously eroded or exposed to erosion, drying up streams and reducing the rivers' flow to alarming levels. Of course, the damage done to our dams is incalculable. That is how we squander our non-renewable resources, such as the dams, and destroy our future production of hydroelectric energy and the recovery of extensive zones for agricultural production through irrigation.

15. Without forgetting our preoccupation about our marine resources, presently attacked by contamination, and our fishing, which continues without any control, and without forgetting the so-called environmental pollution produced by heavy industry, mining, and the abuse of pesticides and insecticides, we understand that the most pressing of all the environmental problems are the destruction of our forests and the degradation of our soils by erosion, with the subsequent danger for our water supply. The soil and the water are the main support of our material life, now and in the future.

16. This situation not only compromises the possibility of life for future generations, whom we will leave a desert as an inheritance, but even compromises our present hope of using water to produce the electric energy our people need to live a moderately civilized existence, and to irrigate the land in the arid valleys for producing the food so scarce and so necessary to resolve the problem of hunger of our people without having to import.

17. Human beings are born, grow up and mature within a complex, closed, interrelated system. Nature is their living home. Our existence and the quality of our life depend on it, and it depends on us whose intelligence and skill (scientific and technical) should conserve, defend, improve, and perfect it. In this whole of many and varied interrelated checks and balances, the breakdown or disturbance of one of them has a negative repercussion on the rest.

18. The tragedy is that interrupting the balance of nature and the chain reactions which follow can be so devastating that they make life for the human species difficult or impossible in a given place. So it is no longer a question of the greater or lesser riches in a place, but of the quality, or existence of life itself.

19. What Paul VI warned about is already a reality in the Dominican Republic. "Because of an irrational and negligent exploitation of nature, human beings can destroy it and become the victim of its degradation" *(Octogesima Adveniens, 21).*

20. In the chapter on causes, we found that the increasing growth of the population with the resulting increase in the demand for food, resources, and energy, negligence in general, lack of adequate measures, the eagerness for gain at any cost, and the misery of those who inhabit rural areas are what are producing among us such a degradation of the environment that the necessary balance between ourselves and nature and within nature itself are already seriously threatened.

21. For that reason, the problem of the forests and the soil isn't just a technical problem but a problem with deep social and moral implications.

22. It isn't the poor rural worker who is most responsible for the degradation of our natural resources, concretely the deforestation and severe erosion of the land. Public authorities have lacked foresight, control, strictness, and responsible and efficacious planning. There has been negligence, complicity, and rapaciousness among many of those very authorities in charge of conservation. There has been avarice and unforgivable carelessness among owners incredibly insensitive to ecological problems.

23. But, it is also true that there have been plenty of negligent farm workers among us. However, most of the time the scarcity of land, the lack of adequate technical preparation, the absence of any aid, the lack of

access to necessary credit, and finally, a life of misery have forced them into marginal lands with the only option the intensive use of land without the proper cautions. That has caused the destruction of the vegetation and even the soil itself.

24. While it is true that formerly the majority of those who exploited the woods destroyed almost all our forest riches with complete impunity, and while it is equally true that in recent times many unscrupulous Dominicans took advantage of their positions of influence to continue pillaging nature for their own advantage, it is also true that a very numerous group of our Dominican brothers, among them the poorest of the country, live in the mountains with the "stripping and burning" of the woods their only means of survival, of eking out a precarious living and so place our eco-system and future well-being in danger.

Fauna

25. What we have said of our forests, water, and land is also true of our fauna. That is, our four-footed beasts, birds, and fish.

26. It is as though there were within us an instinct for destruction. Any bird which takes wing or lands is immediately attacked. This is killing for the sake of killing.

27. Also, the closed game seasons aren't respected. There isn't the slightest scruple in violating such laws. Species and specimens are decimated with no consideration even for the reproductive season. Negligence and ignorance reign.

28. We have reached the extreme that in a country with little variety in its fauna some species of birds and animals have already disappeared and others are in danger of disappearing forever.

29. Clearly the recovery and protection of all the resources we have described is an inescapable obligation which can't be postponed.

II. GOD'S MARVELOUS DESIGN FOR NATURE

God's Plan

30. God, through his wisdom and might, created—brought into existence without any pre-existing matter—the cosmos, and within the cosmos, the planet earth, according to the admirable laws with which he endowed this cosmos he created.

31. We are witnesses that on this earth the Lord created the mineral world and life. First, vegetable and animal life, then human life. He endowed us with intelligence, the capacity to love, different skills, and responsible freedom, and made us both the hub and the peak of this earth.

32. He gave this "human being"—all present and future humanity—the earth and all it contains as his common patrimony.

33. Having endowed this patrimony with marvelous and often mysterious laws which include immense possibilities of maintaining and improving the quality of human life through combinations of these laws, God imposed on us the task and obligation of "dominating," of "being lord of" this earth through science and technology. We are meant to make it ever more useful for ourselves, capable of perfecting human beings and society (see Genesis 1, 26-28, and Psalm 8, 5-9).

34. Thus, to use the human intelligence and skills (science and technology) to destroy the earth or threaten it, or not to use them when difficulties or new challenges arise from different sources, goes against human reason, is a violation of the divine plan, and shows disobedience to the will of the Creator, absolute Lord of the earth and of humanity.

Principles

35. This presentation includes various basic principles from which derive basic moral requirements we wish to stress:

a) The earth with all its goods is humanity's patrimony. It is our inheritance and we should administer and distribute it with justice and equity and pass it on to future generations not only without deterioration, but improved.

b) The earth with all its goods is a challenge to the capacity for labor, the skill, and the intelligence of human beings, considered as individuals and as social beings.

c) The destiny of earth with all its goods is universal. The individual or group appropriation of this patrimony is legitimate only if restricted to portions adequate to the needs of the individual or group, or if it is managed so it makes more real and effective that basic universal destiny.

d) Science and technology are the fruit and the patrimony of humanity. Any individual's discovery, no matter how eminent he may be, makes up only a part of humanity's science and technology. We are always in debt to former or simultaneous discoveries. This social debt should be paid by respecting and making effective the social function of science, technology, and all human work.

e) Human beings are always just usufructuaries, administrators, perfecters, and guardians of this common patrimony, the earth and all its goods. They should fulfill these functions nobly and intelligently.

f) For that reason, we read in the inspired Book of Wisdom: "God of our Fathers, Lord of mercy, who with your word made the universe and with your wisdom created us to dominate the beings created by you, to rule the world with holiness and justice and to exercise authority with righteousness of spirit, give me the wisdom which sits next to your

throne" (Wisdom 9: 1-4).

Nature demands of the human being wisdom, rectitude, justice and holiness and so, forbids carelessness, ignorance, irrationality, avarice, exploitation, aggressiveness, perversity, and impiety.

g) God made earth a paradise for us. Our sin is that we transformed that paradise into "an accursed land." "Because you ate of the forbidden tree, the land will be cursed through your fault. You will eat of it through the sweat of your brow while you live and weeds and thorns will flourish" (Genesis 3, 17-18).

Morality and Ecology

36. According to what we have said, the obligation of the human being to God and others includes very serious obligations to nature, on which we depend, and to which we owe our very selves, and those relationships of nature with us and us with nature haven't been left to our free choice, but rather have been determined by God. God's will is shown to us in the very laws of nature itself and in Revelation. Of course, our relationships with nature include our relationships with others and with God.

37. From the principles stated, a series of moral criteria for reflection and directives for action are derived. We wish to make them explicit: Natural resources should never be exploited for rapid enrichment, using what we could call a miner's criterion, careless of their correct management and the reforestation of the woods. They are meant to fulfill the needs of the whole human family, present and future. Our woods, with few exceptions, have been sad examples of this type of abuse and plundering.

38. It isn't acceptable for so many rural workers to be permanently condemned to extreme poverty because of lack of access to land. This often forces them to a fatal over-exploitation of the land and the result is the deterioration and even real destruction of the soil. Such destruction because of the scarcity of tillable land and, most especially, for lack of an adequate cultivation of the hillside in the mountainous zones is as unfortunate as deforestation.

39. It isn't just for those who have greater incomes(countries, cities, groups, and persons) to tend to wasteful consumption. Besides being an insult and a provocation for the poor, it is a wicked waste of natural resources needed for the dispossessed.

40. Those who have the authority to orientate the use of natural resources can't let their conduct be ruled only by immediate economic and political benefits without taking the future into account.

41. Correct behavior and the common good itself should encourage us to set and respect priorities in the use of the limited resources available to the government (at this time). At a time when reforestation is an urgent national necessity, it is unjust and irrational to demand other projects which, in comparison to this national emergency, become secondary.

42. In the case of non-renewable resources, the highly developed industrialized nations cannot monopolize the exploitation and use of those resources without considering the present and future needs of the countries supplying the resources. Nor should these countries themselves hand over the present and future national patrimony and invest the income unwisely for short-term economic interests.

43. If nature has taken millions of years to give us natural resources, their extraction calls for reflection and prudence. At best more millions of years would be needed to produce them again, and some can never be reproduced.

44. The income generated by the exploitation of non-renewable resources should be invested so it becomes a permanent solution for the inhuman and unjust poverty which exists and generates an income for future generations which won't receive the benefit from the exploitation of these resources.

45. A large part of the income received from operations which disturb the necessary ecological balance should always be used to recover, in so far as possible, the lost balance in nature.

46. The renewable resources such as the forests, the soil and the water, so necessary for sustaining life, should be used so the constant renewal of resources is assured for the good of future generations.

47. There must be constant vigilance and measures taken so that neither the exaggerated desire for gain nor the immediate needs of the poor harm the conservation of natural resources.

48. When there have been favored groups who have benefitted greatly and irrationally from these renewable resources, it is unjust for the whole cost of the renewing of these resources to fall on the poor.

49. It is just as contrary to the Creator's plan to waste or use irrationally nature's resources as it is to prevent their use to satisfy the needs of the whole population.

50. It is everyone's obligation, not just the government's, to preserve and defend the necessary ecological balance. The abuse of natural resources is an offense against nature, against human beings who need such resources, and against God, the Creator of nature and of human beings.

51. The most extraordinary scientific progress, the most spectacular technological feats, and the most prodigious economic growth return to haunt us and nature if simultaneously there isn't genuine moral and social progress of individuals and of society.

52. The ideology of work as the uncontrolled domination and exploitation of material is false. The search for maximum production or profit from production as an

e d in itself is a mistake. The myth of limitless efficiency and a hedonistic consumption leading to extravagance is a trap. The fascination with and the idolatrous attitude toward science and technology, capable of increasing and transforming natural reserves, but not of creating them, are a risk and a danger.

Spirituality and Ecology

53. Christ, to whom all things are subject (1 Corinthians 15), who freed them from the slavery of corruption (Romans 8, 21), taught us during his lifetime on earth to admire and respect nature, to use it and enjoy it without sullying or using violence against it. He taught us to be inspired by it and to love it.

54. To explain different aspects and conditions of the Kingdom of God that Jesus came to establish on earth, he turned to such realities as the sowing, the harvest, the weeding, the grain of mustard, the fig tree, the vineyard, the sun, the rain, the lilies of the field, the birds: (Matthew 13, 18-23; Mark 4, 13-20; Luke 8, 11-15; Mark 4, 26-29; Matthew 13, 24-30; Mark 4, 30-32; Luke 13, 18-19; Matthew 5, 45; Luke 12, 27; Matthew 6, 28; Luke 12, 4-7). He always liked the mountain for reflection and prayer (Matthew 17, 1; Mark 6, 45) and at the foot of the mountain, with the blue sky as the only roof, he proclaimed the beatitudes to the world (Matthew 5, 3-13; Luke 6, 17-20). After calling together the first disciples there (Luke 5, 1-11; Mark 1, 19-20), he returned again and again to the Sea of Galilee, the Sea of Tiberias, and the Lake of Genesareth to preach, perform miracles, and rest (Mark 1, 21-28; Matthew 13, 1-52; Mark 4, 35-41; John 21, 1-14).

55. The gradual perfecting of human nature also includes an ever increasing improvement of the natural environment of which humanity is master, guardian, and intelligent and faithful administrator.

56. St. Francis of Assisi, with his gentle and enchanting nature, now Patron of Ecologists, always called nature his "Sister." And he treated it like a sister. In his Canticle to brother sun, he says: "Praised be, my Lord, for our sister, mother earth, which sustains and governs us, and produces different fruit with colored flowers and herbs."

Francis of Assisi is a living, limpid call not only for the reconciliation among human beings, but of ourselves with nature. For that reason, he is an extraordinarily valid and opportune figure today.

57. St. Ignatius of Loyola, a faithful servant of the church, liked to see God in nature. He said: "Seeing how God is present in creatures: giving being to the elements, growth to the plants, feeling to animals, and understanding to human beings. And to me, giving me being, encouraging me, making me feel and understand" (Spiritual Exercises, n. 235). In this profound way, he presents the relationship of everything with nature.

III. THERE IS NEED FOR URGENT ACTION

58. These will all be words carried away by the wind if nothing or little is done. There is an urgent need for effective and coordinated action.

59. However, the measures taken should be of a double nature: technical and ethical. Both are necessary. Neither alone is enough.

60. We understand the problems involved in reforestation and the rational use of the soil because of the present state of deterioration, the chaotic situation reigning in this aspect of our material life, and because of the social causes which have brought us to this chaotic situation.

61. We consider correct the measures taken to completely stop the deforestation to be the first of a series of measures needed to overcome the serious problem of national ecological deterioration.

62. However, we believe that the diversity of the groups which were responsible for destroying renewable resources should be taken into account now and later. It isn't right to judge everyone equally. Each case calls for special treatment. Among the groups we wish to mention are the following:

a) Those who became rich be destroying nature.

b) Those who took advantage of their position of influence to benefit at any cost.

c) Those who destroy nature out of necessity, having no other immediate choice unless it is given them.

d) Those who, though not in direct contact with natural resources, nevertheless depend in large part on those resources, such as the poor who cook with charcoal and wood.

e) Groups which, in good faith, want to establish a more productive use of the soil through forestry industries which will benefit the country.

63. It would be unjust to treat all equally for the purpose of assuring the physical survival of our country. Of these groups, the farm workers and urban poor, who depend on charcoal, need special treatment.

64. The margination of the farm worker and the consequent poverty, the cause of our ecological problems, should be resolved simultaneously, as an essential, not secondary, part of the ecological problem. The defense of nature isn't an end in itself, but tends to a balance between the environment and ourselves by creating a more human world for all by improving the quality of nature.

65. Just as it would be unacceptable to permit those who ruined our fo ts for business reasons to continue their destructive action, so it is also unacceptable to sink even deeper into misery those poor farm workers from the mountains or the arid zones whom our soci-

ety has left no choice except a nomadic agriculture or the burning of a sack of charcoal. It would also be unacceptable to stop the supply of the only fuel the poor have to cook their food without having first sought real alternative solutions.

66. As complementary steps to the measures taken against deforestation, the following seem opportune:

a) To continue the rigorous vigilance over the critical zones of the national territory.

b) To organize production of the minimum of fuel indispensable to alleviate the situation of so many Dominicans who are suffering because they have nothing with which to cook their food.

c) To carry out a census among the farm workers in the mountains substantially affected by the necessary prohibition to cut down trees in fragile zones so as to be able to relocate many of those families to other land or other occupations where they can earn a living.

d) To have a debate of the different opinions among national and foreign technicians and the farm workers from the mountains to clarify the existing confusion about the true dimension of the problem and about the real possibilities of a solution.

e) To start up again the agricultural and tourism projects which will benefit the country but will not noticeably affect the ecosystem.

f) To dedicate a meaningful part of the national budget to reforestation every year.

g) Not to forget fruit trees when doing the reforestation.

67. Ultimately, the reforestation of critical areas must be faced. According to the experts, at least 600,000 hectares of the essential hydrographic basins must be reforested. The two parks of the Central Range, among others, must be preserved. Both measures are essential to assure the nation's water needs. To do this within a prudent period might call for the equivalent of 10% of the national budget every year.

68. To prepare for this tremendous task, which can't be postponed, we would like to see the following measures put into practice in a medium term:

a) Determine with the help of national and foreign technicians how each hectare of Dominican soil could best be used. Revise the laws and pass laws on the adequate use of soil, independent of who possesses the land.

b) Elaborate a national strategy for the renewal of the country's forests. This strategy which, as we understand it, would be useless without the previous measure, could include special training for groups of farm workers, members of the armed forces and national police and certain labor requirements in reforestation to graduate from secondary school or the university.

c) Design programs which can guarantee an adequate means of earning a living for those who now are forced by misery to live as destroyers of natural resources.

d) Educate the general Dominican population on environmental issues through mass means of communication and formal education and insist on the preparation of the technicians and farm workers who will dedicate their lives to agro-forestry.

e) Reinforce and take advantage of the experiments taking place in the country for the agro-forestry education of the farm workers.

69. As for the non-renewable resources, we are also worried about the use being given to the profits derived from our mines.

70. These mining resources have been there for millions of years and belong to all Dominicans, present and future.

71. Consequently, it is immoral for the profits generated by mining resources to benefit chiefly international syndicates, or for the governing authorities to feel forced to spend those profits on present needs which aren't of high priority. The extraction of these mining resources is only fully justified if the profits are used for permanent investments which will permit future Dominicans to find a country where they can work and live in conditions for human beings.

72. The profits coming from the extraction of non-renewable natural resources could very well be invested to cover the cost of the ecological recovery of the country, once the crushing problems of the moment are overcome.

73. We are aware that the recovery and care of our renewable natural resources is everyone's task, but the Government, as State Administrator, has the obligation to orient and coordinate this important task. All citizens should understand this.

74. The State, representing future generations, should guarantee the use of natural resources to satisfy present needs while keeping clearly in mind future generations.

75. The strengthening of a higher organization with real authority to encourage, coordinate, reflect on, and rule on everything related to natural resources in their ecological dimension is an urgent need.

76. The church can do a lot in the moral sphere and even through collaboration with the technical aspect through promotion and help with emergency needs. Faithful to its multi-secular tradition, the church commits itself to this task.

77. Parish priests, assembly presidents, lay ministers,

and all pastoral agents should insist on our obligation to nature. Prepare a special catechesis on the subject. Organize periods of study and reflection. Adapt the liturgical seasons creatively and establish special liturgical celebrations on the day of the tree or the beginning or end of the harvest of a specific fruit (coffee, chocolate, sugar-cane, tobacco, etc.). At the proper moment, see that the people are aware of sins against the environment and against nature. Support warmly all initiatives which tend to defend or improve nature. Let us not be afraid of proposing, to accomplish this goal, some kind of a "lay ministry." There are surely places where the parish and community are the ideal institutions to take charge of the zone's "tree seedlings," "seedbed," etc.

78. We congratulate the pastors who are already developing initiatives and actions among their faithful in preparation for reforestation.

79. In the country, there are five radio stations with great influence among rural inhabitants because they have justly earned the confidence and esteem of the farm workers. They are "Radio Santa Maria," in La Vegas; "Radio Seibo" in Seibo; "Radio Enriquillo" in Tamayo; "Radio Marien" in Dejabon; and "Radio ABC" in the capital. We ask them to make this a special cause. Get together and plan common programs. Exhort, encourage, inform, instruct, denounce every negative practice, propose necessary positive ones, support every useful initiative, give your collaboration and always be on alert. There is much you can do in the ecological field. Do it with enthusiasm and creativity.

80. We order the national Catholic Weekly, "Camino," to stress this preoccupation. We make the same suggestion to the rest of the Catholic publications.

81. We also make a public request of Dominican Caritas, a consciousness raising, promotional institution which gives emergency aid to those in need, and to the different diocesan and parish centers for human promotion to include in their plan and programs the ecological problem in all its complexity. They will always have our support and encouragement. The majority of these programs should be carried out in coordination with the pastors.

82. Last of all, we ask the Catholic high schools and the schools generally to impart ecological formation from the earliest years. Sow responsibly in future generations a deep love and respect for nature and make them aware that morality also includes ecological concerns.

83. We will conclude with some inspirational reflections from Ecclesiasticus: "The works of God are all good and fulfill their purpose in good time. With his word he united the waters, at his order they came together. His will is fulfilled every moment and nothing refuses to serve him. He has before him the actions of every living thing, and nothing is hidden from his sight. Since all time and for all time he is watching and his salvation is without limits. Nothing is small or minute for him, nothing is difficult or impossible. It is meaningless to ask, 'What is that good for?' since everything has its assigned functions. It is meaningless to say 'This is worse than that,' as everything has value at its proper time" (Ec. 39, 16-21).

84. Last of all: We wished to write this Pastoral Letter on a theme which affects all of us Dominicans on the feast of the Virgin of Altagracia, our National Protector. She has always interceded in our behalf before God. She has done that especially in critical moments and when it is a question of something serious. We ask her, again, to protect us maternally and we place under her care and protection this area, so urgent for the Dominican people, the reforestation of our country.

The American College in the Ecological Age

Thomas Berry, CP

INTRODUCTION

The American college may be considered a continuation, at the human level, of the self-education processes of the earth itself. Universe education, earth education, and human education are stages of development in a single unbroken process. We cannot adequately discuss any stage of this development without seeing it within this comprehensive context.

By universe education I do not mean universal education or university education but the education that identifies with the emergent universe in its variety of manifestations from the beginning until now. So to be earth education I do not mean education about the earth, but the earth, within the solar system, as the immediate self-educating community of those living and nonliving beings that constitute the earth and among whom we must number the human component of the community. I might also go further and designate earth as the primary educational establishment or the primary college with a record of extraordinary success over some billions of years.

Such fundamental issues need to be discussed because we need to be absolutely clear about the whole issue of what we designate as "education" and what we are concerned with when we talk about a "college." Our difficulty in appreciating the earth community as primary educator is that we have little sense of or feeling for the natural world in its integral dimension. Serious attention in terms of real values seems to be given to the spiritual world or to the human world. Our concern for the natural world is one of utility or as an object to satisfy intellectual curiosity or aesthetic feeling.

A sense of the earth and its meaning is particularly urgent just now for the different sciences have developed an immense volume of information about the natural world in its physical aspects and a corresponding power to control it. Yet the earth is still seen as so much quantified matter. Life and consciousness as integral and pervasive dimensions of the earth have until recently found little understanding or appreciation except as more advanced phases of mechanistic processes. Because of this the human community, the psychic component of the earth in its most complete expression, has become alienated from the larger dynamics of the planet and thereby has lost its own meaning. That we are confused about the human is a consequence of our confusion about the planet.

This disturbed situation is affecting our educational programs at their deepest levels. Some, looking for answers in th traditional civilizations, suggest that we rediscover our educational principles in the humanities. Some suggest that we turn more fervently to our spiritual-moral traditions. Some put their hope in pragmatic adaptation to the world through acceptance of its imperatives as known by physical sciences, by politics, economics, or sociology. Some consider that our best guidance comes from psychology.

What is really needed is a functional cosmology. The difficulty is that the term "cosmology" is so exclusively physical in its accepted meaning that it does not indicate the integral reality of the universe. For the same reason the term "geology" does not indicate the integral reality of the earth, but only its physical aspects. Thus, these terms are not usable terms for the subject under discussion. Indeed, we do not presently have a terminology suited to a serious consideration of the earth.

This presents us with something of an impasse since any significant discussion of the human must deal with the human as an invention of the earth, as fulfilling a role in the earth community of beings, and as by definition that being in whom the earth attains consciousness of itself.

The earth in turn can be designated, in its solar context, as a self-educating community of beings, just as it is a self-emergent, self-sustaining, self-governing, self-healing, and self-fulfilling community. The earth is the central locus in the universe of the three later phases of the fourfold evolutionary process; first, the evolution of the galaxies and the elements; secondly, the evolu-

---

Father Berry is director of the Riverdale Center for Religious Research. This essay, and the two following it, appeared in Religion and Intellectual Life, *VI, 2; an earlier version was published in* The Dream of the Earth *(San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988).*

tion of the solar system and of the earth with its molecular and geological formations; thirdly, the evolution of life in all its variety; and, fourthly, the evolution of consciousness and the cultural developments of the human order.

It is especially important in this discussion to recognize the unity of the total process from that first unimaginable moment of cosmic emergence through all its subsequent forms of expression until the present. This unbreakable bond of relatedness that makes of the world a universe becomes increasingly apparent to scientific observation, although this bond ultimately escapes scientific formulation or understanding. In virtue of this relatedness everything is intimately present to everything else in the universe. Nothing is completely itself without everything else. This relatedness is both spatial and temporal. However distant in space or time the bond of unity is functionally there. The universe is a communion and a community. We ourselves are that communion become conscious itself.

As regards the planet earth any adequate description must include its every aspect. The simpler elements are not known fully until their integration into more comprehensive modes of being is recognized. On the other hand later complex unities are not fully intelligible until their component parts are understood. We would not know the real capacities of hydrogen, carbon, oxygen, and nitrogen were it not for their later expression in cellular life and indeed in the entire world of living beings, including the remarkable world of human consciousness. So with consciousness; the thoughts and emotions, the social forms and rituals of the human community are as much "earth" as is the soil and the rocks and the trees and the flowers. We can reduce the flowers to the atoms or the atoms to the flowers. There are no atoms that are just atoms, no flowers that are just flowers. There is not earth without the human; no human without the earth. Any other earth or any other human is a pure abstraction.

Having said all this we might come more directly to ourselves, to our identity and our function within this comprehensive context if we are to achieve any adequate sense of what education is, or what a college is, or what the American college should be doing. This question identifies with the question of what the earth is, what it is doing presently, and what are its directions into the future. Human education is primarily the activation of the possibilities of the planet in a way that could not be achieved apart from human intelligence and the entire range of human activities. In this sense human education is part of the larger evolutionary process.

CODING: GENETIC AND CULTURAL

The earth's evolutionary process is planetary self-education. The planet has, in a manner, taught itself the arts of life in the vast variety of their manifestations. The invention of such a fantastic complex of genetic codes so interrelated that each depends upon all others is an accomplishment of supreme competence. But then to establish a genetic coding that determines a being to transgenetic cultural development is a much more amazing achievement.

The human in alliance with the earth is genetically mandated to invent a second level of its own being, a cultural realm, a realm freely developed in which the human gives itself its own identity in time and space and expands its activities in language and imagination and in that vast complex of activities that we indicate by the term of human culture. To continue all these humanistic activities in association with the world of physical being and genetic determination has required special educational processes to communicate the cultural tradition from generation to generation. These educational processes must not only communicate some fixed cultural form but also act as creative principles of further self-transformation for the human community and for the planet.

Whereas in other beings the genetic coding provides sufficient guidance for life activities with only minimal teaching after birth, in the human the genetic coding establishes only certain directions and the freedom and intelligence needed to activate these other realms of accomplishment in their particular determinations. These in turn give to life its human qualities. Human education can be defined then as a process whereby the cultural coding is handed on from one generation to another in a manner somewhat parallel to the manner by which the genetic coding of any living being is communicated to succeeding generations. This cultural coding is itself differentiated in a wide variety of patterns that characterize the various societies that are distributed over the planet.

There is also a historical sequence in cultural coding that offers a parallel to the evolutionary mutation of prehuman species. Thus we have not only the diverse patterning within a certain level of cultural development but also historical change of cultural level. So far in the course of human development we can identify four basic states of such macrophase transformation. These we might indicate as the tribal-shamanic-neolithic village phase, the classical cultural phase, the scientific-technological phase, and now the emerging ecological phase.

The educational problem is especially severe at these moments of change into a new historical mode of cultural patterning. The difference between the tribal-shamanic and the great classical cultures is much greater than the difference between the tribal cultures among themselves. It is also greater than the difference between any of the greater classical cultures.

Transition from the classical cultural patterns to the scientific-technological cultural pattern is especially severe, so severe indeed, that we still do not compre-

hend just what has happened. The human creators of the scientific-technological age had only minimal awareness of what they were doing. This type of scientific life context has required some centuries of functioning before its creative and destructive aspects could be revealed in any effective manner.

The next transition, from the dominant scientific-technological period to the ecological period, is turbulent indeed. This turbulence establishes the context of our present educational discussions.

Just as each of the great evolutional periods from the physical shaping of the earth to the emergence of life and of consciousness is an irreversible and unrepeatable process, so too, in the larger time sequence, each of these historical phases of human cultural development is an abiding achievement in the psycho-physical dimensions of earth development.

The tribal-shamanic-neolithic village phase initiates ways of integrating the human, the physical, and the numinous aspects of the one world, the one planet. Each of these, the human, the natural, and the divine, is intimately present to the others in an encompassing community. The psychic perceptions of the human require a capacity to establish power relations with the spirit forces of the earth, as well as the capacity for technical skills relating to the physical forces of the earth, and emotional-social dispositions in dealing with human relationships.

The educational process in this context of development can best be considered as initiation into a unified life program with ritual evocation, technical training, personal discipline, and social responsibilities. Life and education are integrated into a single activity. Everything interacts with everything else in the seasonal processes of renewal of the planetary communion in which the human is one of a multitude of components.

It is important to recognize that the visions and rituals and languages and literature and artistic expression of tribal peoples are as truly productions of the earth as are the other natural phenomena such as the flight of birds through the air and the swimming of fishes in the sea. That language and ritual and dance and music are so universal at the human level indicates that they must somehow be rooted in the genetic process itself and even more deeply in the prebiological dynamics of the earth. Cultural productions are as natural as are the flowering species that came forth so mysteriously and covered the planet some millions of years ago. The voice of the human as well as the song of the birds and the croaking of the frog are all the voice of the earth and revelatory of the deeper nature of the earth itself. All this is particularly clear at this early level of human cultural formation.

This period can also be designated as the prepatriarchal period when the fertility powers of women were central to the entire cultural expression. The great goddesses appeared at this time as the supreme expression of the world of the sacred. The mysteries of woman provided the deepest human experience of the universe in its numinous qualities. As patriarchy came to be expressed in the transcendence of the sacred and in power relationships so the matricentric culture of this early period came to be expressed in immanence and in nurturance. An emphasis on these cultural orientations is especially important in understanding the course of Western civilization since all the later controlling establishments of the West—the great empires, the ecclesiastical establishment, the nation states, and our modern corporations—can be considered as patriarchal establishments with all the grandeur but with all the inherent destructiveness of such a cultural formation.

The second macrophase historical period of human development is that of the classical religious cultures. These cultural patterns dominated the educational program in the classical Hindu period, in Confucian and Buddhist cultures, in the classical Mediterranean, Christian and Islamic, in the Mayan, Inca, and Aztec cultures. Education varied in each of these, but we can say that they generally included intense awareness of a pervasive numinous presence, an extensive ritual order, interior disciplines of spiritual formation, thought, literary and artistic development, complex social and political forms.

In the mature phase of these classical cultures, formal academic education becomes distinct from the familial education and general social education that has been based on the fundamental cultural pattern in life orientation, value norms, social observances, religious rituals, spiritual disciplines, technical skills, and artistic expression. Formal education advances verbal understanding, literary style, historical awareness, philosophical thought, and advanced religious learning. Specialized training establishes professional status, leadership rank, and social distinction.

Elaboration of functional roles requires extensive training in thought, linguistic expression, and social functioning. Creative literature, critical commentary, and analytical thought combine with later professional development to establish a great volume of learning generally carried in written form. This eventually turns in on itself and we get the academic type caught up in formal learning, frequently with loss of inner vitality and cultural creativity. Although in this period of classical cultures there is the clear differentiation of the sacred, the natural, and the human as distinctive phases of reality, these three modes of being remain in profound communion with each other. As with the tribal-shamanic period the most significant achievements of this period must ultimately be the expression of deeper forces at work within the planetary process.

A third macrophase period is attained in the scientific technological period of understanding the dynamics

of the planet earth, and of technological controls over earth's functioning. This period, which emerged first in the European context, spread throughout the entire world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with its new mode of understanding and with its new powers for exploiting the planet. During this period an effort was made to keep the religious faith of the past, the moral and spiritual values, and the humanistic education.

As the cultural coding of this third period established itself, however, it became progressively less oriented toward the numinous experience of the divine, more oriented toward secular values, more exploitative in relation to the natural world, more mechanistic in its conception of the universe, more egalitarian in its social forms.

Education in this context became more an external conditioning than an interior discipline, more a training in manipulative techniques than initiation into religious rituals. The skills to be mastered were not the contemplative skills or imaginative capacities for dealing with numinous presence or with the esthetic insight into the inner structure of reality; they were rather the skills needed to bring forth the natural resources out of the hidden depths of the planet by industry, the skills to shape them in the manufacturing establishments, and to make them available to a consumer-oriented society.

Behind the entire endeavor was the vast scientific effort to understand the universe in quantitative terms, mainly by an analytical reductionism of apparent wholes to their component parts. These component parts were seen as the true reality with the design of the whole being seen as secondary and adventitious. But while this quantitative universe, seen as the integral reality of things, was really an abstraction, it did achieve an experience of the universe of such impact as to alter human consciousness on a scale associated with religious revelatory experiences of the past whereby the earlier cultural codings had been established.

The difficulty has been in the inability of the scientific venture to understand the significance of its own achievements. As a consequence, the cultural coding could not be established in an integral form; education remained dependent on its earlier structures for its humanistic meaning.

Meanwhile there was a frightening disruption in the human-natural world taking place, and this on a geological and biological rather than simply on a human historical scale. As this situation has become aggravated, the demand for a further cultural mutation into an ecological cultural coding has been experienced.

The fourth macrophase period, the ecological period of cultural coding, mandates a reintegration of the human process with the earth process in all its living forms. The deepest involvement in the emerging ecological age is found in the sciences themselves, especially in the biological sciences. Finally, after generations of analytical preoccupation with taking the earth apart, the sciences begin a new phase of synthesis, of seeing the integral majesty of the natural world, the need that every form of life has for every other form, and the involvement of the human in the total process. Science has given us the basis for a metareligious vision that provides not only the intelligibility of the ecological period but also the energy needed to bring it into existence.

Beyond the formal scientific world, however, are the more pervasive countercultural movements that are taking place throughout American society in all areas of human activities. Indeed, the more creative events are taking place outside the formal establishments, outside the institutions or professional training, at a depth of human consciousness that is seldom reached by formal training processes. These primordial-type movements are themselves now transforming all our contemporary institutions, our professions, and indeed all human activities. The interaction now taking place between the spontaneous and the trained is often dominated by the instinctive and intuitional modes of awareness not bound by established dogmas of the existing professional worlds.

This mode of historical transformation is indeed following the customary path whereby new codings take place in the genetic and in the cultural orders. Yet as soon as its influence is felt on this scale there is a need for the spontaneous and intuitional to establish their own critical reflection and their capacity for developing formal processes lest their achievements be dissipated or trivialized.

Establishing this new mode of cultural expression can be considered as a final overcoming of the inherent destructiveness of patriarchal establishments in favor of a more integral matricentric cultural form based on nurturing rather than dominating relationships between the human and the natural, between the masculine and the feminine, between the governance and the people; a greater sense of the air, the water, and the land as a revered commons would also obtain.

At such moments of cultural transformation the educational process must go through a period of groping toward its new formal expression. This groping period has been especially difficult in recent times because of the magnitude of cultural change that is involved. Education in this context is precisely the subject of this paper. Yet, before a detailed presentation of the educational program that is needed, we might note that the cultural coding of the ecological age is asserting itself already in all areas of contemporary life, but in the confused and groping manner that we have indicated.

This integration of the human with an organic functional world, after detaching the human from the mechanistic world, can be considered among the most

difficult of all historical transitions. The feel for life, the skills for creative interaction with the earth processes: these have been suppressed over a series of generations. The land is now paved over, production is automated, the automobile has so taken over the roadways that walking has become dangerous. In this context new forms of physical conditioning as well as cultural adaptation and technical training are required before the relationship between the human and the earth can become fully functional.

Formal educational programs cannot fulfill all of these requirements. The education needed must be a pervasive life experience. The proper role of formal education would be that of providing the integrating context for the total life functioning; it would also provide the instrument of historical continuity and development of the new coding of the ecological age. Finally, especially at the higher levels of formal education, the needed processes of reflection on meaning and values would take place within a critical context.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Here we might identify the American college and think somewhat about its role in this expansive context of the ecological period. Education is an awesome process, a process as deep and as broad as the universe itself. College should be a center for creating the more encompassing visions as well as for communicating such visions to students. Above all, the college student needs to be involved in a significant historical as well as a significant personal process. Neither of these can exist without the other. Presently our college students need to feel that they are participating in one of the most significant ventures ever to take place in the entire history of the planet. Yet it is first necessary for college administrations and faculties themselves to envisage the creative urgencies that are upon them. The contemporary college is admitted to be less adequate and less effective than is desired. The difficulty is in the transition from the mechanistic culture of the scientific-technological period to the integral culture of the ecological period.

Even more devastating, however, is the fact that the transgenetic cultural coding is so extensively developed, has attained such insight into the mechanics of the earth and such control over its functioning, that the human has assumed an olympian status above and beyond the entire earth process. Alienation from the earth venture has led to confusion about the human venture.

In this situation the college has no adequate social or cultural context in which to function. Religious colleges could always feel that somewhere in the background there was a meaningful world that could provide from without what was not available from within the college process itself. But this has not been an effective response. The most common solution in cultural terms has been to reinstate past forms of humanistic studies in a core curriculum, a curriculum that includes philosophy, ethics, history, literature, religious studies, and perhaps some form of general science—all of these in a critical rather than a commitment context. Yet somehow these programs do not seem to take. A functional cultural canon does not emerge that can do for our world what the religious and cultural orientations or earlier religious cultures did for the societies of those centuries. The program does not activate the human energies that are needed for a vital human mode of being. There is an inability to bring together the scientific secular world with the religious believing world or with the humanist cultural world. Each of these eventually finds that it must go its own way. Consequently all three remain trivialized. No unifying paradigm emerges. Effective education does not take place. No larger context is established in which the college can envisage itself or its educational mission.

THE NEW ORIGIN STORY

At such crisis moments we need to return to the mythic norms governing the world of reality. The entire college project can be seen as that of enabling the student to awaken to the new origin myth and the immense journey of primordial energy through its long series of transformations until the present. Cultural coding at whatever level of expression can be presented in terms of a journey story.

Perhaps our difficulty is that we have never before appreciated the fact that the entire scientific venture of modern times has found its intellectual fulfillment in this story of how the universe came to be by an emergent evolutionary process, and how the entire technological venture of modern times finds its fulfillment in the role it plays in shaping the present and future course of this immense journey. Never before has the origin myth and its related journey story been so clearly presented as by contemporary accounts based on observation of the dynamism of the universe from its beginning until now. While this account is scientific, it is also mythic as a coherent presentation of the universe against backgrounds far beyond anything that rational intelligence can properly understand and that is often trivialized by such terms as "Big Bang." Almost every term used by science carries with it more mystery than rational comprehension. Thus the all-pervading sense of the mythic at the heart of the scientific process. Thus, too, the role of myth and symbolism in scientific discovery.

Although as yet unrealized, this scientific account of the universe is the greatest religious, moral, and spiritual event that has taken place in these centuries. It is the supreme humanistic as well as the supreme scien-

tific event. The sublime mission of modern education is to reveal the true importance of this story for the total range of human and earthly affairs.

The importance of this story of the universe can be seen in the fact that for the first time the peoples of the entire world, insofar as they are educated in a modern context, are being educated within this origin story. It provides the setting in which children everywhere, whether in Africa or China, in the Soviet Union or South America, North America, Europe, or India, are given their world and their own personal identity in time and space. While all the traditional origin and journey stories are also needed in the educational process, none of them can provide the encompassing context for education such as is available in this new story; this new story is the mythic aspect of our modern account of the world, how the universe emerged into being, the phases of transformation through which it has passed, especially on the planet earth, until its present phase of development was realized in contemporary human intelligence.

What is needed, however, is the completion of this story given by modern inquiry into its physical dimensions by an awareness of the numinous and psychic dimensions of the story. The primordial atomic particle is already radiant with intelligibility and with unfathomable mystery as well as with the physical energy that is articulated within its structure.

While this story is the basic context of the entire educational process, it cannot be appreciated by students at elementary and high school levels in an integral reflexive manner. This is the excitement of the college years. At that time the story can be understood in its more profound implications. It can become functional in every phase of those professional activities for which students are being prepared. This constitutes what might be called both a philosophy and a program for college education.

THE CORE CURRICULUM

A set of core courses could be indicated as the practical fulfillment of these suggestions; it would consist of the following:

A First Course, perhaps the most difficult, would present the four evolutionary phases of this functional cosmology: The formation of the galactic systems and the shaping of the elements out of which all future developments took place; the formation of the earth within the solar system; the emergence of life in all its variety upon the earth; the rise of consciousness and human cultural development.

This course, if related to the stars we see, to the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we are nourished by, the earth we stand on, the natural life of the environment as well as the cities we inhabit, the societies of which we are a part, could serve to give a profound sense of mutual presence of the student and the universe to each other. But most powerfully, the student looking at his or her own hand and considering the time span of fourteen billion years that it took to produce such a hand could feel a personal importance in the scheme of things. This would be further enhanced by consideration of those great moments when the universe found its way through the many apparent impasses that it faced. Such a moment occurred after life began, when the life forms had consumed the conditions of their own survival and life was threatened with extinction; at this moment photosynthesis was suddenly invented, the process upon which all future life development depended. If Virgil could say, "It was such a labor to build Rome," we can say with infinitely more truth that it has been "such an effort to build the world" that we inherit.

Finally, there could be communicated to the student the responsibility now borne by the human mode of being to the entire earth process and even to the universe process. The urgency for this type of a comprehensive course can hardly be exaggerated. Its value is enhanced when we consider that this interpretative context for the universe as well as for human existence is bound in only a minimal way to any prior cultural context, but is available to all the peoples of the world, and is indeed at present the most powerful single intellectual force in enabling the over 150 nation-societies of the planet to communicate with each other in a meaningful way.

This mode of experiencing the universe and human life can serve as a common ground for both the traditional religious-humanistic personality and the modern scientific-technological personality. While in earlier times the scientist was more absolute and unrelenting in his or her insistence on the mechanistic and purely random aspects of the universe, this is less true of the thinking scientist of the present. So too with the religious or humanist personality; while there has frequently been an aversion to or an inability to understand the scientific presentation of the universe shown by such religious-humanist personalities, there is now a greater feeling for the imaginative power, the intellectual insight, and the spiritual quality of the scientific vision. The fruitful interaction between the scientific and the religious-humanist vision is our greatest promise for the future as well as the great task of the educator, both in comprehending this for oneself and in communicating this integral vision to future generations of students.

A Second Course in the proposed curriculum could be a course on the various phases of human cultural development: The tribal-shamanic phase, the neolithic village phase, the period of the great religious cultures, the scientific-technological phase, and the emerging ecological phase. This course would enable the student to envisage a comprehensive human

development in its historical stages as well as in its cultural differentiation. Persons could see the continuity and support of their own personal development in the prior development of the universe, of the earth, and of all human history.

A feeling of identity with the entire human venture could be activated in the student. Thus a person could more easily appreciate the genius of the time when the languages of the human community took shape, when the religions and arts and social forms of the world were developed, when the great humanistic cultures were formed, when the elementary technologies were invented; how the modern sciences merged within the European cultural region; and now the need for a new adjustment of human modes of being and activity to the dynamics of the natural world. Such an overview would enable students to discover their personal identity in historical time and cultural space. It would assist the college generations in envisaging the historical mission of their times. This would provide a life meaning that might not otherwise be available.

Special attention should be given to the neolithic village or matricentric phase of cultural development. This was the period when the great goddess figures dominated human affairs, when the fertility rituals were most highly developed, and for awhile, in the prepatriarchal phase, a more effective balance in the feminine-masculine determination of the social and cultural orders obtained.

A Third Course might deal with the period of the great classical cultures that have dominated human development over the past several thousand years and that have given to the human community its more elaborated patterns of linguistic expression, of religious formation, spiritual disciplines, its critical phase in the arts and sciences and literature, its political and social structures, its ethical and legal norms, its advanced craft skills and its popular recreations.

While these cultures have been widely differentiated in the cultural patterns that cover the planet, they have achieved throughout the Eurasian, American, and African worlds certain basic expressions of the human that seem to be definitive achievements. Even though these expressions will surely be extensively modified in the future, they will always be present in the psychic structure of the human, at least for the foreseeable future. From these cultures the student should learn the powerful impact of the divine, the need of spiritual discipline, the majesty of art, the great literature and music and dance and drama which befit the human mode of being, as well as how to achieve economic well-being through technological know-how.

While these traditions are now undergoing the most profound alteration they have experienced since they came into existence, they still account for, and in the immediate future will continue to supply, the main principles of civilized order known to the human community. These traditions until now have been seen as the most formidable barriers to chaos that the human community possesses. The problem, of course, is that these traditions cannot remain static; they must enter into a new phase of their own history. No longer will each be isolated from the others, no longer will the economies of the various peoples be independent of the others.

One great difficulty of these civilizations, born in a dominant spatial experience of reality, is the difficulty of entering into a dominant temporal experience of reality. How to do this and be strengthened rather than disintegrated is the challenge to these cultures and to those societies in which these cultures have found their finest expression.

In different parts of the world a special emphasis could be given to that special humanist-religious tradition to which the students generally are heirs. Since the American student lives within the humanist traditions of Western society, a certain emphasis needs to be given to this tradition in all the richness of its development, in its spiritual as well as in its humanistic aspects. A serious understanding of Western traditions becomes especially important when we consider the extent to which the entire world of life and thought and values has been influenced by these Western cultural traditions. The tragedy is that the dark, destructive aspect of Western patriarchal civilization has become virulent just at this time when the influence of the West has become so pervasive throughout the human community and when its technological capacity for plundering the earth has become so overwhelming that all the basic life systems of the planet are being closed down.

A Fourth Course that might be proposed is the study of the scientific-technological phase of human development, culminating in the awakening of human consciousness to the time sequence in the story of the universe, of the earth, of life, and of the human community. This course should be especially concerned with the power that has come under human control in and through the technological inventions of recent centuries. The consequences of this new power, its helpful and harmful aspects, could be considered along with those social, economic, political, and cultural changes that we have witnessed in the past two centuries.

While this period has so far lasted only a few hundred years in contrast to the several thousand years of the classical civilizations and the sixty to a hundred thousand years of the tribal existence of modern human beings, these centuries of science and technology deserve consideration more as a geological age than as an historical period, because the physical alterations of the planet that have taken place are so great. This is above all the age of the dominance of the human over the natural; it is also the period when the

numinous presence pervading the universe has diminished in human awareness in favor of a dominant preoccupation with human reason, human power, and the sense of the machine as the dominant metaphor for understanding the reality of things.

Yet this is also the period when a profound social consciousness was developed. The globe was affected by political, social, economic, and religious adjustments that have shaken the planet with unique severity. It has been the period of medical advance, of increased human population, of release from many of the physical as well as the social ills of former times.

A Fifth Course could deal with the emerging ecological age, the age of the growing intercommunion between all the living and nonliving systems of the planet and even of the universe entire. A study of this age should concern itself with reestablishing the human within its natural context. Above all, it should deal with the integral functioning of the biosphere, the healing of the damage already done to the dynamics of the earth, the fostering of a renewable economic order by integration of the human within the ever renewing cycles of the natural world as these are sustained by solar energy.

This course might also deal with the renewal of all human roles and all human institutions within this context after the adventurism of the former period dominated by the mechanistic and exploitative processes of science, technology, industry, manufacturing, and commerce.

Law in this new ecological context would function with a greater sense of the inherent rights of natural realities, that is, the rights of living beings to exist and not to be abused or wantonly used or exterminated, whether directly or indirectly, by exploitative human processes. Consideration of natural beings simply as physical or material realities would be recognized as an inadequate or false perception, or even criminal if made the basis of action.

Medicine in this context would envisage the earth as primary healer, and integration with its functioning as the primary basis of health for the human being. The role of the physician would be to assist in interpreting earth-human relationship and guiding the human community in its intercommunion with the earth, with its air and water and sunlight, with its nourishment, and the opportunity it offers for the expression of human physical capacities.

Religion would perceive the natural world as the primary revelation of the divine, as primary scripture, as the primary mode of numinous presence. Christian religion would cease its antagonism toward the earth and discover its sacred quality.

Commerce would recognize that a base exploitation of the planet—the poisoning of earth, air, and water—cannot be justified as an acceptable mode of commercial or industrial activity. It is ultimately self-destructive for commerce as well as for the human community and constitutes an ultimate blasphemy against a sacred reality. The entire system of bookkeeping needs to be revised to bring it out of its fictional context into some relation with reality by including the cost to environment, the invaluable nature of irreplaceable resources, the awareness of the need to integrate the entire industrial-commercial enterprise with the ever renewing cycle of the natural world.

These are simply a few of the issues that give urgency to courses on the ecological age. Mainly, these courses should envisage activities already taking place, or in preparation, to establish centers of human occupation in terms of biocultural regions; that is, regions where the economic and cultural life of the human social group would be established in relation to the geological and climatical conditions of a given region, and in relation to the life forms native to the place.

Values

A Sixth Course could be a course on the origin and identification of values. This course would seek to discover within the context of this new way of experiencing the universe just what can be a foundation for values. This foundation for values should supply in our times what was supplied in medieval times by the doctrine of natural law. This becomes especially urgent since we no longer accept the earlier doctrine of the fixed nature of things that in former times determined the natural goodness or evil of things or actions. Obviously we cannot simply transpose values from the medieval to the modern period. We need to discover the values indicated by reality itself as we experience it.

In terms of the educational process as we have been discussing it, we will find these values in the self-emergent processes of the universe, which are the self-governing processes of the universe and also the value manifestations of the universe. The universe emerges as a differentiation process. Without differentiation there is no universe, there is no existent reality. From the beginning, after its brief period of almost formless radiation, the universe articulated itself in unique, identifiable, intelligible energy constellations or patterns. Reality is not some infinitely extended homogeneous smudge. Each articulation is unrepeatable and irreplaceable at whatever level, from the sub-atomic to the galactic, from the iron core to the earth to the flower, the eagle in flight, or the human persons who walk over the land. Each of these is a unique expression of the total earth presence. At the human level the individual becomes almost a species; the unique quality of the individual becomes such a commanding presence. This, then, is the first value.

The second value is subjectivity. Not only is the artic-

ulation of the individual reality absolute in reference to otherness, but this identity carries with it an interior depth, a special quality, a mystery that expresses not only a phenomenal mode but an archetypal realization. This enables each articulation of the real to resonate with that numinous mystery that pervades all the world. This quality of things is universal but its activation in the human order provides the creative dynamics of the thinker, the poet, the writer, the scientist, the farmer, the craftsman, the political leader, the trader, the educator, and whatever other role is fulfilled by human beings in the functioning of the universe.

A third basis of value is communion, for every reality of the universe is intimately present to every other reality of the universe and finds its fulfillment in this mutual presence. The entire evolutionary process depends on communion. Without this fulfillment that each being finds in beings outside itself, nothing would ever happen in the entire world. There would be no elements, no molecules, no life, no consciousness.

This law of communion finds its most elementary expression in the law of gravitation whereby every physical being in the universe attracts and is attracted to every other physical being in the universe. Gravitation at this elementary level finds an ascending sequence of realizations through the variety of life forms and their modes of generation up to human affection in its most entrancing forms.

The universal and intensity of this communion indicate its immense value. But even more evident is the fact that human survival depends so immediately and absolutely on this capacity for intimate human relationships, a capacity that requires a high level of human development for its proper human fulfillment. Thus there is the need for extensive interior discipline and development if this value is to be realized in any satisfying human form.

The communion whereby the universe becomes reflexively present to itself in human consciousness is completed by the communion attained in the affective and in the aesthetic experience the universe attains of itself in its human expression. These modes of self-fulfilling experience are in some manner reminiscent of the ancient Western religious teaching of the inner life of a trinitarian deity.

One of the difficulties experienced by the human, one of the causes of our planetary, human, and educational disarray, is that we have not adequately developed this capacity for communion. We have been especially delinquent in fulfilling this law of communion in relation to the natural world, a failure that this proposed college program is intended to remedy.

CONCLUSION

Much else might be said here. I will end, however, with a personal view that the first college to announce that its entire program is grounded in the dynamics of the earth as a self-emerging, self-sustaining, self-governing, self-healing, self-educating community of all the living and nonliving beings of the planet will have an extraordinary future.

Professional education should be based on awareness that the earth is itself the primary physician, primary lawgiver, primary revelation of the divine, primary scientist, primary technologist, primary commercial venturer, primary artist, primary educator, and primary agent in whatever other activity we find in human affairs.

General education should likewise be explained on the basis of the courses that have been suggested. These could provide the cultural and historical context that students need to provide for themselves a functional identity.

Business education also should be grounded in this appreciation of the dynamics of the planet. The great need of the commercial-industrial-financial world is to escape from the inflationary processes that it has imposed upon the planet by wanton exploitation of both renewable and nonrenewable resources and by excessive pressures it has exerted to force the earth to produce renewable resources beyond what the earth can reasonably bring forth on a sustainable basis. Business has a great mission to fulfill in establishing a viable economy for the human community by integrating the human economy within the renewable cycles of earth economy.

Liberal arts, the humanities as they are called, can experience a grand renewal within this context. The deeply felt antipathies between the sciences and the humanities could be eliminated. The amazing new discovery by science of the story of the universe would be recognized as a supreme humanistic achievement and as providing a basis for the further expansion of all the traditional humanistic cultures.

The educational process itself would have through this program a cultural, an historical, and a cosmological context of meaning that can be accepted on a broad scale by persons of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Within this context the American college could understand in some depth its role in creating a future worthy of that larger universal community of beings out of which the human component emerged and in which the human community finds its proper fulfillment.

A Terrestrial Dogmatism

Everett Gendler

When I first heard of Father Berry's timely attempt to formulate an appropriate curriculum for the American College in the Ecological Age, I expected to find myself in natural alliance with him. After all, for the past twenty years my teaching and congregational involvements have been significantly circumscribed by the demanding privilege of helping food grow on the small acreage where we live in northern Massachusetts. "Seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night" (Gen. 8:22) did not pass unnoticed, nor did I often fall prey to the illusion that my human life was detached from sun and soil. How surprising, then, and somewhat troubling, that Father Berry's proposal draws from me only a qualified rather than a fully appreciative assent.

Why is this so? It is surely not for the lack of some valuable suggestions for a new and comprehensive core curriculum. The sequence beginning with cosmology and moving through human cultural development to our present age is appropriately sweeping, and the attempt to anticipate the emerging age and respond with formulations of values is both relevant and responsible. These proposals strike me as well worth exploring further, even if, as will become evident, I do have some disagreements about certain of his evaluations of these stages.

Neither have I anything but praise for Father Berry's persuasive insistence on the urgent need to reintegrate ourselves with the life-sustaining earth processes. We have, indeed, become alienated from the natural world of which we are such a distinctive and unique feature, and not only our environment but we ourselves are paying dearly for this severing. Theologically speaking, our disregard for the sustaining gift of earth represents a breach of God's first biblical covenant, which extends not only to Noah, his descendants, and all living creatures, but to earth itself (Gen. 9:13). Surely our way to redemption must pass through creation, not around it.

Everett Gendler is rabbi to Temple Emanuel, Lowell, Massachusetts, and Jewish chaplain and instructor of philosophy and religious studies at Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts.

One part of the price we pay as persons was trenchantly expressed by D.H. Lawrence:

> Oh, what a catastrophe for man when he cut himself off from the rhythm of the year, from his union with the sun and the earth. Oh, what a catastrophe, what a maiming of love when it was a personal, merely personal feeling, taken away from the rising and setting of the sun, and cut off from the magic connection of the solstice and the equinox! That is what is the matter with us. We are bleeding at the roots, because we are cut off from the earth and sun and stars, and love is a grinning mockery, because, poor blossom, we plucked it from its stem on the tree of Life, and expected it to keep on blooming in our civilized vase on the table.

Where, then, do I have difficulty? With a number of the terms used as well as with what seems to be a basic assumption of the proposed reintegration. Let me be specific.

Father Berry asserts that "any significant discussion of the human must deal with the human as an invention of the earth, as fulfilling a role in the earth community of beings, and as by definition that being in whom the earth attains consciousness of itself." With the latter two clauses specifying human functions in relation to earth I have no quarrel. Surely we do play a pivotal role among our fellow beings on this planet; so far as we know, we do bring consciousness to fullest expression on earth; and insofar as we are earth, this may be earth attaining consciousness of itself.

But what of that opening clause, "the human as an invention of the earth"? Is this simply a formulation to make certain that we do not lose our sense of connection with earth, or does it purport to be the adequate statement of our origin and lineage? From the characterization of earth as "a self-educating community of beings . . . self-emergent, self-sustaining, self-governing, self-healing, and self-fulfilling," it seems clear that it is the latter; and so by *fiat* of definition we are declared children of earth, period. Is transcendence thus banished, with God renamed Gaia? Is this

the intent of Father Berry's words, or do I misunderstand and misinterpret them?

Nor is this inflation of earth made more convincing by some of the subsequent argument. That "consciousness, the thoughts and emotions, the social forms and rituals of the human community, are as much earth as is the soil and the rocks and the trees and the flowers," is in one sense true: These human developments are earthly by virtue of our connectedness with earth. But they are also distinguishable from those aforementioned components of earth, and the consciousness that Father Berry rightly esteems has often expressed this uniqueness of the human, figuratively speaking, as clay touched by God, a singular combination of the earthly and the Divine, the dust of the ground with life breathed into it by God. Is such a formulation inferior to the contrived language that attempts to make earth so inclusive a term that it loses specificity and contrast? Whence this apparent fear of the transcendent? For if it is not some such fear operating, why such contortions to avoid more traditional and, for at least some of us, more moving and coherent formulations?

Is there an unstated suspicion that considerate treatment of the earth cannot be included in a scheme that derives from a transcendent, though concerned, Creator? This is hardly the case, as the following Midrash will attest:

> In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be s/he,
> created the first human being,
> God took the person and let him/her pass before
> all the trees of the garden of Eden,
> and said to the person:
> See my works, how fine and excellent they are!
> Now all that I have created, for you have I created.
> Think upon this, and do not corrupt and desolately world;
> for if you corrupt it, there is no one to set it right after you.

This passage should not surprise us, given some of the biblical teachings that are its foundation. If "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein," then the immanent life of earth, transcendently tinged, of course deserves respectful treatment. According to the great biblical scholar Johannes Pedersen, "earth itself is alive" for the ancient Israelites, a covenant relation exists between the owner and the land, "and the owner does not solely prevail in the relation. The earth has its nature, which makes itself felt, and demands respect. The important thing is to deal with it accordingly and not to illtreat it."

When I compare the biblical and Father Berry's formulations of the human being in relation to earth, I am struck by the way in which at one level Father Berry has expanded our horizon, while at another level he has constricted our frames of reference and reduced our personal dimensions. Copernican in relation to the vast time of emergent evolution, how puzzlingly Ptolemaic he becomes in another view of the universe: "The earth is central locus in the universe of . . . the evolution of life in all its variety and . . . the evolution of consciousness and the cultural developments of the human order." Concerning the cultural developments of the human order there is no room for doubt: Earth is surely the central locus of this life experiment. But is earth the *only* locus for the evolution of life and consciousness in the universe? It is the one we know, and it is to be cherished and cared for as intensely as Father Berry urges. But to move from this to the certainty that ours is the only locus of such development in the vast universe? What sustains such a geocentric claim? More encompassing, yet simultaneously more modest, seem to me these two perspectives, one classical rabbinic, one modern poetic:

Rabbi Abbahu said:

> . . . the Holy One, blessed be s/he, kept creating worlds and desolating
> them, creating worlds and desolating them,
> until God created these worlds of heaven and earth.
> Then God said: 'These please me; those did not please me.'

> O TAKE HEART, MY BROTHERS
> Even now . . . with every Leader
> and every Resource and every Strategy
> of every Nation on Earth
> arrayed against Her—
> Even now
> O even Now! my Brothers
> Life is in no danger
> of losing the argument!
> —For after all . . .
> (as will be shown)
> She has only to change the subject
> Kenneth Patchen

What a pity that Father Berry has vitiated the merits of his college proposal by linking it with a substitute theology—earthology—that is not only intellectually dubious but, I am convinced, societally counterproductive. I respect the soil and try to till and tend it organically and respectfully; I am annually in awe, as was the transmitter of Genesis 1:29, of the marvel of the seed, that tiny incarnation of the Life Force, at once the fulfillment of one growth cycle and the initiation of the next; I am excited by the earth both for its energy in itself and for its ceaseless contribution to our well being, not to speak of its exquisite beauty. But when I hear it effectively deified I bridle, and I am hardly the most pious of Jews. "Self-emergent, self-sustaining, self-governing, self-healing, self-fulfilling" indeed! Let me state it plainly: I find this a terrestrial dogmatism that offends my transcendent religious sensibilities.

And if I find it so, how might a traditional Muslim react, for whom Allah is supremely Lord of Creation, and only by whose largesse earth itself exists? Or what of a traditional Hindu, for whom earth may be of some value but is ultimately maya, illusion? With a less narrow and exclusive presuppositional base, at least this much of Father Berry's vision might be realized: the scientific origin story serving as the *supplementary* unifying myth for all peoples of the world "insofar as they are educated in a modern context." It is, indeed, intellectually exciting and personally expanding, and is a most remarkable account of "how the universe emerged into being, the phases of transformation through which it has passed." My own reading of Genesis and Midrashim over the decades has been immeasurably enriched by knowledge of this "how" account. But this has been so for me precisely because I have had a "traditional origin and journey story" to contribute a needed *why* to my own *how* account. Is this what Father Berry had in mind when he spoke of the need for such traditional stories? Or was it something different? It would be clarifying if he would give a specific example of how the scientific myth might interrelate with a traditional myth to provide an "encompassing context." In this way he might assure me, and perhaps others, that his proposal can be encompassing and need not be exclusionary or reductionist, as it seems to me it is in its present formulation.

Helpful, also, would be some clarification about the interplay of matriarchy, patriarchy, and consciousness. If I remember Erich Neumann with any accuracy, the consciousness that Father Berry rightly esteems is a hard-won contribution of the patriarchal. Might the seeming assessment of the matriarchal and the patriarchal be somewhat more nuanced in a fuller statement? The patriarchal may, on critical scrutiny, have a few more positives than have been conceded in his essay; and the matriarchal, if one thinks of Kali, Durga, or the Amazons, is not invariably a nurturing principle.

Despite these apparent, perhaps real, theological differences, I continue to feel that Father Berry and I are natural allies, and I hope there will be further opportunities to deal with some of his proposals in very specific terms. My attention is especially engaged when he speaks of the natural world as "the primary revelation of the divine, as primary scripture, as the primary mode of numinous presence." As one who has enjoyed for thirty years the challenges and satisfactions of finding ways for liturgy to help us sense the numinous presence in the natural world, I'd like to hear more concretely how he envisages the classroom functioning to make more evident the role of the natural world in revealing the divine.

I'd also like to see discussed the interrelations and integration of word-scripture and natural-scripture at this point in the development of human consciousness. Since the natural world does, on Father Berry's definition, include consciousness, and since consciousness at the human level is ultimately intertwined with words (whose echoes may include *dibbur* and *logos*), the numinous possibilities of word-scriptures in relation to natural-scriptures should be a rich area for exploration and further development.

Some thirty years ago the late Abraham Joshua Heschel, professor of Jewish Ethics and Mysticism at Jewish Theological Seminary and one whose sensitivity to the ineffable helped a number of us sense the Divine in life-sustaining ways, spoke also of the realm of nature:

> There are three aspects of nature that command our attention: its *power*, its *beauty*, and its *grandeur*. Accordingly, there are three ways in which we may relate ourselves to the world—we may exploit it, we may enjoy it, we may accept it in awe . . . . Our age is one in which usefulness is thought to be the chief merit of nature; in which the attainment of power, the utilization of its resources is taken to be the chief purpose of man in God's creation. Man has indeed become primarily a tool-making animal, and the world is now a gigantic tool box for the satisfaction of his needs . . . . Nature as a tool box is a world that does not point beyond itself. It is when nature is sensed as mystery and grandeur that it calls upon us to look beyond it . . . . The awareness of grandeur and the sublime is all but gone from the modern mind. Our systems of education stress the important of enabling the student to exploit the power aspect of reality. To some degree, they try to develop his ability to appreciate beauty. But there is no education for the sublime. We teach the children how to measure, how to weigh. We fail to teach them how to revere, how to sense wonder and awe. The sense for the sublime, the sign of inward greatness of the human soul and something which is potentially given to all men, is now a rare gift. Yet without it, the world becomes flat and the soul a vacuum.

Father Berry has many natural allies among those whom nature points beyond itself. I urge him not to exclude us from our common challenge and task in this ecological age.

"Getting from Here to There"

By Betty Reardon

"The American College in an Ecological Age" is a significant challenge to educators, particularly to peace educators. Growing numbers of us who have systematically reflected on the obstacles to and possibilities for the achievement of peace and who have struggled to develop an education suited to preparing citizens to contribute to that achievement have come to see the need for the very kind of education Thomas Berry proposes as the mission of the American college. We have come to argue, as does Father Berry, that what is needed for peace education and, probably, for all of education is just such a wholistic, comprehensive approach as he advocates. Those who identify ourselves as feminist peace educators would especially support his implied argument about ecological versus rationalistic, reductionist thinking. The former must displace the latter if we are to use "the nuclear age" as the schooling period for a major new stage in the human experience.

Berry's challenge calls educators to work for and within the context of "the ecological age" rooted in and reflecting values of the Earth as that new stage. Peace educators agree that the human capacities for relatedness and creativeness integral to his approach are equally essential to the achievement of peace and to the health and survival of the planet and the human species. To achieve such a peace, we must begin to make peace with Earth, for, as Patricia Mische has suggested, the most devastating war is that which humans are waging against this planet. Other peace educators would also argue that most human activity is dominated by the war system and that only a profound change of consciousness will enable us to transcend this system. Berry's article provides the fundamentals of an education far better suited than present programs in higher education to the encouragement of a new stage of human consciousness. Thus we welcome Father Berry's article and urge our colleagues to read and reflect on its challenge.

What makes the article such a challenge is the degree to which it is both inspiring and problematic. It provides us with a range and scope for thinking about "re-purposing education" that we can find in no other document, save perhaps Robert Muller's "World Core Curriculum," which outlines four major conceptual areas focusing on the human person's place in the cosmos. While there are significant differences between the two, they are both based on an acknowledged belief in the fundamental human responsibility for the future of the Earth, a belief that appears to be supported by faith in the spiritual and transcendent capacities of the human family. It is these capacities described and identified in various forms by peace educators that will make it possible for us to carry on that responsibility if we choose to do so. They also constitute some of the fundamental learning goals of peace education. It is in the design of concrete curricular routes (i.e., the particular programs and processes of education) to achieving these goals that Father Berry and Robert Muller pose the real problem for educators.

In outlining his six proposed course areas, Berry implies that it would be possible even now for American colleges and universities to take up such a curriculum. Those of us who spend our professional lives pursuing innovative programs in universities hesitate to become unqualified advocates of Father Berry's proposal in the absence of any particular plan for what world order scholars call "transition strategies" or what most people would refer to as "getting from here to there." There is no need to rehearse the many problems of curriculum and educational process that now plague American educational institutions. It is, however, necessary for us to think clearly about two areas of action that we must pursue if we are to take up Father Berry's challenge: first, the political processes that will be necessary to gain support for educational change of the dimensions that the "American College in the Ecological Age" calls for; and second, the arduous task of curriculum planning to implement these proposals.

To some extent, we can say that the political process has in fact already begun through the discussions and debates surrounding the development of a more socially relevant and less culturally exclusive humanities curriculum and the arguments for black studies, women's studies, and peace studies—the very efforts decried by

Dr. Reardon is director of the Peace Education Program at Teachers College, Columbia University.

the reactionary, "classical" critics of education. These and similar efforts over the last two decades have attempted to open the American mind, to help it to transcend its cultural and gender-biased view of the world and the human experience. Yet, given even that somewhat less than radical goal, far more modest than the transformatory purposes apparent in the Berry proposal, there has been little support for these innovations except from those whose views and experience are excluded from the traditional curriculum. And even those who argue for these innovations do so for the most part in the familiar and, some peace educators would say, sterile terms of the traditional rationalist academic model. The argument tends to be for new and "relevant" subject matter, with little attention to either pedagogy or modes of thinking. Save for some Freireans and feminists, questions of structure and process are raised more by students than by faculty or administration. Thus the politics of change, although it must be attended to as a sphere of action of its own, cannot be separated from the curriculum development process.

It seems to me that the political process of change will also be made the more difficult by the fact that American colleges and universities are now organized to serve the very interests that perpetuate the war system. The curriculum in general, with the discipline-bound structure that still predominates, discourages wholistic thinking, and the sciences—"hard" and "soft"—have been virtually co-opted by what Professor Archie Singham has called the "warrior caste." The subject matter, interpretation, and values of political science, traditional physics, and other such areas promote adversarial as well as reductionist thinking. While much of the knowledge base of the curricular suggestions for an ecological age comes largely from recent knowledge produced by the sciences, this knowledge has yet to become the "meat and potatoes" of any university curriculum. The subject matter itself is as problematic as the fundamental political purposes and structure of the academy, compounding the problems of curriculum development.

It is in the process of curriculum development that we are brought to face the most direct challenges implicit in Berry's article, requiring us to raise some crucial questions about the specifics of implementation. Berry's six core courses are, in both content and purpose, drastically different from most present offerings. However, there is no suggestion that the pedagogic process of the learning environment would be significantly different from that in which present college courses are conducted. This observation is not intended to bring up the argument about the efficacy of the lecture versus other classroom processes, but to raise questions about whether colleges and curricula as presently organized can, in fact, fulfill the intention and purpose of the proposals.

Father Berry seems to assume that a purpose of education, indeed what I read to be the major purpose of the curriculum he suggests, is the development of a capacity to find meaning, and that formal education can produce, or at least contribute significantly to, spiritual transformation. The profound change in the human relationship to the planet that the realization of its spiritual character would produce cannot, it seems to me, be brought about by any primarily instructional information-based process. Even if the information on which we build the ecological curriculum takes into account the new scientific knowledge about the origins and nature of the Earth, introducing it only as a change of content would be no more a guarantee of the kind of spiritual and intellectual change (i.e., change of consciousness) implied as necessary by an ecological approach than traditional religious instruction has been a guarantee of moral behavior.

What I am suggesting is that not only do we need to look toward a transformed structure for college and universities and for new sources of the material basis of learning, but that we must also challenge the primacy of the rational, analytic, Western, masculine thinking modes to which colleges and universities "train" the minds of students. We need especially to challenge the technocratic and "informatic" form such reductionist thought has taken on over the last decades, even in some "liberal traditional" academic strongholds. This is not to argue that the classical forms should be abandoned, nor that the kinds of information carried by the printed page or the computer disk should be totally replaced. Rather it is a plea to reconstitute some of the truly humanistic attributes of classicism such as the unity of knowledge, the intrinsic relationship of philosophy and science, and the interdependence between knower and known. It is to reclaim the role of value in the production and exchange of knowledge, to affirm the sense of knowing as loving the known, most especially if the known is to become the Earth and its life systems. This reclamation of the "primitive," of the wholistic experience of first learning as well as the discovery of the full cosmic dimensions of the human experience is to me implicit in "The American College in the Ecological Age." I thus assume that the intent of the article is also to argue for complementary changes in institutional organization and pedagogic process. Father Berry does not even hint at what these may be, but I am reasonably sure that he would argue for such complementary changes as requisite for the kind of collegiate learning experience he advocates. What is most significant about the essay is that it calls us to think about these practical problems. The inspiration it provides should be sufficient to move educators to action.

Berry provides us with a schema of the kind of organic approach to human knowledge and human experience that some peace educators and some feminist scholars have been advocating, and in some scattered and limited places actually practicing. We know

that it is possible to move toward these kinds of changes, and we believe that if this movement and these attempts to practice and live new modes of learning can exist at all within the current social and educational systems, then the kind of transformation of educational institutions and of the society the essay projects are also possible. If we do confront and tackle the practical problems with energy and courage we can make them probable as well. Berry provides us with a vision of a phase of human experience in which we can experience our wholeness, our true integrity, carrying out our unique capacities to provide the reflective consciousness of the total Earth system and to be responsible for our own effects on the conditions and the future of that system. He provides for us a clear articulation of the ultimate values—life and Earth—that should be the core values of all education. He suggests to us that as the evolution of life and human experience is an organic, cyclical process, so too is learning.

Authentic learning, learning of the cyclical process type, cannot, I fear, be fully pursued in the American college as it is currently constituted. Indeed, the kind of learning called for here is not and cannot be restricted to colleges. It is a process that must begin with early childhood education and be integrated into an attitude toward lifelong learning for individuals and for societies. As the human is the reflective organ of the Earth system, so too the American college may become the reflective organ of our educational system, not separate from, not above, but part of an ongoing wholistic learning process. Such a process is, I would argue, essential if we are to transcend the rationalist-reductionist paradigms currently dominating collegiate learning which many of us believe bear the ultimate responsibility for the major threats to life and to the survival of our planet and our species. The American college must attend to its responsibility to formulate and communicate the knowledge required to transcend those threats. Father Berry outlines the direction in which we should be moving and a vision of a transformed educational system that can inspire and energize our efforts.

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
(A Department of NCEA)
Suite 650 One Dupont Circle Washington, D.C. 20036

Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education is a publication of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. It contains original articles and reprints of articles of interest to colleagues in Catholic higher education. Editor: Sr. Alice Gallin, OSU. Managing Editor: Paul J. Gallagher. Editorial offices: ACCU, Suite 650, One DuPont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. Additional copies $5.00 each (1-9 copies), ten or more copies $4.50 each, prepaid.