Journal of Markets & Morality 4, no. 1 (Spring 2001), 1-13

Globalization and the Insights of Catholic Social Teaching

Samuel Gregg
Director
Center for Economic Personalism

With the process commonly referred to as *globalization* embracing the planet, many Christian social thinkers have naturally begun to write extensively about the question. Yet, before they enter into the details of this issue, it is reasonable that Christian scholars give serious consideration to the matter of how they think about globalization. If they are to avoid the common error of simply articulating secularist bromides in the language of Christian theology, they need to begin by looking to the unique intellectual apparatuses that have been bequeathed to Christians by the Church. Thus, from the standpoint of Roman Catholicism, careful reflection upon magisterial teaching about socialization, subsidiarity, and the common good should allow Catholic scholars to think through the phenomenon of globalization in a way that yields insights that may escape the attention of orthodox secularist thought.

Introduction

The word *globalization* is on everyone's lips. For some it means what we are bound to do if we wish to be happy, while others view it as a primary cause of their unhappiness. What is clear, however, is that globalization appears to be an intractable, even irreversible, process that affects everyone. It is also evident that the very word *globalization* is used in such a variety of positive, negative, and neutral senses that it is increasingly difficult to be precise about what people mean when they use the term. As the Polish-Jewish sociologist, Zygmunt Bauman, notes: "All vogue words appear to share a similar fate: the more experiences they pretend to make transparent, the more they themselves become opaque…. 'Globalization' is no exception to that rule."[1]

What, then, is globalization? Rather than enter into a long discussion of its definition, we content ourselves here with simply noting some of the tendencies commonly associated with the word, without passing judgment on whether such developments are essentially positive or negative in nature. These include:

- the proliferation of transnational organizations and movements both of a "private" (e.g., multinational corporations) and "public" (e.g., international judicial bodies) nature;

- a diminishing—though not an extinction—of the decision-making abilities and sovereignty of nation-state governments in favor of some of these transnational bodies;

- the emergence of planetary dimensions to business, finance, trade, technological, and information flows;
- the diminution of many hitherto common political and economic barriers such as tariffs;
- an increasing degree of cultural homogenization; and
- the unparalleled expansion of personal relationships beyond the level of the family, local communities and associations, and even nations.

Globalization, then, has social, cultural, and political manifestations. Unfortunately, much discussion about globalization and its implications for the state has already degenerated into a somewhat sterile debate about whether the tendencies associated with globalization are essentially good, inevitable, and to be welcomed unquestionably, or fundamentally regrettable, destructive, and to be resisted at every turn.[2]

This article, however, does not involve itself in that discussion, nor does it concern itself with examining globalization's implications for the role of national governments in specific policy areas. Prior to involving themselves in such discussions, it is surely reasonable that theologians and church leaders undertake some basic preliminary work on the issue of *how* Christians should approach the subject of globalization, because this will help determine the nature of their response to this phenomenon.

This, of course, is a potentially inexhaustible subject. As a way of presenting some brief preliminary contributions to this methodological issue, this article draws upon the resources of modern Catholic social teaching as articulated by the Papal and Conciliar magisterium to ask:

- How Christians might comprehend the nature, origin, and consequences of globalization;
- How Christians might situate globalization within a specifically Christian vision of history; and
- How Christians might think about the role of the state in light of globalization.

Because it is regularly required to address newly emerging social, economic, and political phenomena such as globalization, Catholic social teaching is not a "static" body of thought. On the contrary, the teaching grows and develops over time. It does not, happily enough, do so by simply blessing whatever happens to be the latest fashionable secular view of such changes. The eminent commentator on Catholic social teaching, Rodger Charles, S.J., points out that the Church develops its teaching on social matters by looking to:

> (i) the Scriptures, (ii) the Tradition of the Church, that is, the teaching of its Fathers and Doctors, the decisions of councils and popes, the witness of the saints, and the writings of approved theologians and philosophers, (iii) the experience of the Church and her members throughout her history among peoples of all cultures and social, political, and economic systems, and (iv) the relevant findings of non-Christian thinkers and writers on the social, political, and economic life of man. It also draws on the lessons to be learned from the experience of different non-Christian social, political, and economic systems.[3]

What is perhaps most revealing about these sources is the extent to which they are located in the Church's *heritage* rather than simply the knowledge proceeding from secular intellectual disciplines and the non-Christian world. This is to be welcomed, because, as Jeffrey Stout, a non-believer, observes

> To gain a hearing in our culture, theology has often assumed a voice not its own and found itself merely repeating the bromides of secular intellectuals in transparently figuratively language…. The explanation for the eclipse of religious ethics in recent secular moral philosophy may therefore be … that academic theologians have increasingly given the impression of saying nothing that atheists don't already know.[4]

If Christians do not have anything to say about issues such as globalization that has not or cannot be articulated by secular humanists, then, as John Finnis notes, "No one should be surprised to find the Church ceasing to be even an interesting participant in the secular debate, and faltering in its own primary and irreplaceable purpose of leading people to salvation."[5] It would be difficult to find a more decisive rebuttal to Harvey Cox's "secular city"—a vision that even Cox himself has disowned as fundamentally misconceived.

In attempting, then, to offer some reflections upon how people might think about the three issues outlined above in ways that may not be immediately obvious to the secular humanist mindset, we examine here just two aspects of the heritage of Catholic social teaching. These are John XXIII's social encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (1961); and the Second Vatican Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes* (1965).

Globalization: A Form of "Socialization"

When one examines modern Catholic social teaching, the word *globalization* does not appear in any papal encyclical or Conciliar document. Given that this term only really assumed common usage in the 1990s, this should not be surprising. Nonetheless, if only because of the detailed attention that globalization is receiving from secular commentators in so many intellectual disciplines, there is little doubt in my mind that this phenomenon will be—and perhaps

should be—one of the topics in the next major magisterial document on the social question. This underscores the need for preliminary methodological work on *how* to approach this subject.

Globalization is, of course, by its very nature an international phenomenon. When it comes to Catholic social teaching, the magisterial document that first gave serious consideration to issues of a specifically "international" (as opposed to an essentially Western) character was not, as is commonly supposed, Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio* (1967), but, rather, John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra*. A treatment by the magisterium of the problems characterizing the relationship between the developed and developing worlds, for example, featured in a substantial way in Catholic social teaching for the first time in this text.[6]

One of the general worldwide trends to which John XXIII directed attention was that social life was growing both more diverse and complex:

> … one of the principal characteristics which seem to be typical of our age is an increase in social relationships [*socialium rationum incrementa*], in those mutual ties, that is, which grow more daily and which have led to the introduction of many and varied forms of associations in the lives and activities of citizens.[7]

What was the cause of this phenomenon, often incorrectly described as *socialization* in some English translations of the encyclical?[8] On one level, John XXIII posited, it was "a symptom and a cause of the growing intervention of the state, even in matters which are of intimate concern to the individual, hence of great importance and not devoid of risk."[9] This observation, one may suggest, is equally applicable to the phenomenon of globalization. Too often, globalization is simplistically associated with the growth of multinational corporations and other non-governmental organizations. In this context, it is worth remembering that the emergence and codification of international law as well as the proliferation of international public agencies, such as the International Court of Justice, were some of the first concrete manifestations of a tendency toward global homogenization at a certain institutional level.

At the same time, however, John XXIII suggested that socialization also reflected something innate in human beings, which was now beginning to manifest itself at an international level on a scale never before seen in human history. As Pope John stated:

> It [socialization] is also partly the result, partly the expression of a natural, well-nigh irresistible urge in man to combine with his fellows for the attainment of aims and objectives that are beyond the means or capabilities of single individuals. In recent times, this tendency has given rise

> to the formation everywhere of both national and international movements, associations and institutions with economic, cultural, sporting, recreational, professional, and political ends.[10]

In his last encyclical, *Pacem in Terris* (1963), John XXIII was even more specific about the international dimensions of socialization. He referred, for instance, to "recent progress in science and technology" acting as "a spur to men all over the world to extend their collaboration and association with one another." Notice was also made of the reality of "growing economic interdependence" so much so that "a kind of world economy is being born from the simultaneous integration of the economies of individual states."[11]

Though these words were written almost forty years ago, they seem now to have been prescient in foreshadowing certain aspects of globalization. Moreover, they also provide us with an insight into *why* globalization is occurring. Christianity has always held that it is *impossible* for human beings to achieve many things by their own unaided efforts. As creatures made in God's image, we possess free will and intelligence. This endows us with individuality and autonomy. We are, however, also social creatures by nature—"male and female He created them" (Gen. 1:27)—who need to associate with others in a variety of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* forms of relationship if we are to grow as persons. Aquinas, following Aristotle, argued that the state (*civitas*) emerged naturally because of the need to do certain things, such as maintain the rule of law, that were necessary for the well-being of individuals, families, and intermediate associations, but which were beyond the capacity of any of these groups to organize without coordination of some kind.[12]

From the perspective of *Mater et Magistra*, one may say that the emergence of many international organizations such as the United Nations has proceeded, in part, as a consequence of a widespread desire and need to coordinate responses to issues and dilemmas that are beyond the capacity of any one nation-state to handle unilaterally. *Mater et Magistra*'s discussion of socialization also underlines two fundamental principles that Christians may wish to use when reflecting upon globalization. Restating a fundamental point of Christian anthropology, John XXIII explains that human beings are "free and autonomous by nature … [but] cannot altogether escape from the pressure of environment."[13] Hence, on one level, the encyclical explains that socialization is to be welcomed because it "makes it possible for the individual to exercise many of his personal rights … on a more extended basis." The proliferation of mass media, for example, makes it "possible for everyone to participate in human events the world over."[14] Nonetheless, socialization also "brings with it a multiplicity of restrictive laws and regulations" that "narrows the sphere of a person's

freedom of action." Socialization consequently makes it more "difficult for a person to think independently of outside influences, to act on his own initiative, exercise his responsibility and express and fulfil his own personality."[15]

Two points accent the preceding statements that contemporary Christians would do well to consider when thinking about globalization. The first is that socialization has many consequences, both positive and negative, and therefore should not be assessed as a wholly good or wholly evil development. The challenge, rather, is to discern "and promote its inherent advantages and to preclude, or at least diminish, its attendant disadvantages."[16] Surely the same may be said of globalization. The second is that one of the basic criteria by which socialization's various manifestations should be assessed is whether they facilitate or hinder the ability of human beings to choose freely to actualize those basic goods that are conducive to human flourishing[17] and thereby fulfill themselves as persons. Christians may wish to ask a similar question about globalization. Writing in 1975, Cardinal-Archbishop Karol Wojtyla of Krakow warned that socialization could have negative consequences if the primacy of the human person's welfare was not kept in mind. Speaking of the Church's teaching regarding socialization, Wojtyla suggested that

> [it] calls attention to a certain danger … that the 'order of things' will take precedence over the 'order of persons'…. In such a system, socialization may be diverted from its basic orientation towards the 'welfare of persons'…. In other words, [the Church] perceives in contemporary social processes—those connected with the enormous advance of technological, industrial, and material factors—the *danger of a fundamental alienation of human beings*. People can easily become tools in the system of things, the material system created by their own intelligence, and they can become objects of different kinds of social manipulation.[18]

The same warning is, one may suggest, equally applicable to globalization.

A "Dialectical" Approach

Although *Mater et Magistra*'s discussion of socialization provides Christians with some useful ways of understanding globalization, it does not furnish us with a historical perspective for this phenomenon, specifically one underpinned by faith that Jesus Christ is the Lord of History, the Alpha and Omega to whom all time belongs. Something of this nature, however, may be found in *Gaudium et Spes* which, unlike many other magisterial texts that touch on the social question, attempts to place its reflections within a Christological understanding of human history. In paragraph five of *Gaudium et Spes*, the Council states:

> History itself is accelerating [*acceleratur*] on so rapid a course that individuals can scarcely keep pace with it…. And so the human race is passing from a relatively static conception of the nature of things [*ordo rerum*] to a more dynamic and evolutionary conception.[19]

The words *dynamic* and *evolutionary* would appear to attest to the influence of the thought of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J., upon this section of *Gaudium et Spes*, which effectively holds that rapid change is becoming a new constant of human existence. If there is one thing that seems characteristic of globalization, it is precisely endless and fast change, typified by rapid and seemingly ceaseless transformations in the realm of technology.

The Council, however, is careful to remind us that in the midst of this seemingly perpetual acceleration some things remain fixed and immutable:

> The Church believes that in her Lord and Master are to be found the key, the center, and the purpose of the whole history of mankind. And the Church affirms, too, that underlying all that changes there are many things that do not change, and that have their ultimate foundation in Christ who is the same yesterday, today, and forever.[20]

Thus, while the Council considers the modern age to be characterized by ceaseless transformation, it attests that there are certain fundamentals that *never* change precisely because they are derived from the God-Man Himself who simultaneously pervades and transcends history.[21]

But, one might ask, what does this view of humanity's journey through history have to do with providing guidance for Christians as to how they might go about discerning globalization's meaning? Do the manifestations of an accelerating history—such as globalization—simply coexist with fundamental truths about God and humanity, or does the relationship between the two provide us with a way of assessing emerging historical trends?

It is here, one may suggest, that the Pastoral Constitution's description[22] of its "signs-of-the-time" method—highly misunderstood by some Christian social thinkers[23]—becomes relevant insofar as it provides us with a key to unlocking the relationship between historical change and the fundamental truths of the Gospel. Its opening paragraphs state that "[a]t all times the Church carries the responsibility of reading the signs of the time and interpreting them in light of the Gospel."[24] Later in the text, the Council adds:

> Moved by that faith [the Church] tries to discern in the events, the needs, and the longings which it shares with other men of our time, what may be genuine signs of the presence or of the purpose of God. For faith throws a new light on all things and makes known the full ideal which God has set for man, thus guiding the mind toward solutions that are fully human.[25]

Thus, there is always a two-step process: *identifying* what, out of many events of the present time, might be "signs" of God's presence or purpose; and then *analyzing* them from the Gospel's viewpoint. Germain Grisez explains this approach as follows:

> The Council's method proceeds neither solely by deduction from general principles nor solely by induction from experienced situations but by dialectical reflection on data in the light of faith. This process uses both deductive and inductive reasoning to arrive at synthetic insights.[26]

On the basis of the cited extracts, this seems to be an accurate interpretation. One may add that the Council's words indicate that the Church is *expected* "at all times" to pay attention to what is happening in the world. A "fortress Church" is therefore not an option. On the other hand, the Church is *obliged* to be *critically reflective*, and *its reflection is to be informed by Revelation*. Consequently, the true meaning of something that may qualify as a sign of the times, such as globalization, can only be discerned in light of all the general principles contained in the Gospel.

Globalization, the State, and the Common Good

Having modestly outlined some ways that Christians might approach the subject of globalization, it remains to offer some reflections on how Christians may wish to think about the role of the state in an apparently globalized future. In this connection, an appropriate starting point is to be precise about the state's purpose and origin. *Gaudium et Spes* contains a concise treatment of this matter:

> Individuals, families, and the various groups that make up the civil community, are aware of their inability to achieve a truly human life by their own unaided efforts; they see the need for a wider community where each one will make a specific contribution to an even broader implementation of the common good. For this reason, they set up various forms of political communities. The political community, then, exists for the common good: This is the full justification and meaning and source of its specific and basic right to exist. The common good embraces the sum total of all those conditions of social life that enable individuals, families, and organizations to achieve complete and efficacious fulfillment.[27]

From the viewpoint of Christian political thought, this understanding of the state is not new. It hardly differs from Aquinas' commentary on this subject, noted earlier. The Council's connection between the state and the common good should also be familiar to students of Christian political philosophy.

Nonetheless, it is important for our purposes to remember the intimacy of this connection when thinking about globalization. We must ask ourselves where,

in light of globalization, the public authorities of nation-states can be expected to continue to assume responsibility for "guiding the energies of all towards the common good";[28] where decentralization to a regional and local level may now be required; and where the relinquishment of powers to higher or lower authorities may be necessary. For, in a globalized milieu, the character of many of the conditions that make up the common good have surely been transformed. Indeed, as Robert George notes, "Many natural law theorists are coming to view the territorial or national state as crucially 'incomplete'; that is to say, incapable of doing all that can and must be done to secure conditions for the all-round flourishing of its citizens."[29] In a world of international free trade, for example, the capacity of any one individual government to ensure that commercial activity remains subject to the rule of law becomes more circumscribed.

The answer to these questions will depend, in part, upon *what we understand to be the common good* and *which level of public authority* is most capable of assuming coordinating responsibility for the conditions that make up the common good and that manifest themselves concretely at local, regional, national, or international levels. This requires us to be clear about two things: The first is the *object* of the common good. Catholic social teaching does not interpret this in terms of a type of utilitarian "greatest good of the greatest number." As Yves R. Simon stated, the object of the common good is *each* and *every* human subject's self-realization of their potentiality as a person—as the *imago Dei*.[30]

The second point requiring clarification is determining the conditions that allow each and every person the maximum opportunity to fulfill themselves as persons. Here it is arguable that a great deal of work needs to be done, especially within the context of Catholic social teaching. Michael Novak, for example, suggests that

> Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI use the term 'common good' in a baffling variety of meanings and contexts.... Sometimes they use the term in great and sweeping generality, in a way hard to decipher concretely or institutionally. Sometimes they use it to justify some very concrete proposal.... Most often ... they are trying to lift the eyes of humans from their personal concerns to the large changes in social structures that marked the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[31]

Here one should note that in the 1940s, Pius XII began discussing the rights and duties of the human person as part of a general effort to widen and deepen Catholic social teaching's understanding of the common good.[32]

Unfortunately, when it comes to being more concrete about the conditions associated with the common good, Catholic social teaching has *not*, in more recent years, engaged in a systematic analysis of what these might be. It is

precisely for this reason that scholars such as David Hollenbach, S.J. are presently busy undertaking such a task.

As Christian theologians begin to focus on identifying these conditions, it is surely important that they do not allow their analysis to become overly structural or material in emphasis if they want to make distinctly Christian contributions to this discussion. As Jacques Maritain pointed out:

> [what] constitutes the common good of political society is not only the collection of public commodities and services—the roads, ports, schools, et cetera, which the organization of common life presupposes; a sound fiscal condition of the state and its military power; the body of just laws, good customs and wise institutions, which provide the nation with its structure; the heritage of its great historical remembrances, its symbols and its glories, its living traditions and cultural treasures. The common good includes all of these and something more besides—something more profound, more concrete, more human. For it includes also, and above all, the whole sum itself of these; a sum which is quite different from a simple collection of juxtaposed units.... It includes the sum or sociological integration of all the civic conscience, political virtues and sense of right and liberty, of all the activity, material prosperity and spiritual riches, of unconsciously operative hereditary wisdom, of moral rectitude, justice, friendship, happiness, virtue and heroism in the individual lives of its members. For these things all are, in a certain measure, *communicable* and so revert to each member, helping him to perfect his life and liberty of person. They all constitute the good human life of the multitude.[33]

Two important points emerge from this analysis. First, Maritain highlights that the common good consists, in part, of the various *moral*, *spiritual*, and *cultural* goods in which every human person is capable of freely choosing to participate. Surely, Christians have substantial and distinctive contributions to make when it comes to exploring these dimensions of the common good. The second point is that once all the conditions that constitute the common good are "unpacked," the complexity of determining which level of political authority is most capable of assuming the coordinating responsibility for various conditions in a globalized environment becomes evident.

One principle articulated by Catholic social teaching, that assists in clarifying which level of government should assume primary responsibility for certain conditions conducive to human flourishing, is that of subsidiarity. The meaning of this principle is nicely stated in Pius XI's 1931 social encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*:

> Just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to a group what private initiative and effort can accomplish, so too it is an injustice ... for a larger and higher association to arrogate to itself func-

> tions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower associations. This is a fundamental principle…. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help members of a social body, and never to destroy or absorb them.[34]

The common good, we recall, is a set of conditions that enables people to realize certain goods *for themselves*, that is, as the result of their own deliberation, judgment, choice, and action. Hence, to help others (*subsidium*) does not mean doing *everything* for them—in some instances, it may even mean doing *nothing* to assist them, if this is necessary to encourage people to act for themselves.

As applied to the question of globalization and the international order, the principle of subsidiarity would restrict the authority of any "world" government to those problems that cannot be dealt with successfully by national governments, just as it restricts the authority of national governments to those problems that cannot be dealt with successfully by local government. From this perspective, "world" government is, in principle, limited government—it is not meant to displace regional, local, or national authorities and may only legitimately exercise power where regional, local, or national governments are not competent to solve the problem at hand.

This is not to suggest, of course, that theologians should limit themselves strictly to the realm of theory when thinking about these issues. Robert George agrees:

> The application of the principle of subsidiarity is more a matter of art than of science; and, in the modern world, the principle must be applied under constantly shifting conditions. In many cases, problems that are appropriately dealt with at one level in the conditions prevailing today may be more appropriately dealt with at another level (higher or lower) in the conditions prevailing tomorrow.[35]

But while Christians have to be conscious of such realities when thinking about globalization and the challenges it creates for nation-state governments, it is also true that their contributions should not amount to simple rearticulation of the ideas of secular scholars in theological language. Otherwise, they leave themselves open to Jeffrey Stout's charge of having nothing original or even special to say about such issues. In *Gaudium et Spes*, the Second Vatican Council stated its desire to examine the difficulties and dilemmas faced by humanity and to "clarify these problems in light of the Gospel and … furnish mankind with the saving resources which the Church has received from its founder under the prompting of the Holy Spirit."[36] If the same intention underlies the reflections

of those Christians who choose to study the phenomenon of globalization, they should have no fear of being considered irrelevant.

Notes

1. Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 1.

2. See, for example, John Wiseman, *Global Nation? Australia and the Politics of Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); cf. Gregory Melleuish, "Globalization: 'Politics' Versus 'Economics'," *Policy* 15, 1 (1999): 48–50.

3. Rodger Charles, S.J., *Christian Social Witness and Teaching: The Catholic Tradition—From 'Genesis' to 'Centesimus Annus'*, vol.1 (Gracewing: Leominster, 1998), 6.

4. Jeffrey Stout, *Ethics After Babel: Language of Morals and Their Discontents* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990), 110.

5. John Finnis, "The Catholic Church and Public Policy Debates in Western Liberal Societies: The Basis and Limits of Intellectual Engagement," in *Issues for a Catholic Bioethic: Proceedings of the International Conference to Celebrate the Twentieth Anniversary of the Foundation of the Linacre Centre*, ed. L. Gormally (London: The Linacre Centre, 1999), 272.

6. John XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Mater et Magistra* (May 15, 1961), in *The Papal Encyclicals*, ed. C. Carlen, I.H.M., vol. 5 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: McGrath Publishing, 1981), nos. 157–77.

7. Ibid., no. 59.

8. The Latin translation of *Mater et Magistra* does not use *socialization* at all. Instead, expressions such as *socialum rationum incrementa* (literally "incrementing social relations," no. 59) and *huismodi rationum socialium progressione* (no. 61) were used to describe the "increased complexity of social life." See R. Bandas, "The Word 'Socialization' in *Mater et Magistra*," *Priest* 17 (1961): 839–41.

9. *Mater et Magistra*, no. 60.

10. Ibid.

11. John XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Pacem in Terris* (April 11, 1963), in *The Papal Encyclicals*, no. 130.

12. See Thomas Aquinas, *De Regimine Principum ad Regem Cypri*, ed. and intro. I. T. Eschmann, O.P., trans. G. B. Phelan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1949), I: 8–9.

13. *Mater et Magistra*, no. 63. It hardly need be said that when the Church speaks of the human person as "free," it does not mean free to do whatever they wish as long as their actions do not harm others, as many secular humanists posit, but, rather, free to choose to do what they ought to do in light of the Revealed Truth. This bond between truth and freedom is captured in the Deuteronomic verse: "I set before you life or death, blessing or curse. Choose life, then, so that you and your descendants may live" (Dt 30:19).

14. Ibid., no. 61.

15. Ibid., no. 62.

16. Ibid., no. 64.

17. See John Finnis, *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 80–99.

18. Karol Wojtyla, "Rodzicielstwo a '*communio personarum*'" [Parenthood and the "*Communio Personarum*"], *Ateneum Kaplanskie* 84, 1 (1975): 29–30.

19. Second Vatican Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes* (December 7, 1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, rev. ed., ed., A. Flannery, O.P., vol. 1 (Leominster: Fowler Wright Books, Ltd., 1988), no. 5.

20. Ibid., no. 10.

21. For the challenge of the Council's understanding of history to the Hegelian view, see Carol Pinto de Oliveira, "L'esprit agit dans l'historie. La totalisation hegelienne de l'historie confrontée avec les perspectives du Concile de Vatican II," in *Hegel et la théologie contemporaine*, eds. L. Rumpf et al. (Neufchâtel/Paris: Cerf, 1977), 54–83.

22. The word *description* is used here because, despite its importance, the Council does not define the phrase, "the signs of the times." *Gaudium et Spes* simply provides a description and outlines some of its consequences for the life of faith. See Marie-Dominique Chenu, O.P., "Les signes des temps: Réflexion théologique," in *L'église dans le monde de ce temps*, eds. Yves Congar, O.P., and M. Peuchmaurd, O.P., vol. 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 205–25. Moeller suggests that the Council employs the phrase sparingly because it was aware that the term is used in the Bible in reference to something quite different—the eschatological signs of the last days. See Charles Moeller, "Preface and Introductory Statement," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Vol. V, ed. Hans Vorgrimler (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 94.

23. For a correct understanding of the signs-of-the-times method, see James V. Schall, S.J., "The Teaching of *Centesimus Annus*," *Gregorianum* 74, 1 (1993): 17. Here Schall notes that 'To read the "signs of the times" is to interpret personal and historical events, events of the orders of action and making in Aristotle's sense, in the light of some more stable and intelligible, usually divine, order." Germain Grisez's view is similar: "The true meaning of situational factors can be discerned only in the light of all the general principles of Christian doctrine and morality." Germain Grisez, *The Way of the Lord Jesus*, vol. 2, *Living a Christian Life* (Quincy: Franciscan Press, 1993), 59. See also Samuel Gregg, *Challenging the Modern World: Karol Wojtyla and the Development of Catholic Social Teaching* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 1999), 32–37.

24. *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 4.

25. Ibid., no. 11.

26. Grisez, *Living a Christian Life*, 59, n. 114.

27. *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 74.

28. Ibid.

29. Robert George, "Natural Law and International Order," *In Defense of Natural Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 235.

30. See "Letter of Yves Simon to Jacques Maritain," December 11, 1945, quoted in Ralph McInerny, "The Primacy of the Common Good," in *The Common Good and U.S. Capitalism*, eds. Oliver Williams, C.S.C., and John Houck (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1987), 82, n. 19.

31. Michael Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good* (Lanham, Md.: Madison Books, 1989), 148–49.

32. Pius XII, "Christmas Message, 1942"; *The Rights of Man*, *AAS* 35 (1943), 9–24.

33. Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, trans. J. Fitzgerald (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1948), 37–38.

34. Pius XI, Encyclical Letter *Quadragesimo Anno* (May 15, 1931), in *The Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, no. 79. As Finnis states, "An attempt, for the sake of the common good, to absorb the individual altogether into common enterprises would be disastrous for the common good, however much the common enterprises might prosper." *Natural Law and Natural Right*, 168.

35. George, "Natural Law and International Order," 240.

36. *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 3.