Journal of Markets & Morality
Volume 16, Number 1 (Spring 2013): 69–83

There Is Now Only One Social Question: The Development of 'The Whole Person in Every Single Dimension'*

Jean-Yves Naudet
Université d'Aix-Marseille

Two aspects of *Caritas in Veritate* are noteworthy for a social encyclical: its title and its intended recipients. Despite outlining a theological and Christian approach to integral human development, the social encyclical takes an explicitly theological title and is promulgated not only to Christians but to "all people of good will." This article explores how *Caritas in Veritate* expands on previous Roman Catholic social teaching by highlighting the centrality of a holistic understanding of the human person—the relationship between love and justice; the condition of original sin, humanity's moral nature, unity, and globalization; the concept of gift, education, culture, environment; and the sanctity of human life—for the social question and integral human development.

When we read the social encyclical of Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, two things strike us from its very first page: first, its title and, second, the list of recipients.

A Theological Title for a Social Encyclical

Among the various social encyclicals, we normally find two different kinds of titles.

The first refers to an anniversary date: for *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius VI in 1931, the title refers to the 40 years of *Rerum Novarum* (1891); *Octogesima Adveniens* of Paul VI in 1971, for the 80 years of the text of Leo XIII; and, last, *Centesimus Annus* in 1991, the 100th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*.

On the other hand, there is a whole series of encyclicals with titles that are explicitly social. In 1891, Leo XIII called the first social encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, referring to the new things expressed in the subtitle "On the Condition of Workers."[1] John XXIII, for his part, also expressed social teaching, even if indirectly, in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris* in 1963. Things are more direct in the 1967 encyclical of Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, dedicated to human development and also with John Paul II in 1981, *Laborem Excercens* devoted to human labor. This trend continues in John Paul II's 1987 encyclical, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, which focuses on development and highlights the abiding concern the Church has for social issues.

With Benedict XVI's text, we seem at first glance to have a theological encyclical rather than a social one since the title, *Caritas in Veritate* ("charity, or love, in truth") sounds more theological.[2] Certainly, the subtitle does reference integral human development, but even this subtitle makes clear that it is a development in love and truth. More than with other popes, this title means that we are probably dealing with a theological interpretation of social issues, not just anthropological questions. The pope himself uses this expression, which remains in Latin in the various official vernacular translations: *Caritas in veritate in re sociali*. It seems to me that this ought to attract our attention. Of course, Benedict XVI's theological presentation is unsurprisingly accompanied by a natural and Christian anthropology.

An Encyclical Sent to All People of Good Will

Especially when they concern matters ecclesiological or theological, papal encyclicals are explicitly addressed to all Catholics, and more precisely, to bishops, priests, deacons, consecrated persons, and lay faithful. This has been the case since the first social encyclicals. Since John XXIII and Paul VI, then John Paul II, and finally, with Benedict XVI, who continues the same tradition, the phrase "and all people of good will" is added to this list. However, one does not write the same way only to believers as well as to all people of good will.

Indeed, to believers we can speak the language of faith, that of the revelation of Scripture, which, of course, does not exclude reason, but insists on defining faith as a means of access to knowledge. On the contrary, if we broaden the recipients of the letter to all people of good will, we must insist on the importance of reason. We cannot speak to believers of other religions, agnostics, and atheists, using only the language of the Catholic faith to address issues that are of common life in society and, in particular, of economic and social life.

On several occasions in his text, Benedict XVI emphasizes this double source, that of faith and of reason. Thus he says that the social doctrine of the Church "is at the same time the truth of faith and of reason" (*CV*, 5). He goes further in chapter 5 (56) affirming the need for a fruitful dialogue between faith and reason, a theme already dear to John Paul II, to which he had dedicated the encyclical *Fides et Ratio*.

Benedict says,

> *Reason always stands in need of being purified by faith*: this also holds true for political reason, which must not consider itself omnipotent. For its part, *religion always needs to be purified by reason* in order to show its authentically human face. Any breach in this dialogue comes only at an enormous price to human development. (*CV*, 56)

If we appeal to reason, we proceed by way of anthropology, natural law, and philosophy—a method already used in the Middle Ages, notably by Thomas Aquinas, with the rediscovery of Greek philosophy, especially Aristotle. This is what allows dialogue with all people of good will to build together a "civilization of love."[3] Benedict XVI emphasizes that "in all cultures there are examples of ethical convergence, some isolated, some interrelated, as an expression of the one human nature, willed by the Creator; the tradition of ethical wisdom knows this as the natural law. This universal moral law provides a sound basis for all cultural, religious and political dialogue" (*CV*, 59).

The double reference to faith and reason enables Benedict XVI to clarify that "these important teachings form the basis for the missionary aspect of the Church's social doctrine, which is an essential element of evangelization" (*CV*, 15). In fact, this promotes dialogue with all people, both believers and nonbelievers, as everyone can use reason included in the social teaching of the Church and can help nonbelievers to meet believers and perhaps discover faith. John Paul II wrote, "[T]he Church's *social teaching* is itself a valid *instrument of evangelization*."[4]

To all people of good will, Benedict XVI offers first charity in truth concerning the social question and then what he calls, after Paul VI, "integral development."

Caritas in Veritate in Re Sociali

The formula is love, or charity in truth "in the social thing," literally, or, concerning social questions. It should be noted, first, that, as he himself states, the formula *Caritas in Veritate* reverses what Saint Paul wrote. Indeed, Benedict XVI writes,

> Hence the need to link charity with truth not only in the sequence, pointed out by Saint Paul, of *veritas in caritate* (Eph. 4:15), but also in the inverse and complementary sequence of *caritas in veritate*. Truth needs to be sought, found and expressed within the "economy" of charity, but charity in its turn needs to be understood, confirmed and practiced in the light of truth. (*CV*, 2)

This text has a theological dimension primarily as its title refers to God, as God is both love and truth. For the believer, the only truth is God. Jesus makes this clear in what we read in the gospel of John (8:32), "The truth will set you free." Beyond this properly theological frame, the text of Benedict XVI explains how charity in truth applies to social issues.

First, this text takes up a theme Benedict XVI explored in his encyclical on charity, that of the relationship between justice and charity.[5] This is a key issue in human society—one that sparked considerable debate with Marxism in the nineteenth century. Marxists, as Benedict XVI recalled in his first encyclical, accused the Church of neglecting justice in the name of charity: "the poor, it is claimed, do not need charity but justice" (*DCE*, 26). Benedict argues again in his latest encyclical for the link between justice and charity:

> Every society draws up its own system of justice. *Charity goes beyond justice*, because to love is to give, to offer what is "mine" to the other; but it never lacks justice, which prompts us to give the other what is "his," what is due to him by reason of his being or his acting. I cannot "give" what is mine to the other, without first giving him what pertains to him in justice. If we love others with charity, then first of all we are just towards them. (*CV*, 6)

By its nineteenth-century explanation, this traditional discussion said that we cannot give in charity what we should give in justice, referring, for example, to the issue of workers' wages. Benedict XVI writes,

> On the one hand, charity demands justice: recognition and respect for the legitimate rights of individuals and peoples. It strives to build the *earthly city* according to law and justice. On the other hand, charity transcends justice and completes it in the logic of giving and forgiving. The *earthly city* is promoted not merely by relationships of rights and duties, but to an even greater and more fundamental extent by relationships of gratuitousness, mercy and communion.

Charity especially shows the love of God, even in human relationships.

This is why "love—*caritas*—will always prove necessary, even in the most just society. There is no ordering of the State so just that it can eliminate the need for a service of love" (*DCE*, 28); "The claim that just social structures would

make works of charity superfluous masks a materialist conception of man" (*DCE*, 28). This would mean that man lives by bread alone.

A second major theme that at first glance might surprise economists is the treatment of original sin. Why does Benedict XVI introduce the subject of original sin into a discussion of social issues? He specifies,

> The Church's wisdom has always pointed to the presence of original sin in social conditions and in the structure of society: "Ignorance of the fact that man has a wounded nature inclined to evil gives rise to serious errors in the areas of education, politics, social action and morals." In the list of areas where the pernicious effects of sin are evident, the economy has been included for some time now.

And again he writes,

> The conviction that man is self-sufficient and can successfully eliminate the evil present in history by his own action alone has led him to confuse happiness and salvation with immanent forms of material prosperity and social action. Then, the conviction that the economy must be autonomous, that it must be shielded from "influences" of a moral character, has led man to abuse the economic process in a thoroughly destructive way. (*CV*, 34)

This implies, third, that there is no solution to an economic crisis, economic questions, or social issues without reference to morality. The pope devotes several paragraphs of *CV*, especially paragraphs 36, 37, 40, and 45, to ethical issues applied to the economy. He applies his ethical reasoning to a whole set of specific themes like the market, profit, business, entrepreneurship, banking, or the social responsibility of companies. Generally, Benedict XVI says, "The economic sphere is neither ethically neutral, nor inherently inhuman and opposed to society. It is part and parcel of human activity and precisely because it is human, it must be structured and governed in an ethical manner" (*CV*, 36). Yet,

> The Church's social doctrine has always maintained that *justice must be applied to every phase of economic activity*, because this is always concerned with man and his needs. Locating resources, financing, production, consumption and all the other phases in the economic cycle inevitably have moral implications. *Thus every economic decision has a moral consequence*. (*CV*, 37)

These ethical reflections bring the pope in his subsequent remarks to condemn what he calls the "technocratic ideology" that dominates our societies, even beyond the domination of traditional ideologies. Admittedly, he condemns at the same time the ideologies that deny "the very value of development, viewing it as

radically anti-human and merely a source of degradation" (*CV*, 14) because "the idea of a world without development indicates a lack of trust in man and in God."

The modern world is based on the idea that in most areas the end justifies the means. Therefore, a technique that gives good results in economic matters, and also in the fields of health and life, justifies itself by its results alone. This is what Benedict XVI denounces as "technocratic ideology" (*CV*, 14), which is obviously the opposite of ethical necessity because the end does not justify the means. We see this every day in economic life (for example, in discussions of profits). Yet it is also in health care when one wants to use human embryos to treat disease. The goal is honorable, but the method is not ethically acceptable. This is the same principle that ought to apply to the economy.

However, for Benedict XVI ethics (which can be fashionable in the modern world of business where everyone develops charters of ethics and even publicizes their ethical behavior in advertising) is not a small thing for the Church. Benedict writes, "*The economy needs ethics in order to function correctly*—not any ethics whatsoever, but an ethics which is people-centered" (*CV*, 45). A little later he continues, "[I]t would be advisable, however, to develop a sound criterion of discernment, since the adjective 'ethical' can be abused. When the word is used generically, it can lend itself to any number of interpretations, even to the point where it includes decisions and choices contrary to justice and authentic human welfare."

This then is what Benedict XVI considers as genuine ethics:

> Much in fact depends on the underlying system of morality. On this subject the Church's social doctrine can make a specific contribution, since it is based on man's creation "in the image of God" (Gen. 1:27), a datum which gives rise to the inviolable dignity of the human person and the transcendent value of natural moral norms. When business ethics prescinds from these two pillars, it inevitably risks losing its distinctive nature and it falls prey to forms of exploitation.

Of course, Benedict XVI says that love goes much further—this is why he refers in the title to *caritas*. Love according to Pope Benedict XVI "is an extraordinary force which leads people to opt for courageous and generous engagement in the field of justice and peace" (*CV*, 1). We must love our brothers and sisters in the truth of God's plan.

Based on Paul VI, Benedict makes another observation that he finds in the expanding social teaching of the Church. The pope expresses his belief that "*Populorum Progressio* deserves to be considered 'the *Rerum Novarum* of the present age,' shedding light upon humanity's journey towards unity" (*CV*, 8).

Benedict is more precise because he indicates that "Love in truth—*caritas in veritate*—is a great challenge for the Church in a world that is becoming progressively and pervasively globalized. The risk for our time is that the *de facto* interdependence of people and nations is not matched by ethical interaction of consciences and minds that would give rise to truly human development" (*CV*, 9).

Paul VI had already pointed out that the social question had become a global reality. This was particularly true in Third World development. Forty years later, Benedict XVI sees himself at the heart of the current understanding of globalization. He returns repeatedly to this theme, recalling first, like John Paul II, that "globalization, *a priori*, is neither good nor bad," but that we have to go beyond the socio-economic processes to see that "the truth of globalization as a process and its fundamental ethical criterion are given by the unity of the human family and its development towards what is good" (*CV*, 42).

Yet, it is also true that 1967 is not 1987 and even less is it a time in the second decade of the twenty-first century. The world has changed. Beside the countries continually sinking into poverty, there are also countries in the Third World showing growth. Since 1967, globalization and international trade have only intensified. There has been economic progress, but also new concerns, such as environmental degradation. The global economic (namely, globalization and emerging economies), political (namely, the collapse of Communism in 1989), social, cultural, and environmental situations have changed between 1967 and our time. Nevertheless the social teaching of the Church, confronted by this new reality, has stayed the same. Paul VI's insights continue to inform Benedict XVI's engagement with this changing situation.

Therefore, Benedict XVI says of globalization, "Blind opposition would be a mistaken and prejudiced attitude, incapable of recognizing the positive aspects of the process." Yet, we must "*correct the malfunctions*" (*CV*, 42). He mentions that Paul VI already "grasped the interconnection between the impetus towards the unification of humanity and the Christian ideal of a single family of peoples in solidarity and fraternity" (*CV*, 13).

We need to make globalization human—an idea that is not contrary to Christian ideals or catholicity. Of course, Benedict XVI helps us remember that globalization does pose many problems: of the limits of state action (*CV*, 24), of culture and the risk of "cultural leveling," and "indiscriminate acceptance of types of conduct and life-styles" (*CV*, 26); of social protection (*CV*, 25); of trade unions and their role (*CV*, 25 and 64); of consumers (*CV*, 66); of world trade (*CV*, 33); of the mobility of employees, both positively and negatively understood (*CV*, 25); of migrant workers (*CV*, 62); of relocation (40); of non-renewable resources (*CV*, 56); of basic inequality (*CV*, 32); and of the sometimes questionable practices of

certain international organizations (*CV*, 47). In all these areas, he emphasizes not only the importance of the fundamental principles of the inalienable dignity of the human person and the ethical dimension of all aspects of globalization but also the two main principles of subsidiarity and solidarity, explaining, for example, that solidarity helps us apply the principle of subsidiarity to "promote the active participation of private individuals and civil society" (*CV*, 60).

Finally, we cannot conclude the first part of our essay without reference to a central theme of the encyclical, which Benedict XVI calls "the astonishing experience of gift" (*CV*, 34): "*Charity in truth* places man before the astonishing experience." He adds that the "human being is made for gift, which expresses and makes present his transcendent dimension."

This surely is one of the most fundamental contributions of Benedict XVI—that, as he writes in paragraphs 36 and following, the idea of the free gift should be at the heart of economic life. This is his essential point (*CV*, 37):

> *Economic life* undoubtedly requires *contracts*, in order to regulate relations of exchange between goods of equivalent value. It also needs *just laws* and *forms of redistribution* governed by politics, and what is more, it needs works redolent of the *spirit of gift*. The economy in the global era seems to privilege the former logic, that of contractual exchange, but directly or indirectly it also demonstrates its need for the other two: political logic, and the logic of the unconditional gift.

Taking up an idea already advanced by John Paul II, Benedict XVI argues that there is a need for a system with three subjects: the market, the state, and civil society (*CV*, 38). He clarifies that John Paul II "saw civil society as the most natural setting for an *economy of gratuitousness* and fraternity, but did not mean to deny it a place in the other two settings." Hence, the fundamental question for Benedict XVI is not only the development of the gift in civil society, that is to say in our families, our charities, our parishes and NGOs, but also its development in the market and in politics.

Benedict XVI goes so far as to consider that economic entities, especially business entities, alongside traditional profit-making entities, should, in their own ways, focus on the gift and gratuitousness. He shows that the coexistence of companies with different goals and structures would have a positive effect so that "one may expect hybrid forms of commercial behaviour to emerge, and hence an attentiveness to ways of *civilizing the economy*" (*CV*, 38).

The presence of some gratuitousness, of gift and of communion in economic life would profoundly change it, introducing next to the "*giving in order to acquire* (the logic of exchange) and *giving through duty* (the logic of public obligation,

imposed by State law)" another logic, that of the "actions of gratuitousness" (*CV*, 39). He concludes by saying, "The market of gratuitousness does not exist, and attitudes of gratuitousness cannot be established by law. Yet both the market and politics need individuals who are open to reciprocal gift."

All this leads Benedict to continue and develop further a major theme of Paul VI on integral development.

Integral Development

Of course, there is no major break in the social teaching of the Church between Leo XIII and Benedict XVI. Benedict XVI specifies (*CV*, 12) that "it is not a case of two typologies of social doctrine, one pre-conciliar and one post-conciliar, differing from one another: on the contrary, there is *a single teaching, consistent and at the same time ever new*." Further, the "Church's social doctrine illuminates with an unchanging light the new problems that are constantly emerging." Yet without losing sight "of the coherence of the overall doctrinal *corpus*," each pontiff can bring his own contribution to the discussion. This is what Benedict XVI does, in the footsteps of Paul VI and John Paul II.

There is now only one social question. As we have seen, it has become global. It concerns the whole person, that is to say, "the whole person in every single dimension" (*CV*, 11). Integral development is not only the development of people in general but also the development of each individual. The Church can make pronouncements in this domain for it is, as Paul VI said, an "expert in humanity." Integral development means, first, the respect for all the fundamental rights of humanity that though intangible cannot be changed by law. Yet there are no rights without responsibilities, as Benedict XVI says, "*The sharing of reciprocal duties is a more powerful incentive to action than the mere assertion of rights*" (*CV*, 43).

Integral development therefore covers all aspects of human life. Obviously, it covers the economic matters and therefore development in the economic sense, starting with the fundamental issues of hunger, thirst, and health, and moving beyond to education. Integral development includes economic development in the narrow but basic sense of the term. Benedict XVI reminds us that Paul VI already understood the term "to indicate the goal of rescuing peoples, first and foremost, from hunger, deprivation, endemic diseases and illiteracy" (*CV*, 21). While the Church has no technical solution to offer, it can provide important avenues for thought, even in the field of economic development. Benedict XVI examines current issues, from starvation and the scarcity of resources, such as water or energy, to issues of international economic relations and justice in

international trade. There is great food for thought for everyone because everyone is involved in economic life in their own way, be it as consumers, or, for many, as investors, as employees, or as entrepreneurs. Benedict XVI does not shy away from any current problems—from financing and profit to the market and the role of the entrepreneur.

The matter of integral development means that development is not limited to the economy in the ordinary sense of the term. Integral development includes not only attention to education and culture but also to the environment, to issues of demography, and to life. Concerning life, the pope says that against "strategies of mandatory birth control," the Church must remember that "there is a need to defend the primary competence of the family in the area of sexuality, as opposed to the State and its restrictive policies, and to ensure that parents are suitably prepared to undertake their responsibilities. *Morally responsible openness to life represents a rich social and economic resource*" (*CV*, 44).

In paragraph 74, Benedict XVI also addresses questions that might have been outside the purview of what would have been called the social question in the nineteenth century or in the social teaching of the Church. He speaks of *in vitro* fertilization, embryo research, and the possibility of manufacturing clones and human hybrids, all of which are issues that again point to what the pope calls "technological absolutism." He revisits a leading theme of John Paul II on the "culture of death" in addressing the issues of abortion, systematic eugenic planning of births, and favorable opinions toward euthanasia. "Underlying these scenarios," he writes, "are cultural viewpoints that deny human dignity" (*CV*, 75).

Finally, if the integral development also requires respect for life, it also has another basic dimension, the transcendental. It is no surprise that Benedict XVI repeatedly underlines the importance of religious freedom that allows expression of this spiritual and transcendental dimension of human life. He specifies that "religious freedom does not mean religious indifferentism, nor does it imply that all religions are equal" (*CV*, 55). Yet, he immediately adds that "the Christian religion and other religions can offer their contribution to development *only if God has a place in the public realm*, specifically in regard to its cultural, social, economic, and particularly its political dimensions" (*CV*, 56).

Of course, in some ways, all this is not new and the popes of the twentieth century, especially John Paul II, already discussed the social question, that of respect for life, and, of course, the spiritual question. What is probably new is the assertion of Benedict XVI, referencing *Humanae Vitae*, that there are "*strong links between life ethics and social ethics*" (*CV*, 15).[6]

Paul VI and John Paul II usually addressed these ethics of life issues in texts different from those of social ethics. For his part, Benedict XVI shows their unity

and the fact that all these issues are part of the social question and the social teaching of the Church. This observation is probably one of the key phrases of this encyclical: "we need to affirm today that *the social question has become a radically anthropological question*, in the sense that it concerns not just how life is conceived but also how it is manipulated, as bio-technology places it increasingly under man's control" (*CV*, 75). That the social question and, therefore, social teaching have become radically anthropological is another way of understanding integral development. The social teaching of the Church is concerned with the whole human in all its dimensions.

By integrating these dimensions into a single text, Benedict XVI rejects the temptation of some Christians who, following the spirit of our consumer society, pick and choose that which they like. Either they affirm the social dimensions of this teaching but minimize what it says concerning respect for life, or they highlight all aspects of respect for life, especially its transcendental implications, but neglect the Church's teaching on social matters and on matters of justice and economic ethics. We can no longer divide the teaching of the Church following our natural inclinations.

Among the most innovative themes of this integral dimension of development, especially because the pope came back to it for his letter for the International Day of Peace, January 1, 2010, is the treatment of the environment and the integrity of creation. The pope devotes several paragraphs, 48 to 51, in which he recalls the errors in regard to creation: "we end up either considering nature an untouchable taboo or, on the contrary, abusing it" (*CV*, 48). These two attitudes are not consistent with the Christian vision of nature as the fruit of God's creation. Indeed, the pope reminds us that "nature is at our disposal not as 'a heap of scattered refuse,' but as a gift of the Creator who has given it an inbuilt order, enabling man to draw from it the principles needed in order 'to till it and keep it' (Gen. 2:15)." However, he immediately adds, "But it should also be stressed that it is contrary to authentic development to view nature as something more important than the human person." We move from ecology in a narrow sense to that of "human ecology" (*CV*, 51). Forgetting human ecology inevitably leads to forgetting environmental ecology.

Another important discussion emphasized by Benedict XVI is the relationship between the common good, one of the pillars of the social teaching of the Church, and the concept of personhood and, therefore, integral development. He recalls that "besides the good of the individual, there is a good that is linked to living in society: the common good. It is the good of 'all of us,' made up of individuals, families, and intermediate groups who together constitute society.

It is a good that is sought not for its own sake, but for the people who belong to the social community" (*CV*, 7).

This was already an important concept emphasized by Pope John XXIII in *Mater et Magistra*, in which he gave one of the clearest definitions of the common good as "all those social conditions which favor the full development of human personality."[7] In this way, the common good has as goal the full development of people, that is to say, their integral development. Here there is a clear unity of perspective between John XXIII and Benedict XVI.

This emphasis on the individual led Benedict XVI to use a term that has invited criticism. The term *human capital* is used by many economists and was developed by Nobel Prize winning thinkers such as Gary Becker.[8] Benedict XVI emphasizes that "the *primary capital to be safeguarded and valued is man, the human person in his or her integrity*" (*CV*, 25). Responsible business leaders know that their most significant capital of their enterprise, that which brings wealth to their empire, is human capital.

Although criticized by some, Benedict XVI borrows this expression and restores the true meaning to the term *capital*, which had been perverted in the nineteenth century, especially by Marx. In fact, capital is the source of all wealth. Therefore, speaking of human capital puts the word back in its place by explaining that the most important capital is human. Humans are the source of all creation of all wealth, in every sense of the word. Indeed, what is crucial is what is essential, and *caput* literally means head. Talk about human capital basically emphasizes that the head of the economy, the key element, is the human being.

This integral development cannot be complete without freedom: "A vocation is a call that requires a free and responsible answer. *Integral human development presupposes the responsible freedom* of the individual and of peoples: no structure can guarantee this development over and above human responsibility" (*CV*, 17). A few lines later he adds, "Only when it is free can development be integrally human; only in a climate of responsible freedom can it grow in a satisfactory manner" (*CV*, 17).

All this requires many conditions. For this Benedict XVI calls for "new lifestyles" (*CV*, 51). He calls us to consider, in particular, our consumer society, which John Paul II had already said in his discourse at the Parc des Princes in Paris can never make humans happy.[9] It also requires an examination of international relations (*CV*, 53) and of what is now called global governance. Some were surprised that Benedict XVI went as far as to speak about a "true world political authority" (*CV*, 67). This is not a new term for the Church, and it gave Benedict an avenue to criticize current international institutions. He specifies that any world political authority "would need to be regulated by law, to observe

consistently the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity, to seek to establish the common good, and *to make a commitment to securing authentic integral human development inspired by the values of charity in truth*." It is clear that this model is far different from what we see in current international institutions.

Because the modern world has given it so much importance, this integral development also requires presence in social communications. Benedict XVI says that the means of social communication "are so integral a part of life today that it seems quite absurd to maintain that they are neutral—and hence unaffected by any moral considerations concerning people" (*CV*, 73).

Finally, Benedict XVI explains on a number of occasions that integral development needs to move beyond a one-on-one debate—he speaks even of the monopoly of the market and of politics—and gives a larger place to what he calls civil society. By this he means that which were named "intermediate bodies" in the nineteenth century or what John Paul II called in *Centesimus Annus*, the "'subjectivity' of society."[10] The state cannot do everything. The market cannot do everything. By the way of family, churches, charity organizations, and all other associations, civil society allows a central place for feelings of love, affection, friendship, solidarity, and gratuitousness.

That the pope finally insists on the spiritual dimension of integral development is not surprising. He says in particular that "life in Christ is the first and principal factor of development" (*CV*, 8), which had already been said by Paul VI in *Populorum Progressio*. He adds, first, that "*the whole Church, in all her being and acting—when she proclaims, when she celebrates, when she performs works of charity—is engaged in promoting integral human development*" (*CV*, 11) and, second, that "*development must include not just material growth but also spiritual growth*" because the human person is a "'unity of body and soul' born of God's creative love and destined for eternal life" (*CV*, 76).

Conclusion

We can conclude with the end of chapter 6, paragraph 77, of *Caritas in Veritate* that merits study in its entirety. I cite only one passage:

> In every truth there is something more than we would have expected, in the love that we receive there is always an element that surprises us. We should never cease to marvel at these things. In all knowledge and in every act of love the human soul experiences something "over and above," which seems very much like a gift that we receive, or a height to which we are raised. The development of individuals and peoples is likewise located on a height, if we consider *the spiritual dimension* that must be present if such development is

> to be authentic. It requires new eyes and a new heart, capable of *rising above a materialistic vision of human events*, capable of glimpsing in development the "beyond" that technology cannot give. By following this path, it is possible to pursue the integral human development that takes its direction from the driving force of charity in truth.

For this reason Benedict XVI clarifies in paragraph 79 that "*development needs Christians with their arms raised towards God* in prayer, Christians moved by the knowledge that truth-filled love, *caritas in veritate*, from which authentic development proceeds, is not produced by us, but given to us."

Notes

* A first draft of this essay was presented on March 8, 2010, during a day-long colloquium organized for the priests of the Dioceses of Aix-en-Provence and Arles presided by the archbishop of Aix and Arles (France). The theme of the gathering was "Development, reflection and discussion of the theological and anthropological foundations of the arguments in Benedict XVI's encyclical *Caritas in Veritate*." Translations of all papal texts are those found at http://www.vatican.va/. All italics used in these translations are reproduced in the citations used here. This essay has been translated by Jason Zuidema from the original French.

1. This was the title under which the encyclical appeared as published by the United States Catholic Conference; the official English translation by the Vatican renders the subtitle "On Capital and Labor."

2. Benedict XVI, encyclical letter *Caritas in Veritate* (June 29, 2009). Hereinafter direct references will be made in the text and abbreviated *CV*.

3. See Paul VI, Regina Coeli address (May 17, 1970): "It is the civilization of love and of peace which Pentecost has inaugurated."

4. John Paul II, encyclical letter *Centesimus Annus* (May 1, 1991), 54.

5. See Benedict XVI, encyclical letter *Deus Caritas Est* (December 25, 2005). Hereinafter, *DCE*.

6. On this connection, see especially Manfred Spieker, "Continuity and *Res Novae* in the Encyclical Letter *Caritas in Veritate*," *Journal of Markets & Morality* 14, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 327–43.

7. John XXIII, encyclical letter *Mater et Magistra* (May 15, 1961), 65.

8. See, for instance, Gary S. Becker, *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

9. See John Paul II, Address to the youth gathered in Parc des Princes, Paris (June 1, 1980), 8, available in French at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1980/june/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19800601_veglia-giovani_fr.html.

10. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 13.