

Dyck ultimately offers a management theory that reflects a belief that the kingdom of God is not merely an otherworldly notion but one in which all aspects of the life of a community are implicated. The text goes on to unearth the “four-phase process model” that is imbedded in Luke’s gospel, finally spelling out the implications of his analysis for twenty-first-century-management theory and practice.

Dyck invokes Max Weber’s classic text, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, stating that his own book is really an effort to complete the project Weber started: to reach beyond the secularized version of Protestant Christianity that Weber argues is the basis of modern organizational and management theory to provide “an understanding of management based on a rigorous analysis of the biblical narrative.” It does seem clear that Weber’s prediction that the ethic he describes would ultimately fail to sustain human prosperity is on the verge of coming true. Dyck’s text thus comes at a critical juncture in the movement toward a sustainable business model that permits the human person to prosper at both the material and spiritual levels.

—Deborah Savage (e-mail: pdsavage@stthomas.edu)
St. Paul Seminary School of Divinity, Minnesota

Religion and Human Security: A Global Perspective

James K. Wellman, Jr. and Clark B. Lombardi (Editors)

Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012 (332 pages)

In the dank domain of wonks and pundits, the return of religion onto the foreign policy docket has largely pivoted around security. It would be only a slight exaggeration to say that of the prodigious effort produced since 2001 on religion, the vast majority is security related, and of that the underlying theme generally runs about how to put religion back into the domestic bottle so we can return to the business of liberal-democratic state building. Further, you can largely scratch religion and paste in Islam.

What a treat, then, to read *Religion and Human Security: A Global Perspective*, swimming upstream to offer a substantial theoretical account of human security and religion as well as in-depth, practical case studies on their at-times rival accounts in specific cultural and political settings.

The value of this kind of careful work should not be understated when almost any passable thinking on religion and security is now grant-worthy. Taking two rather wooly and highly contested concepts, human security and religion, and putting them into conversation is not work for the faint of heart, but Wellman and Lombardi are up to it. Without overwhelming the reader in their introduction, they make clear the territory of contestation over both of these terms, while unapologetically marking out their own stake in the conversation.

They define human security in three parts: (1) a physical aspect that involves protection from threats to basic welfare; (2) a juridical piece that relates to protection from violations

of human rights; and (3) a more elusive, cultural conditioned factor that relates to a sense of personal autonomy and freedom.

That is a decent definition as far as it goes, but the nexus with religion is the especially hard part. How does religion, or religious actors, influence this trinity of human security?

Most accounts would take religion as a system of beliefs, apply it by testing how these beliefs and their denizens either do or do not serve as force multipliers of the above, and call it a day. However, Wellman and Lombardi do one better. They define religion as *a socially enacted desire for the ultimate, embodied in practices that have ultimate significance*. Part of their rationale for preferring this definition is that it avoids the common pitfall of “overvaluing belief and downplaying practice” (9). The other part, explained at length in the first chapter by Wellman as “The Dance of Desire in Religion and Human Security” is that religion and human security intersect precisely at the center of human social desire. That is to say, it is impossible to come up with an irreligious concept of human security that does not, in some way, aim at the ultimate, at what it means to be human, at what the dignities of our humanity are, and therefore what securing them means.

This, then, is an account that passes Charles Taylor’s smell test of religious scholarship—what he calls the St. Francis of Assisi problem. In *A Secular Age*, Taylor asks how purely secular theory can explain accounts of human flourishing that exceed or subvert material or political power. Can we render an account of *human security* that makes the Mother Teresas of the world intelligible—and accept as infinitely *more secure* the poverty and deprivations of service than the powers of self-determination and wealth? This, too, is international theorist Scott Thomas’ complaint when studying the ancient kingdom of Israel, which is called to be radically dependent on God in the midst of a regional real-politik of substantial insecurity. It is a profound inversion of traditional security to see the Old Testament indict competent kings, responsible for economic growth and prudent alliances, as evidence of forsaking their trust in God. Wellman and Lombardi’s nexus of social desire, of rituals of ultimate significant, make exactly this kind of political-theological conversation possible.

The second aspect of this definition of the religious is, naturally, that its meanings and social practice do indeed shift from place to place, and time to time. This is the reason why the balance of the book is a localized look at specific regions and their experiences, including their (at times rival) meanings of religious and human security. It is an ambitious survey, including five Islamic, six Christian, a comparative Muslim-Christian, and Japanese case studies. There are certainly gaps, perhaps even some notable absences, but the aim of the book is not to exhaustively survey but rather winsomely convince that conversations on human security and religion are not only necessary to each other but are *necessarily essential* to one another. Religious accounts *already* invoke understandings and practices of human security, some complementary to the global human rights agendas and others not. So, too, human security *already* invokes its own understandings of what it means to be human, and what dignities should be guarded, and why.

At least in this respect, Wellman and Lombardi have edited a book that lacks the hubris of “bringing religion to human security” but rather constructively acknowledges, in academic detail, the nexus at which this has long persisted, and only now has our attention. This book, for that reason, is also worth our attention and is an outstanding contribution to the field.

—Robert J. Joustra
Redeemer University College, Ancaster, Ontario

**Verso il metaprofit. Gratuità e profitto nella
gestione d'impresa**
Giorgio Mion
Cristian Loza Aduai
Siena, Italy: Cantagalli, 2011 (178 pages)

Residents of the Anglophone world easily forget that much interesting work on topics of economics and ethics is published in other languages. Not surprisingly, the preferred language for many studies on Catholic social thought is Italian. The authors of this small book in a series published by the Cardinal Vãn Thuận International Observatory for the Social Doctrine of the Church are Giorgio Mion (a professor of business economics at the University of Verona), and Cristian Loza Aduai (a graduate of Universidad Católica San Pablo in Arequipa, Peru) of the Pontifical Lateran University and of Libera Università Maria SS Assunta (both in Rome) and the recent holder of a doctorate in business ethics from the Catholic University in Eichstätt-Ingolstadt. Both authors are collaborators of the Cardinal Vãn Thuận International Observatory and are engaged in a discussion of a proper Catholic view of business, especially following Benedict XVI's encyclical letter *Caritas in Veritate*.

The title of the book—*Toward Metaprofit: Gratuity and Profit in Business Management*—alone may intrigue: What is “metaprofit”? The Greek preposition *meta* has three basic meanings: (1) “after” in the temporal or spatial sense, (2) “(together) with,” and (3) in composites “change” (as in “metabolism” or “metaphor”). Metaprofit therefore means “going beyond profit,” but in a felicitous polysemy it can also connote “what comes with profit.” Metaprofit is thus a much richer concept than “nonprofit.” It goes beyond all restrictions to the “third sector” because it refers to the purpose of business that must not be reduced to that of making profit. Instead it has an anthropological and a theological meaning. John Paul II and Benedict XVI taught that profit is a means but not an end of business. Profit enables business people to do good in the world (12).

Mion is responsible for chapter 1, which focuses on the return of the enterprise in recent papal teaching. Where previous social teaching often emphasized topics at the macro level—a desirable form of society—the recent popes embraced social realism by dwelling on micro foundations, that is, on the dispositions of consumers and producers,