

The Social Question Is Radically an Anthropological Question: The Perspective of *Caritas in Veritate*

Antoine Suarez
Director, Center for Quantum Philosophy
Zürich, Switzerland

The encyclical letter *Caritas in Veritate* stresses that bioethics is a crucial part of Catholic social teaching because in this field “the very possibility of integral human development is radically called into question.” In this context, the encyclical states that the social question is a radically anthropological question. This article takes this view and shows that the very essence of the social teaching of the popes since the nineteenth century is the principle that *the human person and her fundamental rights are defined by her belonging to the human species*. The denial of this principle characterizes the individualistic ontology proper to “classical liberalism,” and lies at the origin of the tensions between the Magisterium and the liberal position. To imbue present culture with the spirit of the gospel and achieve integral human development, it is crucial to embed the economic and political principles of liberalism in a relational ontology that assumes the human species as the very basis for defining personhood and rights.

Introduction

A most interesting feature of the encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* is the acknowledgement of “the global dimension of the social question”:

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.¹

This means, the encyclical stresses, that “the field of bioethics” is a crucial part of Catholic social teaching because it is in this field “that the very possibility of integral human development is radically called into question.”²

This article aims to show the importance of this statement for understanding in more depth the very essence of the social teaching of the popes. This will allow us to understand better the tensions between this teaching and the liberal position and to propose a way for overcoming mutual differences.

The Foundations of Law Are Also the Foundations of the Christian Faith

Catholic teaching on bioethics is based on the following principle: *The human person and her rights are defined by her belonging to the human species.* A human individual shares the status of a person, and personhood is inseparably united to humankind. This principle means that the fundamental rights of a person cannot be established by belonging to a subgroup of humankind, be it by race, religion, nation, or political class. Neither can one reduce the rights of humankind to the rights of the present-day generation.

This principle can surely be considered crucial in the field of bioethics. However, it actually underpins the whole social teaching of the popes: The social question was always “a radically anthropological question.”

It is important to note that this principle is something more than a “principle of natural law.” In his pastoral visit to Switzerland in 2004, John Paul II stressed that the truth is a person: Jesus Christ.³ This is a basic principle of the Catholic faith. With Jesus Christ, “the Truth in Person” enters history.⁴ The incarnation of the second person of the blessed Trinity starkly reveals the personal character of the human body: “The glory of the Blessed Trinity is reflected in human beings, created by God.”⁵

Additionally, through his incarnation this divine person carries out the redemption of the whole human race. Finally, declaring that God enters human history as the “fruit of a woman’s womb,” the Catholic Church confesses that among created persons the most excellent is a woman and thus puts motherhood at the core of religious faith.

Therefore, the pillars of the Catholic faith, like the incarnation and redemption, become emptied of their meaning if one denies that *the person and her fundamental rights are defined by her belonging to the human species.* In this sense, the Catholic faith appears as a guarantee for humanity.

Therefore the human body reveals personal identity and constitutes the observable basis for establishing rights. Indeed, the body is like the “basic document” of any contract inasmuch as any identity document refers to the human body.

This means, in conclusion, that the foundation of the ascription of rights (be it through natural, civil, penal, or constitutional law) is at the same time the foundation of the Christian faith.⁶

Ontological Individualism and Collectivism

By contrast, the principle that the person is defined by her belonging to the human species is missing in the main ideologies that dominate the thinking about society in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: liberalism and socialism. This is the real cause of the reluctance of the popes to engage with these ideologies.

Liberalism highlighted the excellent principle of the “free market.” On the other hand, it led, in some cases, to an ontological individualism, which applies the concept of ownership to the basic interaction among human beings and disregards the metaphysics of “interpersonal relations.”⁷ As a result, the human individual is not a person but the sole proprietor of his own body and person, for which he owes nothing to humankind.⁸ Under this “possessive individualism,” a human body does not share the status of a person but that of property. This holds not only for one’s own body but also for any other human bodies that an individual may eventually be capable of exploiting for his own self-interest. According to this theory, human society consists of no more than a series of market relations; living together is simply a balance of egoistic interests. The individual has absolute primacy, even over the human species. As far as human rights are used to justify individualism, they are completely emptied of their meaning.

“Socialist collectivism,” in its turn, while assuming the primacy of the economic relation, aimed to tame liberal individualism by declaring that property rights are rooted in society. However, the concept of society (as opposed to the concept of the human species) is ambiguous, and social good is susceptible of being arbitrarily defined by the holder of political power. Depending on the ideology, fundamental personal rights are recognized on the basis of belonging to a particular group (race, nation, political party, social class, and so forth), and not to the human species. The socialist attempt resulted in various well-known forms of totalitarianism, which perverted the law so that “the law in force was actually unlawful.”⁹ By coupling individualism to the socioeconomic postulates of Marxism the socialist cure was worse in some respects than the liberal illness.

A great merit of modern humanism was the acknowledgment of freedom for the organization of society in accord with the dignity of the human person. The concept of human rights, the idea that all men are equal before law, democratic participation in government, constitutionalism, and the separation of political powers are part of this achievement. However, modern humanism, especially as professed by liberalism and socialism, included a concept of man centered not on the person and the category of relation but on the individual conceived as pure subjectivity.¹⁰ One can characterize this view as an “ontological individualism,” that is, the concept that man creates himself; the individual is “merely self-creating freedom.”¹¹ In Europe this concept generated a movement of secularism, which ended up with the Marxist revindication for the separation of the state from God, religion, and morality.

Collectivism has been falsified by history. Ontological individualism subsists: It is the prevailing ideology today. During the twentieth century, the combat against totalitarianism brought liberal and Catholic views nearer, for instance, in the defense of property rights. Indeed these views overlap in supporting the primacy of the individual over society and state. However, there is a radical difference: Liberal individualism assumes the primacy of the individual even over the human species, and thereby destroys the very concept of person. By contrast, Catholic thinking is based on “a deeper critical evaluation of the category of relation,” and assumes the inseparability of person and human species: “The development of peoples depends, above all, on a recognition that the human race is a single family working together in true communion, not simply a group of subjects who happen to live side by side.” The relation between the individual and humankind is a relation between one totality and another.¹²

It is this deviation in the ontological and anthropological perspective that leads to quite different positions in the fields of marriage, family, and life.¹³

Marriage, Life, Motherhood, and Family

No individual or group can be considered to be the owner of the human species and entitled to dispose of it for their own interest. Catholic teaching is based on this principle. Behind positions in support of divorce, contraception, destruction of embryos and fetuses, as well as same-sex marriage, there is a subtle denial of this principle.

This principle is actually the foundation of human rights, which always has to be respected by politics and in particular by the laws regarding human reproduction. It is obvious that humanity would have ceased to exist if procreation had not been linked to the strong pleasure arising from sexuality.¹⁴ The human

species may in principle cease to exist, or at least get into serious demographic difficulties, if more and more individuals share the view that it is legitimate to have “as much sexual pleasure as you wish” without wanting to have offspring.¹⁵ The basic economic principle that “there’s no such thing as a free lunch,” applies to the domain of sexuality as well.

In general one can say that certain faults against the fifth commandment (as, for instance, killing an innocent adult) are easily acknowledged as attempts against the foundations of law and morality because one makes a direct attempt against a human body, that is, one considers himself as the owner of another’s body. The wrongness in the faults against the sixth commandment concerning adultery is more subtle in the sense that one does not directly make an attempt against another’s rights but against the species’ rights; that is, the individual makes himself the lord and owner of the human species. Because belonging to the human species is the visible basis of personal rights, faults against the sixth commandment question the very foundations of law. This opens the path to accepting that the individual can be considered the owner of other human beings and thereby to a mentality of violence that may end in legitimating the destruction of human embryos and fetuses or their use for research.¹⁶

Individualism has worse implications not only for the future of humanity but for individuals themselves. Western civilization is struggling to abolish any cultural and biological barriers to the unlimited satisfaction of sexuality. However (as psychoanalysis confirms) the psychological value of love drops when sexual satisfaction is always readily at hand. In a time of total sexual satisfaction “love becomes worthless and life empty.”¹⁷ Thus individualism is perverting sexuality into a selfish behavior, incapable of founding interpersonal relationships. The high rate of divorce bears out that sexual inflation is depriving sexuality of its communicative potential and even destroying the capacity for erotic love. Western civilization is becoming dominated by a single mentality, which promotes narcissist loneliness. At the end of life, the individualist single realizes that he or she is incapable of generosity and remains alone. Once again in history Christian asceticism appears to be the only way for restoring to love its psychic quality and saving the human person from losing the capability of being in relationship to others: the capability of being a person.

In the Meeting for Peace in Assisi 2011, Julia Kristeva, one of the representatives of the invited nonbeliever humanists stated, “The modern secularized culture is the only civilization that does not contain a reflection about the unique relationship between mother and child.”¹⁸ I think one cannot better explain why the “state arising from secularism” carries a tendency that is adverse to motherhood and humanity.

The Magisterium in the Light of *Caritas in Veritate*

This encyclical brings to light that the bioethical and more generally the social teaching of the popes is based on the idea that the human person and her rights are defined by belonging to the human species. A human individual (the human primate) shares the status of a person, and personhood is inseparably united to humankind.

The papal Magisterium in the nineteenth century detected the individualistic ontology that was hidden in the ideologies of this epoch. For instance, Pius IX asserts that “human society, when set loose from the bonds of religion and true justice, can have, in truth, no other end than the purpose of obtaining and amassing wealth, and that (society under such circumstances) follows no other law in its actions, except the unchastened desire of ministering to its own pleasure and interests.”¹⁹ The individualist concept of the human being eradicates the foundation of right, where religion has been removed from civil society. The doctrine and authority of divine revelation repudiated, the genuine notion itself of justice and human right is darkened and lost, and the place of true justice and legitimate right is supplied by material force.²⁰

Interestingly, Pius IX in *Quanta Cura* directly condemns “Communism and Socialism” rather than liberalism because they assert that “domestic society or the family derives the whole principle of its existence from the civil law alone; and, consequently, that on civil law alone depend all rights of parents over their children, and especially that of providing for education.”²¹

Leo XIII in *Libertas Praestantissimum* directly addresses liberalism. Nonetheless he does not condemn it because of its economic principles but because of the assumed “positivistic” concept of man as “merely self-creating freedom”:

Hence, these followers of liberalism deny the existence of any divine authority to which obedience is due, and proclaim that every man is the law to himself; from which arises that ethical system which they style independent morality, and which, under the guise of liberty, exonerates man from any obedience to the commands of God, and substitutes a boundless license.²²

Quite interesting is the position of Leo XIII as it appears formulated in *Longinqua Oceani*. In this document, the pope praises George Washington for his principles, and uses Washington’s words in his famous *Farewell Address* to formulate basic principles of Catholic social teaching:

without morality the State cannot endure—a truth which that illustrious citizen of yours [G. Washington], whom We have just mentioned, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius and statesmanship perceived and proclaimed.

But the best and strongest support of morality is religion. She, by her very nature, guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded, and setting before us the motives most powerful to influence us, commands us to live virtuously and forbids us to transgress.²³

Then Leo XIII states that for the happy state the Catholic Church enjoys in America,

thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America and to the customs of the well-ordered Republic. For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance.²⁴

However, Leo XIII points out also that the Catholic religion “would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws.”²⁵ In his opinion, he would like to have this favor of the laws, and the pope explicitly explains the reason why some points later:

We mean the Christian dogma of the unity and indissolubility of marriage; which supplies the firmest bond of safety not merely to the family but to society at large.... For difficult it is to imagine a more deadly pest to the community than the wish to declare dissoluble a bond which the law of God has made perpetual and inseverable. Divorce “is the fruitful cause of mutable marriage contracts; it diminishes mutual affection; it supplies a pernicious stimulus to unfaithfulness; it is injurious to the care and education of children; it gives occasion to the breaking up of domestic society; it scatters the seeds of discord among families; it lessens and degrades the dignity of women, who incur the danger of being abandoned when they shall have subserved the lust of their husbands. And since nothing tends so effectually as the corruption of morals to ruin families and undermine the strength of kingdoms, it may easily be perceived that divorce is especially hostile to the prosperity of families and States.”²⁶

The teaching of *Libertas Praestantissimum* and *Longinqua Oceani* clearly shows that the popes of the nineteenth century opposed liberalism neither because of economic principles (like that of free market) nor political postulates (like those of constitutionalism or common law and tribunals protecting the different religious confessions) but because of the subjacent individualistic ontology that defines man as merely self-creating freedom, proclaims that the individual is the law to himself, and puts individualism above the very foundations of rights.

As we have seen, the foundations of rights are the foundations of the Catholic religion as well. When Leo XIII asks for the “favor of the laws” in the context

of *Longinqua* he is asking that the laws do not deny their very foundation. This is confirmed by the fact that Leo XIII asks protection for principles that are also endorsed by citizens who do not fully adhere to Catholic teaching for reasons “rather of inheritance than of will”:

Not a few of your citizens, even of those who dissent from us in other doctrines, terrified by the licentiousness of divorce, admire and approve in this regard the Catholic teaching and the Catholic customs. They are led to this judgment not less by love of country than by the wisdom of the doctrine.²⁷

Pius IX teaches that those who live “sincerely observing the natural law and its precepts inscribed by God on all hearts and ready to obey God, they live honest lives and are able to attain eternal life by the efficacious virtue of divine light and grace.”²⁸ This means that those who acknowledge the principle we refer to as the Foundation of Law actually belong to the Catholic Church as the people of God, because “all salvation comes from Christ the Head through the Church which is his Body.”²⁹

In asking for the protection of law for Catholic teaching, the apostolic Magisterium of the nineteenth century does not deny the teaching of Vatican II about religious freedom but, in fact, simply declares that the state cannot be neutral regarding the principle that the person is defined by belonging to the human species, and it is obliged to defend it, if necessary even by enacting penalties. For different reasons, one can certainly *tolerate* offenders against the foundations of law. However, one cannot acknowledge that someone has the right to destroy the foundations of the law: “For most of the matters that need to be regulated by law, the support of the majority can serve as a sufficient criterion. Yet it is evident that for the fundamental issues of law, in which the dignity of man and of humanity is at stake, the majority principle is not enough.”³⁰ In these issues one has to take account of “the universal good of humanity.”³¹

In his Address at Westminster Hall in September of 2010, Benedict XVI praised the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 as “one of the British Parliament’s particularly notable achievements,” and a contribution to civilization of which Britain may be justly proud.³² The pope stressed, “The campaign that led to this landmark legislation was built upon firm ethical principles, rooted in the natural law.” Although the British citizens responsible for this campaign were a small group of evangelical Christians who formally were not members of the Catholic Church, the principle they were defending belongs undoubtedly to the foundations of Catholic teaching, and in this sense one can say they were defending the Catholic religion “in its overriding concern to safeguard the unique dignity of every human person, created in the image and likeness of God, and in its em-

phasis on the duty of civil authority to foster the common good.”³³ Additionally, as far as they observed the precepts deriving from this principle, they lived “honest lives” and were “able to attain eternal life by the efficacious virtue of divine light and grace,” and, in this sense, they belonged to the Catholic Church as well.³⁴ The abolition of the slave trade by the British Parliament in 1807 can be considered a paramount example of a civil power that restrained offenders against the Catholic religion.

The Magisterium before Vatican Council II condemned the individualistic ontology that assumes the individual “is the law to himself,” and thereby endorsed (indirectly but undoubtedly) the principle that the person is defined by belonging to the human species. The Magisterium proclaimed this principle as the truth without which it is impossible to define the corporal human person.

Vatican II and the Magisterium thereafter denounce ontological individualism as well. *Caritas in Veritate* “invites contemporary society to a serious review of its life-style, which, in many parts of the world, is prone to hedonism and consumerism.” The encyclical declares, “The Church has a responsibility towards creation and she must assert this responsibility in the public sphere. In so doing, she must defend not only earth, water and air as gifts of creation that belong to everyone. She must above all protect mankind from self-destruction.”³⁵ In this respect, a particularly crucial battleground is the field of bioethics.³⁶ Humanity is worth saving. It is good to be a human being.

By putting the accent on the anthropological dimension of the social question, *Caritas in Veritate* brings to light that the very essence of the social teaching of the popes since the nineteenth century is the defense of the human person and “the universal good of humanity.” In this sense, the encyclical can be considered “a testimony of that continuity which keeps together the whole corpus of the social Encyclicals.”³⁷

Do the Economic and Political Assumptions of Liberalism Conflict with the Magisterium?

The *principle* that “personhood is defined by the belonging to the human species” is the foundation of law.³⁸ Therefore, anyone keeping to his or her rights should be all the more interested in it. Imbued with this *principle*, the main economic and political assumptions of liberalism (for instance one’s own interest and the social contract) become significant metaphysical-juridical categories and harmonize perfectly well with the Magisterium.³⁹

Adam Smith stated in the *Wealth of Nations*, “It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their

regard to their own interests.”⁴⁰ However, the butcher, the baker, and the brewer can only regard their own interests as long as they are entitled to claim their own rights. They also are entitled to do that thanks to their specific human body. One’s own interests have to become incorporated into a framework of rights, and the observable basis for establishing such rights is a body of the human species. I conclude that someone in front of me is animated by a spiritual soul and is a person because (1) they have the same specific form (or shape) as my body, and (2) this form or shape exhibits movements similar to the movements I make when expressing thoughts, emotions, and rights-claims. It is quite *consistent* for me to demand from others that they respect my body only if I accept that I respect their bodies to the same extent.

According to the theory of the social contract, people established civil society and the state to resolve conflicts and thereby enjoy reciprocal respect for rights. However one has to be aware that this contract is not an agreement between “pure subjectivities” but between “embodied free wills.” It is the belonging to the human species (the specific human body) that provides the observable basis that allows human beings to make a social contract and constitute a society. Humanity (the human species) precedes society.⁴¹

Metaphysics, science, and rights form a unity and cannot exist separated from each other. Metaphysics and science that do not allow me to defend my rights are useless. To defend my own interest and my rights *in a consistent way*, I am led to acknowledge and respect the rights of others according to the Golden Rule. This view is crucial for solving the bioethical problems we have to face today.⁴²

Toward Integral Human Development

In following *Caritas in Veritate*, I presented in this article an anthropological perspective and showed that there is no real conflict between Catholic social teaching and the economic and political postulates of liberalism. The conflict arises only with the individualistic ontology hidden in “classical liberalism,” which is actually based on the denial of the metaphysical category of person as relation and thereby of central articles of the Christian faith such as the Trinity and the incarnation.

Economics is surely about the interest of individuals and the wealth of nations: “The church’s understanding of the realm of production, consumption, exchange, and service may have achieved a fundamental insight with *Centesimus Annus*.”⁴³ However, economics should be guided by the prosperity of the human person and humankind and respect the conditions for the welfare of the coming

generations as well. This perspective has the capacity to order the “own interest” Adam Smith advocates to a good “that develops us in relationship to others.”⁴⁴

“Christ fully reveals man to himself,” John Paul II insisted tirelessly and ended up by demolishing the walls of atheistic Marxist collectivism. By announcing the incarnation of God, we announce the personal character of the human body, exalt motherhood, and defend humanity: “The glory of the Blessed Trinity is reflected in human beings,” in human bodies.⁴⁵ Proclaiming this truth, we will be able to overwhelm ontological individualism and achieve integral human development.⁴⁶

Responsible freedom is based on the acknowledgment that the body of the human species shares the status of a person. Embedded in this anthropology, economic and political liberal assumptions may generate a new dynamic between persons and institutions that overcomes the divorce between the material and the spiritual, between ability and eternity (“Tüchtigkeit und Ewigkeit”⁴⁷) and forge a unity of work and worship capable of bringing the whole of life under the lordship of Christ, that is, the Truth in Person that allows us to protect the foundation of the law: the personal character of the human body.

Notes

1. Benedict XVI, encyclical letter *Caritas in Veritate* (June 29, 2009), 75.
2. This connection is explored in Manfred Spieker, “Continuity and *Res Novae* in the Encyclical Letter *Caritas in Veritate*,” *Journal of Markets & Morality* 14, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 327–43.
3. John Paul II, Homily at Holy Mass in Allmend Park (Bern) (June 6, 2004), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/2004/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_20040606_bern_en.html.
4. See, for example, Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 8.12. More recently, see Pope Francis, encyclical letter *Lumen Fidei* (July 6, 2013).
5. John Paul II, Homily (Bern), 6.
6. This point remains unaddressed even in outstanding works on moral questions, as the following quotation shows:

By now, as promised in the introduction, this Article has made a case for enshrining the conjugal view of marriage and addressed many theoretical and practical objections to it, without appeals to revelation or religious authority of any type. This reflects a crucial difference between marriage and matters of purely religious belief and practice, such as the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, the enlightenment of the Buddha, baptisms, bar mitzvahs, and rules concerning ritual purification, fasting

and prayer. Unlike these matters, the human good of marriage, and its implications for the common good of human communities, can be understood, analyzed, and discussed without engaging specifically theological issues and debates.

See Sherif Girgis, Robert P. George, and Ryan T. Anderson, “What Is Marriage?” *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 34, no. 1 (2010): 253. I think this argument remains one-sided if one does not clearly argue at the same time that questioning the “conjugal view of marriage” threatens the primacy of the human species and thereby erodes the meaning of incarnation (and indirectly the doctrine of the Trinity as well).

7. See Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 53.
8. This formulation seems near to the way Crawford Brough Macpherson characterizes liberalism as “possessive individualism.” See Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 3, 263. There is however an essential difference: Macpherson states “he owes nothing to society” [instead of “to humankind”]. As we see in the following, this “Marxist inspired” proposal is not a good way to tame “possessive individualism” and may lead to totalitarianism. Macpherson has brilliantly identified “possessive individualism” as the core of John Locke’s “classical liberalism,” but in trying to overcome it he falls in the trap of “socialist collectivism.”
9. Benedict XVI, Address at Visit to the Federal Parliament in the *Reichstag* Building (Bundestag) (September 22, 2011), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2011/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20110922_reichstag-berlin_en.html.
10. For instance, John Locke basically defines the individual as “proprietor of his own person” and thereby reduces personhood to property (Second Treatise of Government, sec. 44 and 123). Accessed July 10, 2013, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/7370/7370-h/7370-h.htm>. In this sense, his ontology is basically individualistic and may explain his denial of Trinitarian theology and the corresponding interpersonal relationship. The “possessive individualism” Macpherson ascertains in “classical liberalism” (see n. 8 above) is nothing other than a modality of “ontological individualism.”
11. Benedict XVI, Address (Bundestag).
12. See Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 53; John Paul II, encyclical letter *Evangelium Vitae* (March 25, 1995), 20.
13. In particular, the ontological view that the human body does not share the status of a person but that of property (cf. notes 8 and 10 above) appears at the core of the deviation regarding marriage. This point is well illustrated in Girgis, George, and Anderson, “What Is Marriage?” 253.
14. Antoine Suarez, “Individualismo e personalismo,” *Studi Cattolici* (October 2012): 681–84. I think the anthropological perspective of *Caritas in Veritate* discussed here

may contribute to improving the definitions of concepts such as “our common human nature” and “common good” by referring to the rights of the human species, that is, “the universal good of humanity” (cf. n. 31 below) and help avoiding seeming inconsistencies. Such happens, for instance, when, on the one hand one argues in favor of “the conjugal view of marriage” referring to our common human nature, and on the other hand one claims that although same-sex attraction may have “natural causes” this does not prove that “same-sex unions can be marriage.” Cf. Girgis, George, and Anderson, “What Is Marriage?” 253.

15. Cf. Jonathan Last, *What to Expect When No One's Expecting: America's Coming Demographic Disaster* (New York: Encounter, 2013).
16. The argument that the wrongness in the faults against the sixth commandment comes from the fact that they are attempts against the human species is already advanced by Thomas Aquinas, however, without establishing the relationship to the foundations of law. See Guy de Broglie, “La doctrine de Saint Thomas sur le fondement communautaire de la chasteté” in *Atti del congresso internazionale Tomasso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario 5, L'agire morale* (Edizioni Domenicane italiane, Roma-Napoli-17/24 aprile 1974), 297–307.
17. This has been acknowledged by Sigmund Freud himself. See “Über die allgemeinste Erniedrigung des Liebeslebens” (“On the Universal Tendency to Debasement in the Sphere of Love,” 1912) in *Beiträge zur Psychologie des Liebeslebens* (Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1924), 15–28.
18. Julia Kristeva, “Dix principes pour l'humanisme du XXIe siècle,” October 26, 2011, accessed November 18, 2012, <http://www.kristeva.fr/assise2011.html>.
19. See Pius IX, encyclical letter *Quanta Cura* (December 8, 1864), 4.
20. Pius IX, *Quanta Cura*, 4.
21. Pius IX, *Quanta Cura*, 4.
22. Leo XIII, encyclical letter *Libertas Praestantissimum* (June 20, 1888), 15.
23. See Leo XIII, encyclical letter *Longinqua Oceani* (January 6, 1895), 5.
24. See Leo XIII, *Longinqua Oceani*, 6. Pius XII speaks in the same sense in encyclical letter *Sertum Laetitiae* (November 1, 1939).
25. Cf. Leo XIII, *Longinqua Oceani*, 6.
26. Leo XIII, *Longinqua Oceani*, 14. Cf. Pius XII, *Sertum Laetitiae*.
27. Leo XIII, *Longinqua Oceani*, 14, 20.
28. Pius IX, encyclical letter *Quanto Conficiamur Moerere* (August 10, 1863).

29. Paul VI, dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium* (November 21, 1964), 16; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 846–48.
30. Benedict XVI, Address (Bundestag).
31. Benedict XVI, Address to the participants of the meeting promoted by the Council for Justice and Peace on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (May 16, 2011), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2011/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20110516_justpeace_en.html.
32. Benedict XVI, Address at Westminster Hall (September 17, 2010), at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2010/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20100917_societa-civile_en.html.
33. Benedict XVI, Address at Westminster Hall.
34. See Pius IX, *Quanto Conficiamur Moerere* and *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 846–48.
35. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 51.
36. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 74.
37. Benedict XVI, Address to the participants of the meeting promoted by the Council for Justice and Peace.
38. Manfred Spieker, “Does a Human Being Have a Right to Life?” in *Is This Cell a Human Being?*, ed. Antoine Suarez and Joachim Huarte (Heidelberg: Springer, 2011), 117.
39. The implications of this approach are highlighted by the controversy among Daniel K. Finn, Anthony E. Santelli II, and John D. Mueller, “Nine Libertarian Heresies Tempting Neoconservative Catholics to Stray from Catholic Social Thought,” *Journal of Markets & Morality* 14, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 487–559; see also Antonio Pancorbo, “Illustrating the Need for Dialogue between Political Economy and Catholic Social Teaching,” *Journal of Markets & Morality* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2012): 329–46.
40. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, vol. 1 (1776; repr., Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1981), 26–27.
41. See Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 53; Leo XIII, encyclical letter *Diuturnum Illud* (June 29, 1881); Pius VI, encyclical letter *Quod Aliquantum* (March 10, 1791).
42. See Suarez and Huarte, *Is This Cell a Human Being?*
43. See Jordan J. Ballor, “Business and the Development of Christian Social Thought,” *Journal of Markets & Morality* 15, no. 1 (Spring 2012): 1.

44. See Michael J. Naughton, “The Business Enterprise,” in *The Moral Dynamics of Economic Life: An Extension and Critique of Caritas in Veritate*, ed. Daniel K. Finn (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 89; and Ballor, “Business and the Development of Christian Social Thought,” 2.
45. John Paul II, Homily (Bern), 6.
46. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 17.
47. See Goethe, *Faust II*, v. 11446–47.