

Development of the Whole Man and of All Men

Guidelines of the Catholic Church for Societal Development

Manfred Spieker
Vice President of the
Joseph Höffner Society

Since the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* of Pope Paul VI (1967) the social teaching of the Catholic Church has been treating the problem of development of the Third World. John Paul II in *Sollicitudo Rei Sociales* (1987) and Benedict XVI in *Caritas in Veritate* (2009) have underlined, as did Paul VI, that development is only true development when it is the development of the whole man and of all men. Development of the whole man requires not only the overcoming of poverty but also a social and cultural development, as well as an opening to the transcendent dimension of human life. Benedict XVI speaks from an anthropological and a theological point of view about the duty of man to develop both himself and the world. Development of all men requires besides economic growth, which must be profitable for all, the development of social and political structures that include good governance and the respect of human life from conception until natural death.

The concept of development does not occupy a central place in the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. Neither does it enjoy a key role in philosophical and social scientific discourse. *The Philosophical Dictionary* edited by Max Mueller and Alois Halder simply places the entry *development* under the rubric of *evolution*,¹ thereby underscoring its biological affinity. Development denotes the continual going forth of a higher condition out of a preceding lower state, in which the new higher state was already prepared and formed. Relevant examples would be egg cells, the unfolding of the embryo, the path of human life from conception to death, or the mutation and selection of species, as investigated by Charles Darwin under the rubric of evolution. All of these objects, however, pertain to the domain of biology.

When the notion of development is brought to bear on societal and economic processes, we are faced at once with two questions: (1) Does the newly attained status of an economy, a society, or corporate entity amount to a higher status that was prefigured in a prior lower one? (2) Is it feasible to define the preceding status not just as temporally prior but also as located on a less-advanced level?

To transpose this matter to a current topical subject one has to ask: Has the new twenty-five member European Union attained a higher level than before when it comprised a mere fifteen members or when it was constituted by the six founding members? Furthermore, does this new state come about by itself or does human action through reason and free will determine development?

When the concept of development is employed outside the sphere of biology, it seems to render the greatest utility in the various engineering disciplines. It is here that new machines, materials, communications, and control systems are being developed, and one is justified to speak of the emergence of a higher or more advanced state out of a lower less-developed one. Indeed, such developments are subsequently designated as progress.

In economics, the concept of development is likewise often used as synonymous with progress. The range of application is broad—from increases of productivity or the gross domestic product to the expansion of corporations or the growth of market share.

When used in the social sciences, the notion of development loses its conceptual clarity. Even when invoked as a synonym for progress, it remains highly problematic. The development of societies and political systems does not always constitute progress or establish a natural law, as Karl Marx would have it when he claimed to have discovered a law for the development of societies based on the contradictions between productive forces and ownership of the means of production.² Against Marx, the assertion has to be made that societal development is dependent on human action and that such action is fundamentally ambivalent. While human action may well be constructive and advance the common good, it may also be destructive and cause much harm.³

The majority of countries on earth have been classified as developing countries. From the perspective of Western industrial nations, the economic, social, and educational systems of these states were branded as backward or underdeveloped, the overwhelming majority of them having been colonial dependents of the industrialized nations until the early 1960s. It is a widely held expectation that these countries will raise their future economic performance to the level of development attained by the Western industrialized world. The social teaching of the Church started to examine the economic, social, and global aspects of development for the first time in 1961 in the social encyclical *Mater et Magistra*

by Pope John XXIII. The date of publication coincided with the beginning of the epoch of decolonization. In subsequent years, the question of the most appropriate development received ongoing attention: in 1965, during Vatican II through the text about the Church in the contemporary world, *Gaudium et Spes*, and in 1967, with the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* by Pope Paul VI in which *development* was characterized as a new template for peace.⁴ The question regarding development surfaced on several occasions during the pontificate of Pope John Paul II, first in his encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* of 1987, which was specifically dedicated to the twentieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, and in his final social encyclical *Centesimus Annus* in 1991. The social justice subject appears in the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, published in 2004 by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. The most recent teaching document is Pope Benedict's first social encyclical *Caritas in Veritate*. It was released in June 2009 and commemorates the fortieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*.

Theological and Anthropological Presuppositions of Development

Before sketching out the concept of development that is put forth by the Church's social doctrine—including its determinants and obstacles—it is imperative to point to the theological and anthropological presuppositions of the Christian understanding of development. These presuppositions are common to all Christians—be they Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, or Orthodox—and are also shared by Jews and Muslims. To wit, development of human life as well as that of society does not find completion during earthly existence. All development stands under an eschatological reservation and “can find complete fulfillment only in God and his plan of salvation.”⁵ The human person is “open to the infinite and to all created beings.” This “openness to transcendence belongs to the human person.”⁶ The human person represents the subject as well as the boundary of all development, which must, therefore, respect the person's uniqueness, indivisibility, and dignity. Human dignity means being entitled to recognition because of plain existence, independent of any characteristic or qualification; it means, furthermore, to be recognized as “someone” and not to be classified as “something.”⁷ It is for this very reason that the human person must never be made an instrument of political or scientific development. The instrumental practice of development has not only powered the ideologies of National Socialism and Communism in years past but is again making an appearance under biomedical guises that promise new therapies for hitherto incurable diseases on the basis of embryonic stem-cell research

and cloning. Against such promises, the social teaching of the Church takes a firm stance and insists that the human person “is the only creature willed by God for itself.” Therefore, a “person cannot be a means for carrying out economic, social, or political projects imposed by some authority, even in the name of an alleged progress of the civil community as a whole or of other persons, either in the present or in the future.”⁸

The critique of the instrumentalization of the human being is also aimed at attempts to define anew the beginning of human life, in order to use the embryo in vitro for biomedical research. Human life begins at conception, that is, with the entry of the male sperm into the female ovum, which is called the pronucleus stage. It does not begin at such thresholds as the fusion of the nuclei, nidation, the extra-uterine survival capacity of the embryo, or birth itself. In a key decision regarding the issue of abortion, the German Constitutional Court ruled on May 28, 1993, that the embryo is “not in the process of becoming [a] human being, but is developing as a human being.” With this ruling, the High Court affirmed an earlier decision (1975) that stated,⁹ “The developmental process that began at conception is continual, has no breaks and does not allow for making distinctions of separate developmental stages of human life. Neither does the process end with birth.”¹⁰

By declaring the dignity of the human person to be indivisible, the state is obligated to protect the human being from the first moment of development, that is, the moment of conception. There is simply no legislative mandate to devise protection in accordance with stages of development and thereby exclude specific levels from their mandated protection. The right “to develop in the mother’s womb from the moment of conception” fits as much into the logic of the right to life as the right to be birthed.¹¹ For the social doctrine of the Church, the right to life from conception to its natural ending marks the very prerequisite for the actual employ of all other rights. It serves, therefore, as key to the dignified development of individual citizens as well as society as a whole.¹² States that legalize the termination of pregnancy and the practice of euthanasia are actually destroying the very ground on which they rest.

For the Christian understanding of development, no other anthropological premise assumes greater weight than the notion that the human person is squarely the subject of all development. This finds succinct formulation in *Populorum Progressio* and repeated in *Caritas in Veritate*: “Endowed with intelligence and freedom, he is responsible for his fulfillment as he is for his salvation. He is aided or sometimes impeded by those who educate him and those with whom he lives, but each one remains, whatever be these influences affecting him, the principal agent of his own success or failure. By the unaided effort of his own intelligence

and his will, each man can grow in humanity, can enhance his personal worth, can become more a person.”¹³ Likewise, the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* underscores the individual responsibility of the person by invoking the person as an “active subject” of development, who is “responsible for his own growth process.”¹⁴ It is, therefore, incumbent upon the state to allow human beings the pursuit of this very responsibility. Consequently, all public authority is to uphold the effective protection of human rights. There must also be limits to all codifications that would threaten to hurt human dignity and the humane development of society.

To grasp the full scope of the Christian understanding of development requires a look at one further theological presupposition. When speaking of delimitation, on account of human dignity, and of eschatological reservation, one could be left with the impression that the Catholic Church views itself as predominantly called to hold back and delay both human and societal development. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Church actually encourages the faithful to take part in the development of the world and, indeed, to shape it. The Christian is always and everywhere called to act purposefully in the world. It is part of the divine mandate for man to assert dominion over the world. “The idea of a world without development indicates a lack of trust in man and in God. It is therefore a serious mistake to undervalue human capacity to exercise control over the deviations of development or to overlook the fact that man is constitutionally oriented toward ‘being more.’”¹⁵ It is not only the Old Testament that provides the mandate, but the New Testament is also rich in implication to carry the gospel and the social teaching of the Church into the public square and workplaces, as well as into laboratories and elected assemblies. Even though neither the gospel nor the social doctrine of the Church feature technical solutions to developmental problems of the world,¹⁶ they nonetheless contain the directive to speak out on behalf of justice and to attest to the visible, incarnate love of God made manifest in the Cross and in the resurrection of Christ.¹⁷ From this it follows that Christians are to engage in the development of society, learning, and economics, as well as in politics and the need to bring significant resources to the task before them. The *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* invokes “the mutual love between human beings in the sight of God as the most powerful instrument of change on the personal and social levels.”¹⁸ It then adds: There are “profound links between evangelization and human promotion.”¹⁹ The history of mission and the lives of missionaries underscore this insight for all times and in all continents.

During the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, the engagement of the Church for societal development created much controversy. Protagonists of liberation theology summarily rejected development together with reform and integration

as a betrayal of revolutionary liberation. Leonardo Boff inveighed against a “theology of development” that he saw originating in the urban centers of Europe and the United States and posing as a mere disguise for the ideology of capitalist accumulation.²⁰ Drawing on the theory of dependency, liberation theology advanced a strong plea against all development, reforms, and integration into global markets and advocated instead a faith-based socialist revolution. This revolutionary trajectory increasingly turned against the eschatological reservation and undermined the distinction between liberation and salvation.²¹ In response, the Latin American bishops issued several clear endorsements of development and the integration of Latin America into the global market at their third General Conference at Puebla, Mexico, in 1979.²² Such pleas also served as an indirect critique of liberation theology.

To make the desired contribution to global development, Christians must marshal more than pious faith and a measure of good will. “It is not enough to be illuminated by faith and driven by the desire to do good in order to instill a culture with sound principles and make it come alive in the spirit of the Gospel.” To attain such goals requires an engagement with the institutions of this world together with “abundant knowledge, technical know-how, and vocational experience”—in other words an ample supply of competence.²³

The Imperative of Comprehensive Development

When the social doctrine of the Church addresses problems of developing countries, it speaks against views that emphasize solely economic development, and, instead, it insists on a broader perspective extending to the societal and political sphere—especially education and social services. The teaching of the Church demands “the fully sounded development of the whole man and of all men.”²⁴ Terminologically, the Church points to a development that opens the path to transcendence for the human being and underscores that the person “far from being the ultimate measure of all things can only realize himself by reaching beyond himself.”²⁵

With this postulate, Pope Paul VI adopted Jacques Maritain’s precept of “integral humanism,” which considered precisely the opening toward the absolute as prerequisite for humane development—namely an integral humanism.²⁶

The demand of human advancement of all men aimed at the development of developing countries and sought to heighten its appeal by designating it “a new name for peace.”²⁷ This definition advises all Christians that it is God’s command to attend not merely to a general advancement of the world but to the specific betterment of developing countries. However, solidarity is not just

a matter of individualized conduct, but it is also a duty of all nations that enjoy prosperity. John Paul II sharpened our understanding of this very issue in his encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* by using the formulation: *Opus solidaritatis pax*—Peace Is the Fruit of Solidarity.²⁸

Development is clearly not just a technical matter. To reduce development to such a level would strip it of its true content.²⁹ What then is the true content of development? The social teaching of the Church proposes a set of criteria for true, genuine, comprehensive, or authentic development. They can be divided into two groups: (1) criteria that clarify the goals and fundamental presuppositions, and (2) criteria that affect specific sectors of advancement.

In the language of team sports, such as football or rugby, one might say that social teaching furnishes on the one hand, rules and, on the other hand, pointers for particular play action. The rules are clearly more important than the pointers to deliver a favorable score or a societal advancement. Among the basic presuppositions, that is, the rules, we reckon the directive thrust of all action toward the good of the person³⁰ and, thereby, also the well-being of the family, for it is within the family that a person learns to grow freely and responsibly into a society.³¹ Society in turn advances based on truth, freedom, justice, and love.³² It is this very outlook that inculcates true development of human rights and the right to life,³³ and, likewise, extends development to all nations.³⁴

A society that does not respect the right to life at the inception and at the end of life and does not devise legal safeguards for it is actually embracing self-destruction. Pope John Paul II emphasized this very precept in *Centesimus Annus* and again four years later in his encyclical *Evangelium Vitae*. It is unfortunate that many teachers of Christian social teaching classify *Evangelium Vitae* as a moral-theological encyclical rather than a document of the social teaching of the Church and thereby ignore its importance. Because it critically addresses the culture of death, it raises basic questions about the common good. Fortunately, Benedict XVI has addressed this issue in his encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* by asserting that the Church must forcefully maintain this link between life ethics and social ethics.³⁵ The respect for life cannot in any way be detached from questions concerning the development of peoples. It is an aspect that has acquired increasing prominence in recent times and thus obliges us to broaden our concept of poverty and underdevelopment to include questions connected with the acceptance of life, especially in cases where it is impeded in a variety of ways. Openness to life is at the center of true development.³⁶ Because of the developments of biotechnologies, “the social question has become a radically anthropological question.”³⁷ In the field of bioethics, “the very possibility of integral human development is radically called into question.”³⁸ Thus, social ethics cannot continue to avoid life ethics.

Among the presuppositions, the principle of subsidiarity merits close attention because of its twofold application: within developing countries on the one side and in their relationship with industrial nations on the other side. The social doctrine of the Church emphasizes that the developing countries “themselves have the prime responsibility to work for their own development.”³⁹ This statement is in full concordance with the already quoted view of *Populorum Progressio*, that every human being is master of his prospects and cause of his failures. However, this does not exonerate the industrial countries from their duty to act in accordance with the principle of solidarity, but rather, underscores that the target group of solidarity must seize the initiative to development by themselves. The principle of subsidiarity has “to foster the spirit of initiative, the fundamental basis of all social and economic development in poor nations.”⁴⁰ Development requires above all the spirit of initiative. A developing country “must act in accordance with its own responsibilities, not expecting everything from the more favored countries.”⁴¹ Overcoming illiteracy and basic education, therefore, constitute “the primary object of any plan of development.”⁴²

There are further requirements, including the increase of domestic food production and the reform of political institutions and social structures, “in order to replace corrupt, dictatorial, and authoritarian forms of government by democratic and participatory ones.”⁴³ Corrupt public institutions and political dictatorships are the lethal enemies of all true development. True, uncorrupt development can only be sustained with a democratic political system and regular, effective participation of the citizenry in the political process.⁴⁴ Another element that short-circuits dictatorships is a civil society that consists of self-confident and active citizens who voluntarily give shape to many public activities free of coercive manipulation by the state. Important spheres of freedoms are political parties as well as media. These are places of fundamental decision-making and thereby help maintain a state that upholds subsidiarity as the condition for the maintenance of a true commonwealth.⁴⁵

Authentic development ranks the principle of the universal destination of goods among the final rules that govern, which holds great significance for socio-economic development. This principle was repeatedly extolled in Pope John Paul’s contributions to the social teaching of the Church.⁴⁶ The universal destination of goods affirms that God has created the goods of this earth for the benefit of all and that they must “therefore accrue to all justly and fairly.”⁴⁷

Universal destination and utilization of goods do not mean that everything is at the disposal of each person or of all people. The principle of the universal destination of goods is an invitation to develop an economic vision inspired

by moral values that permit people to not lose sight of the origin or purpose of these goods, so as to bring about a world of fairness and solidarity, in which the creation of wealth can take a positive function.⁴⁸

There is no doubt that the social doctrine of the Church considers the right to private ownership a natural law, that is, a human right that is linked to the existence of man as a “kind of extension of human freedom.”⁴⁹ However, it must be noted that this right is subordinate to the universal destination of goods.⁵⁰ In a dynamic and globally intertwined economy, the principle of the universal destination of goods assumes global significance. While Pope Paul VI affirmed in *Populorum Progressio* the teaching “that a nation should be the first to benefit from the gifts that Providence has bestowed on it as the fruit of the labors of its people,” he also asserted “that no country can claim on that account to keep its wealth for itself alone.”⁵¹ John Paul II emphasized this globally valid precept in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* no less than ten times.⁵² It is, therefore, imperative “to recognize each people’s equal right ‘to be seated at the table of the common banquet,’ instead of lying outside the door like Lazarus.”⁵³ It is likewise *necessary* to scrutinize international trade to keep it from succumbing to protectionism as well as to strengthen international organizations and a wide network of social policy.⁵⁴

Equally important for true development is human labor, which the *Compendium* calls “a fundamental dimension of human existence,” because labor is “participation not only in the act of creation but also in that of redemption.”⁵⁵ The high regard for labor in the social teaching of the Church can simply not be overstated. Labor is not only seen as a means to gain income but also as “a good thing for man—a good thing for his humanity—because through work man not only transform[s] nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfillment as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes ‘more a human being.’”⁵⁶ Labor is thus a basic prerequisite for the development of the world as well as for the human being. Accordingly, key goals of policy making are full employment; a well-balanced workplace, especially regarding the relationship between labor and capital; and profit sharing.

To the fundamental prerequisites of true development belong also entrepreneurship and market economy. Entrepreneurs and managers are the subjects of economic initiative, of creative response to human needs, and of the cooperative organization of the process of production. They are therefore centrally important for economic as well as social development. Nonetheless, they are admonished to focus not only on economic efficiency but also on the dignity of the employee, which is characterized as “the firm’s most valuable asset.”⁵⁷ Recognizing the real significance of entrepreneurship and markets for the development of the economy

was no easy feat for the social teaching of the Church. Full acknowledgement was only given during the pontificate of John Paul II and visibly documented in the encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, the *Compendium*, and now in Benedict's *Caritas in Veritate*.

The compendium describes the role of the competition-directed market for development in the following terms:

The free market is an institution of social importance because of its capacity to guarantee effective results in the production of goods and services. Historically, it has shown itself able to initiate and sustain economic development over long periods. There are good reasons to hold that, in many circumstances, “the free market is the most efficient instrument for utilizing resources and effectively responding to needs.” The Church’s social doctrine appreciates the secure advantages that the mechanisms of the free market offer, making it possible as they do to utilize resources better and [to facilitate] the exchange of products. These mechanisms “above all ... give central place to the person’s desires and preferences, which, in a contract, meet the desires and preferences of another person.” A truly competitive market is an effective instrument for attaining important objectives of justice: moderating the excessive profits of individual business, responding to consumers’ demands, bringing about a more efficient use and conservation of resources, rewarding entrepreneurship and innovation, making information available so that it is really possible to compare and purchase products in an atmosphere of healthy competition.⁵⁸

The praise of the market, however, is quickly curtailed when the compendium suggests in a subsequent passage that “it is necessary for the market and the State to act in concert, one with the other, and to complement each other mutually” and continues asserting that the free market can only deliver advantages for all “when the State is organized in such a manner that it defines and gives direction to economic development”⁵⁹ and when “the goal of a proper equilibrium between private freedom and public action” is being pursued.⁶⁰ Such formulations invite much misunderstanding. We therefore need to ask: Should the state really be the directing force of economic development? These precepts suggest a rejection of the primacy of private initiative, which has always been extolled by the social doctrine of the Church,⁶¹ and that, incidentally, was upheld by the compendium when it actually acknowledged the priority of civil society.⁶² Likewise, the subsidiarity principle does not prescribe an “equilibrium between private freedom and public action.” On the contrary, it operates from the premise of the priority of private initiative and sanctions only in exceptional circumstances and the limitations of such initiatives.

The social doctrine of the Church is not afraid to designate criteria of a comprehensive common-good oriented development, that is, criteria that speak to specific societal spheres. It is thereby clearly allowing for specific temporal and contextual applications—a casuistry so to speak—that translate into pointers for situations such as play, action, and/or analogy and not into the rules of the game. Accordingly, the comprehensive development of a country is not merely a function of dynamic industrial and service sectors but also of food production and the preservation of a vibrant ecology.⁶³ For this purpose, it may even become necessary to initiate in certain countries a “redistribution of land.”⁶⁴ While in advanced postindustrial countries immigration is frequently seen as a threat to high levels of prosperity, it “can be a resource of development.”⁶⁵ Similarly, labor unions are considered an important factor in the struggle for social justice, socioeconomic development, and the global commonweal—provided that they do not base their precepts on the ideology of class struggle but, rather, on the precepts of cooperation with entrepreneurs and social partnership.⁶⁶

Humane development also presents a challenge to the social sciences that are called on to guide change in directions that are favorable to all.⁶⁷ There is also dependency on the interreligious dialog “which has great significance for maintaining peace and the promotion of a humane society.” Strengthening this dialog has long been a major concern of the social doctrine of the Church.⁶⁸ At the same time, freedom of religion must never be compromised. As is clearly spelled out in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, “not even the imperative of development may serve as a pretext to impose on others one’s own life-style or one’s own religious faith.”⁶⁹ This applies particularly to methods regarding conception.⁷⁰ Respect for other cultures and religions, however, does not mean condoning human rights violations—such as widow-burning known as “Sati,” the caste system, or mutilations of the body through female genital cutting. It is a duty to fight against such abuses—not only for the purpose of development but also for the sake of human dignity.

Developing countries have another basic requirement: The development that they undergo must further integration into global markets. “Today more than ever international trade ... promotes development and can create new employment possibilities and provide useful resources.”⁷¹ History has shown that countries that have isolated themselves from the world market “have suffered stagnation and regression, while the countries that experienced development were those which succeeded in taking part in the general interrelated economic activities at the international level.”⁷² In opposition to liberation theology, the social doctrine of the Church has always advocated the integration of developing countries into a global system of economic interaction. At the same time, the doctrine

encourages developing countries “to practice solidarity among themselves and with the neediest countries of the world.”⁷³ The “right to development” must also “be taken into account when considering questions related to the debt crisis of many poor countries” because the debt scenario has multiple causes that originate within the international level as well as in the debtor nations themselves.” The *Compendium* then proceeds to enumerate some of the causative factors on the national level: corruption, poor administration of public monies, or the improper utilization of loans-received disbursed program money.⁷⁴ While the social doctrine of the Church endorses the principle that debts must be repaid, it nonetheless advocates forms of debt-relief and programs for debt to be set aside “that are compatible with the fundamental right of peoples to subsistence and progress.”⁷⁵

The patterns of human action that are relevant for the comprehensive development of society are richly layered and correspondingly widespread as are the obstacles that can impede comprehensive development. When these obstacles multiply and solidify in a given country, its underdevelopment appears to be “inevitable—like a death sentence.”⁷⁶ Wrongdoing and personal misconduct of leaders in the economy, society, and politics can mushroom into institutional and structural mechanisms of avarice, oppression, and exploitation—in other words, “structures of sin”—that will block all true development.⁷⁷ To break down such obstacles in order to open the road to development requires, on one hand, individual change based on virtues such as courage, fairness, solidarity, and wisdom, and on the other hand, structural and institutional reforms that are needed to end dictatorial and arbitrary conduct. This “dual strategy” on the personal as well as the institutional level has been the focus of the social teaching of the Church since its inception as seen in the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* issued by Pope Leo XIII in 1891.

Overcoming structural and institutional blockades to development will necessitate global cooperation. Accordingly, the social teaching of the Church offers the following exhortation: “Just as there is a collective responsibility for avoiding war, so too there is a collective responsibility for promoting development.”⁷⁸ The teaching of the Church has upheld this precept not merely as a legitimate desire but rather as a tangible right. We thus find the following succinct formulation in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: The cooperation for the development of the whole man and all men is therefore “a duty of all towards all.”⁷⁹ Development that does not embrace all continents is simply not true development. For the social doctrine of the Church, the right to development is grounded in the origin and common destiny of mankind, in the equality of persons and of communities that are based on the dignity of man, in the universal destination of the goods of the earth, in the central position of the human person, and in solidarity.⁸⁰

Notes

1. Max Mueller and Alois Halder, eds., *Kleines Philosophisches Woerterbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1971), 74.
2. Karl Marx, *Zur Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie* (Weimar: G. Kiepenheuer, 1959); see also, K. Marx and F. Engels, *Ausgewaehlte Werke in 2 Bdn.*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1968), 335.
3. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 13.
4. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, Encyclical Letter (March 26, 1967), 76–80; see also John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, Encyclical Letter (May 1, 1991), 52.
5. Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (“Justitia et Pax”), *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Rome, 2004), English version: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html (hereafter: *Compendium*), no. 133.
6. *Compendium*, 130.
7. Robert Spaemann, *Personen. Versuch ueber den Unterschied zwischen “etwas” und “jemand,”* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1996), 26.
8. *Compendium* 133.
9. Das Bundesverfassungsgericht, BVerfGE (Decisions), vol. 88, 252.
10. As formulated by the BVerfG in its first major decision regarding the statute that regulates abortion (February 25, 1975), vol. 39, 37.
11. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 47.
12. *Compendium*, 155 and 553.
13. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 15.
14. *Compendium*, 133.
15. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, Encyclical Letter (June 29, 2009), 14.
16. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, Encyclical Letter (December 30, 1987), 41.
17. Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, Encyclical Letter (December 25, 2005), 20.
18. *Compendium*, 55.
19. *Compendium*, 66.
20. Leonardo Boff, *Aus dem Tal der Traenen ins Gelobte Land. Der Weg der Kirche mit den Unterdrueckten* (Duesseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1982), 39–40.

21. See Gustavo Gutierrez, *Theologie der Befreiung* (Muenchen/Mainz: Kaiser, 1973), 66, 72; and Gustavo Gutierrez, *Die historische Macht der Armen* (Muenchen/Mainz: Kaiser, 1984), 34. Critically examined by Internationale Theologenkommission, "Zum Verhaeltnis zwischen menschlichem Wohl und christlichem Heil," in Karl Lehmann, ed., *Theologie der Befreiung* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1977), 179.
22. "Evangelization in Latin America's Present and Future," Final Document of the Third General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate, Puebla de Los Angeles, Mexico, January 27–February 13, 1979, in *Puebla and Beyond: Documentation and Commentary*, ed. John Eagleson and Philip Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1979), 123–285. See also, John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 46.
23. John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, Encyclical Letter (April 11, 1963), 147–48.
24. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 42; *Compendium*, 82, 373, 446, 527.
25. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 42; Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 11.
26. Jacques Maritain, *Humanisme Integral: Problemes temporels et spirituels d'une nouvelle chretiente* (1936; repr., Paris: French and European, 1968).
27. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 76–80 and 87; John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 10; *Compendium*, 98, 498.
28. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 39; *Compendium*, 103.
29. *Compendium*, 563; see also, Benedict XVI, "Der Mensch—Herz des Friedens. Botschaft zum Weltfriedenstag 2007," *L'Osservatore Romano* (German Weekly Edition) no. 9, December 22, 2006.
30. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes* 26; *Compendium*, 197.
31. *Compendium*, 238, 553.
32. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes* 26; *Compendium*, 197.
33. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 33; *Compendium*, 155.
34. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 17; *Compendium*, 342.
35. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 15.
36. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 28.
37. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 75.
38. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 74.
39. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 77.
40. *Compendium*, 449.

41. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 44.
42. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 35; John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 44.
43. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 44; *Compendium*, 447.
44. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 45, 47.
45. *Compendium*, 188, 443. See also, M. Spieker, "Herrschaft und Subsidiarität: Die Rolle der Zivilgesellschaft," in *Subsidiarität: Gestaltungsprinzip fuer eine freiheitliche Ordnung in Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, ed. Wolfgang J. Mueckl (Muenchen: Paderborn, 1999), 49–61.
46. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes* 69; John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens*, Encyclical Letter (September 14, 1981), 14, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 39, 42, *Centesimus Annus*, 30; *Compendium*, 171.
47. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 69.
48. *Compendium*, 173, 174.
49. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 71; *Compendium*, 176.
50. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio* 23; *Compendium*, 282.
51. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 48.
52. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* 7, 9, 10, 21, 22 (twice); 28, 39, 42, 49.
53. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 33; Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 47.
54. John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens*, 18; *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 43. See also, Manfred Spieker, "Die universelle Bestimmung der Gueter. Zur Eigentumsethik der Christlichen Gesellschaftslehre," in *Bitburger Gespraechе, Jahrbuch 2004 "Eigentums-Ordnungsidee, Zustand und Entwicklungen,"* ed. Stiftung fuer Rechtspolitik an der Universitaet Trier (Muenchen, 2004), 169–87.
55. *Compendium*, 263.
56. John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens*, 9.
57. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 35; *Compendium*, 344.
58. *Compendium*, 347.
59. *Compendium* 353.
60. *Compendium*, 354.
61. See John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra*, 51, 55, 152.

62. *Compendium*, 418, “The political community and civil society, although mutually connected and interdependent, are not equal in the hierarchy of ends. The political community is essentially at the service of civil society, and, in the final analysis, the persons and groups of which civil society is composed. Civil society, therefore, cannot be considered an extension to a changing component of the political community, rather, it has priority because it is in civil society itself that the political community finds its justification.”
63. Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 21; *Compendium*, 299.
64. *Compendium*, 300.
65. *Compendium*, 297.
66. *Compendium* 306, 307; Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 25, 64.
67. *Compendium*, 320.
68. Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 92; John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 60; *Compendium*, 537. See also, M. Spieker, “Gehet hinaus in die Welt. Notwendigkeit, Ziele und Grenzen des interreligiosen Dialogs,” in *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift Communio*, vol. 35 (May/June 2006), 268–80.
69. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 32; Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 29, 55.
70. John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra*, 170; Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, 54, 87; John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 25, 32.
71. *Compendium*, 364.
72. *Compendium*, 447; John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 33.
73. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 45.
74. *Compendium*, 450.
75. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 35; *Compendium*, 450.
76. *Compendium*, 446.
77. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 36, 37; *Compendium*, 119, 446.
78. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, 52.
79. John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 32; *Compendium*, 446.
80. *Compendium*, 446.