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Abstract

Along with Deus Caritas Est and Spe Salvi, Pope Benedict XVI in Caritas in Veritate provides a Christological response to the suffering in the world. In Paragraph 5 of CIV is a particular call to Christians to meet their responsibilities to love God and their neighbour in the broader human community. CIV 5 embeds the task for each Christian to accept the logic of truth of God's Love for their lives and build a relationship with God through the Person of Jesus Christ. Accepting this truth generates responses where people in self-gift love the other and constitute instruments of grace for relationships of service and love. CIV 5's call for networks of charity is for communities of faith to generate social entities offering a service of love for the other. The dissertation explicates and develops a meaning of CIV 5 as the call to build communities of Christian faith through the dynamic of charity.

The dissertation begins with a brief discussion on the Shema, a word that summarises the double love commandment, and Benedict’s approach to the ecclesial realities (or movements) as a prelude to analysing CIV 5's context and the relevant literature. The study of CIV 5 is then in four parts through the themes of relationality, self-gift, and love. The first part discusses the relationality of the human person who authors the social world; the second examines how persons who, through self-gift as a gift for the other, sustain community; the third part develops the idea of communities living in the love of Christ creating a dynamic of charity; and lastly examines how this dynamic grounds the Church's Social Teaching for a renewed social order.
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# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIV</td>
<td>Caritas in Veritate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWM</td>
<td>Catholic Worker Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCE</td>
<td>Deus Caritas Est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EoC</td>
<td>Economy of Communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHD</td>
<td>Integral Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCW</td>
<td>Neocatechumenal Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoCh</td>
<td>Networks of Charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Populorum Progressio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpS</td>
<td>Spe Salvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STCC</td>
<td>Social Teaching of the Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The naming convention for Joseph Ratzinger and Pope Benedict XVI

When referencing an author or source, I use the one applicable at the time of the publication or event (unless otherwise indicated). In practice, ‘Ratzinger’ is the name for all references up to the time of his election to the papacy, including any material published after that date but written before. ‘Benedict’ is used for the period as Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI.
Preface

The Social Teaching of the Catholic Church (hereafter STCC) is a doctrine on the human person and their relations with God through relations with other people in the world’s social and natural orders.\(^1\) The STCC is about human beings and the social structures they build, inhabit, sustain and change. The STCC, through its four fundamental principles, is the map for how Christians who know of God’s Love for them seek to love the other and generate the changes in social patterns and structures needed to foster integral human development and flourishing. Such changes come from people who create communities where beauty, goodness and truth predominate in living life to the full. For Benedict, the STCC is only possible from, through and in the love of Christ. Christ is the basis of all being. Benedict’s thinking about the STCC is a Christological contribution to the ongoing efforts to understand and think about the human person in society.

---

\(^1\) The focus in the dissertation is on the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church (STCCC) rather than the discourse under the label Catholic Social Thought, or Teaching, (CST). CST is a term that covers such a wide spectrum of opinions, discussions and claims, such as to be an ambiguous if not misleading as to what it means. Sometimes the term CSD (Catholic Social Doctrine) is used instead of CST. No further clarity is achieved as to the meaning of these terms and the nature of the discourse these terms means to cover.
Introduction

When he was elected to the papacy in 2005, Ratzinger was under no illusion that the situation he had identified in the late 1950s, of a growing lack of faith among the baptised with significant consequences for the Church’s life, had diminished. He knew that mass apostasy had intensified due, in part, to the rising level of dissension following the Second Vatican Council (the Council), as well as the hostility to Christianity in the broader contemporary culture, magnified by the sexual abuse crisis. Ratzinger identified a need for Catholics to form communities of faith. He welcomed the ecclesial realities as exemplars of the new modes of life: he insisted that all Christians could live the call to holiness. When he became Pope with the name of Benedict XVI (Benedict), these calls received greater significance. In his encyclicals, including Lumen Fidei, Benedict set out a framework for living the truth of their faith in Christ in the twenty-first century.

In ‘Deus Caritas Est’ (DCE), he wrote about the centrality of the double love commandment as ‘a single commandment’ (hereafter the Shema) as the key to the identity and life of faith of the Christian.

In ‘Spe Salvi’ (SpS) (2007), Benedict spoke of Christ as the focus of hope. Benedict issued ‘Caritas in Veritate’ (CIV) in 2009 as a primarily Christological, spiritual and radical encyclical to address the social question. However, the significant

---

2 We need to ‘form communities based on faith’. Benedict XVI, ‘Apostolic Journey to Cologne on the Occasion of the XX World Youth Day Eucharistic Celebration: Homily. The Holy See. 21 August 2005. https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/homilies/2005/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20050821_20th-world-youth-day.html. See earlier remarks by Ratzinger. He saw the need ‘to form vital cells that deliberately withdraw from the pressure of the modern environment and live together according to the gospel “alternative”, to create an environment of faith. In these cells through a culture of prayer and Christian service, a new church can grow that is governed by the principle of the double commandment to love God and neighbour.’ Peter Seewald Benedict XVI: A Life Volume Two: Professor and Prefect to Pope and Pope Emeritus 1966-The Present. (London: Bloomsbury Continuum, 2021), 178. This sentence bears footnote 7, which in Notes, at 547 the reference is to: Joseph Ratzinger, Theologische Prinzipiellehre Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie (Munich 1982). Unfortunately, Seewald does not give a page reference.


development was contained in CIV paragraph 5 (CIV 5). In the magisterium of the Church, Benedict embedded his call for Christians to come forward and, with a mature faith, develop and live out their vocation in new models of the life-giving signs of Christ’s Love for the world. CIV 5, offered Christians a way to answer the call for holiness, meet the crises in the Church and build a way forward for society’s renewal through a rediscovery of the power of Christian love to shape ‘a new vision for the future’ in the context of the world’s current crisis.6

The contribution of CIV 5 to the life of the Church and as a source of renewal for society is assessed and developed in this dissertation through three dimensions present in DCE, SpS and, more fully, CIV. These are the relationality of the person, the self-gift of the person as the source of service and love of the other and the Love of Christ as the ground of social action. The dimension of relationality recognises the centrality of human persons who, as relational beings in the fullness of their relationality, are authors of social structures and life. People who answer to the vocation in CIV 5 by giving themselves (self-gift) in charity as to form networks of charity (NoCh) as communities of faith and charity. Moreover, in such communities, persons, through their relationality and gift of self, live out the vocation of a dynamic of love in NoCh. Further, this dynamic of charity is the basis of the social teaching of the Catholic Church (STCC) as the proclamation of Christ’s love for renewing and reshaping the cultural, social and economic orders to bring about human flourishing.

Structure of the Dissertation

The dissertation is structured in four parts.

Part 1 introduces a reading of CIV and CIV 5. Section 1.1 outlines Ratzinger/Benedict’s theology on aspects of Christian life in three sections. Section 1.1.1 discusses the centrality of the Shema for Christian life in the world. Section 1.1.2 introduces Ratzinger’s argument that the answer to the Church’s crisis is for people with mature faith to develop and live out new models of life, which are a sign of Christ’s Love. Section 1.1.3 sketches Ratzinger/Benedict’s welcome for the ecclesial realities. He considers these exemplars of a new mode of life. Section 1.1 is essential for understanding CIV 5. Section 1.2.1 provides an overview of CIV before considering the Introduction and Conclusion of CIV. Section 1.2.2 reviews some critiques and

6 Ibid., 21.
commentary of CIV. Section 1.3 provides a closer reading of CIV 5, reviewing different responses from commentators to this paragraph. After a brief reflection on CIV 5, (see Section 1.3.1), Section 1.3.2 argues that CIV 5, demonstrates Logos before ethos before leading into a detailed consideration of the three segments of the seventh sentence in CIV 5 (hereafter CIV 5.7). (See Section 1.3.3) Each segment moves from the person recognising God’s Love for them through to creating NoCh. The latter part of Section 1.3 interprets the Latin/Italian word ‘rete’ (see Section 1.3.4), arguing that it goes beyond the concept of a network to the idea of community. Thus, Part 1 provides the groundwork for the discussions in Parts 2, 3 and 4.

The human person is at the centre of the call to create NoCh as sources of charity. This opens the question, nevertheless, what is the nature of the person called to create such NoCh? In CIV Benedict asked for ‘faith, theology, metaphysics, and science to come together in a collaborative effort in the service of humanity’. He insisted a ‘metaphysical understanding of the relations between persons is … [of] great benefit for their development’. Part 2 explicates an approach to understanding the person in three dimensions—religion, metaphysics/philosophy and relational sociology.

As Section 1.3 notes, the human person is at the centre of CIV 5.7, as someone who realises and accepts themselves as a ‘subject of love’ and makes themselves an instrument to generate social realities that reveal this love to, for and in the world. This was expressed in ‘Lumen Fidei’ as perceiving ‘reality in a new way’. Knowing the gift of love, the human person knows the call to give this love to the other through a gift of their life. Such self-gifts create social order because, just like the gift of God’s Love constitutes the human person, people, in their making of themselves as instruments that become the gift that constitutes the other. In turn, both, through their mutual interaction, create NoCh. However, Ratzinger pointed to more than how the network arises; he also indicated how it continues. The social order connects to the Trinity through the human person whose grounding is in Trinitarian relational reality.

---

7 Ibid., 31.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
11 Joseph Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, trans J. R. Foster and Michael J. Miller. Revised English edition with new preface. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004), 267. See also CIV 8: ‘it is the primordial truth of God’s love, grace bestowed upon us, that opens our lives to gift’.
12 Ibid., 68.
observations invite further examination of their meaning and significance. An examination which requires a number of steps.

The first is to recognise CIV and the STCC are fundamentally about the human person accepting responsibility for their actions in God’s creation. Second, these actions are what God uses to transform the world across all its dimensions, from the natural ecology to human ecology, with the human person at the centre. Asking a question about the person, who is the author of social realities, is to ask how a person has truly become human. Benedict argued that humans ‘possess their lives -themselves-only by way of relationship’. Benedict’s theological understanding of the human person’s relational nature led to the metaphysical and sociological explication of the person. The theological articulation of the human person as relational extends to the ‘We’, though not beyond. The metaphysical understanding of the person points to the person as an author and influencer of social orders. The human person as a relational being creates and shapes social realities with others in the different levels—theological, metaphysical and sociological. The discussion of each of the categories follows in Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.

Part 2 explores the human person who answers Benedict’s call, or option, for creating NoCh in response to the crises in the Church and the world and who, as a relational human being, constitutes the social order. This task requires humans who want to respond to God’s Love to live their relationality with others. The analysis begins in Section 2.1, with Ratzinger’s ideas about the person’s ontology; he argued that the person’s relationality is analogical to the relationality of the Trinity. Section 2.1 discusses what this means for the human person’s dignity before concluding that the human person is a dialogical and relational being who forms a ‘We’ in relationships with others. However, Ratzinger did not extend this ‘We’ into developing social structures.

Section 2.2 explores the development of Clarke’s work on Ratzinger’s insights in metaphysical and philosophical terms. It introduces Clarke’s metaphysical and philosophical ideas, drawing on Person and Being, about the person as the one who has the capacity in their relationality to generate social realities. For Clarke, the human person is a being with poles of substantiality and relationality, and the fullness of the

---

14 CIV 53.
human person is a creator of social realities as a gift to and with others to create social entities.

Section 2.3 explica tes the relational sociological analysis of the human person in the context of agency and structure, drawing on the relational sociology of Margaret Archer (Archer) and Pierpaolo Donati (Donati) in their seminal text – *The Relational Subject*.16 The person is a relational subject when they are a meta-reflexive being with ultimate concerns, making them the author of social structures through which social change occurs. Part 2 closes with a brief discussion of relational goods as the ‘fruits’ of a relational subject and how this contributes to understanding NoCh. Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 identify the human person as the generative instrument for creating and maintaining NoCh.

CIV 5.7, constitutes the call, or rather the commandment, for those knowing God’s Love to gift themselves as an instrument of love in the form of NoCh. As Part 2 shows, the act of self-gift is realisable only when the person acts wholly in the relationality of their being towards others. A person’s actions of self-gift derive from receiving and accepting that is a social reality, which differs from what it is in contemporary civil society. However, to give a gift of self is not something a person does alone. All such gifts require what CIV 5.7, designates as NoCh—a pattern of love in communal form, a community where there is a continuity and sharing of the multiplicity of gifts, and a community where no one believes or loves alone, and all are for service to the other. Section 2.4.1 examines sociological structures as the goods of persons’ relationships. Relational goods are social formations or realities existing within, while constituting and shaping, civil society. Section 2.4.2 concludes with a discussion about NoCh as forms of relational goods.

Part 3 explores NoCh as the self-giving of persons, who as relational beings, act through social structures, in three sections, each with a particular focus on determining what NoCh means. Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 analyse NoCh in more depth through three themes—friendship, charity and transcendence—as defining features of NoCh. The discussion of friendship examines it through two lenses: a community in Christ and the idea of friendship as an integral aspect of NoCh. The discussion reveals that relationality is insufficient, and that friendships and God’s Love are essential parts of NoCh. Section 3.1.3 then examines Ratzinger/Benedict’s understanding of charity in three parts—

simple or direct charity, charity as self-gift and charity as social—drawing on texts from before and after his time as Pope. Section 3.1.4 describes the ideas of trust in God and transcendence as keys to grasping the reality of NoCh. Sections 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 draw on the reflections and observations made by Benedict regarding the fruits of following Christ. In these observations, he expressed a vision for Christian life and what this does for the world. Significant parts of the material draw on Ratzinger’s Address given in 1998 to the First World Congress of Ecclesial Movements. Other material comes from the Message Benedict gave a week before Pentecost in 2006 to the Second World Congress of Ecclesial Movements. Further material is drawn from the homily given at the vigil of the ‘Solemnity of Pentecost for 2006. Additional material comes from the theological reflections of Benedict including in his general audiences.

Following Section 3.1, this dissertation interprets CIV 5.7. Section 3.2 considers the development of an approach through a taxonomy. An approach considers how ecclesial realities as faith communities are exemplars of NoCh. A taxonomy provides a basis for considering the many facets of the ecclesial realities as fruits of the Holy Spirit in NoCh. NoCh is a broad concept and is not limited to those entities that consider themselves close to the episcopal ministry of the College of Bishops. The work in Section 3.3 undertakes an exploration of four ecclesial realities as exemplars of networks of charity. This brings together in a concrete way the theoretical discussions in Part 2 and Part 3. The discussion in Part 3 on the relational nature of the human person moved from the theological to the philosophical to the sociological. This movement is from the person understood in abstract theological terms but with the philosophical and more so the sociological arguments the human person appears more clearly as a relational being who is the creator of the ‘We’. A ‘We’ which is more than a collection of persons. The human person as a relational

---

subject can create social from where can emerge cultural and social renewal. This is the logic of the call for NoCh, to create social bodies that will renew the world through God’s Love in social charity. The purpose of Part 3 is to concretise this argument.

The analysis of the selected ecclesial realities in 3.3, though they differ from each other, clearly reveal the practical outline of what Benedict called for. Each is a concrete exemplar of NoCh as communities of relational beings, which is made explicit in the accounts of their origins and activity. Further without Part 2 the general remarks in CIV by Benedict on relationality and discussion of NoCh would lack an anchor. Thus Section 3.3 grounds the more theoretical discussion on the nature of NoCh, more so noting the framework used in this Section for the analysis of the exemplars follows the three elements in CIV 5.7.

Part 4 focuses on the dynamic of love and the basis of the STCC. At the heart of the STCC is the human person who lives their faith in communities of charity that witness the Love of Christ. By identifying the Shema as the heart of Christianity, Benedict made the interactive and creative dynamism of love the essence of how human beings flourish in a cultural, social and economic order. CIV 5, is the call to live the Christian vocation of love, which is the framework for how Christians should engage with and for others in the social world to renew the world in love. The framework of the STCC is where the exercise of living and working through its fundamental principles opens the only possibility for the renewal that Benedict identified in his three encyclicals (most fully in CIV). Parts 1, 2, and 3 focus on explicating the call to live out the Christian vocation formulated in CIV 5.7—the dimensions of the person’s relational nature and the self-gift to the other in the second limb of the Shema, where ecclesial realities are exemplars of this gift. In Part 4, the emphasis is the third dimension of love. At the centre of CIV 5.8, is the dynamic of charity that comes from faith communities living in God’s Love. This dynamic comes from a community of self-giving to love in the Shema.

Section 4.1 explores this dimension of the call in CIV 5, through Archer and Donati’s engagement with CIV and their perspectives on the principles of the STCC in light of relational sociology. Section 4.1 analyses how their relational perspectives have informed their thinking about the four fundamental principles of the STCC, given that NoCh generates a dynamic of charity in word and deed as the basis for the STCC. In this dimension, the principles of the STCC are the scaffold for building a civilisation of
love. In the mutual interaction of the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity, there is a movement towards the common good, where the common good upholds every human being’s dignity. Section 4.2 studies Benedict’s contribution to the STCC in the framework of love, gift and relationality. Sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 explore the call for an encounter with Christ in DCE and how CIV argues that Christ is present in the social order. Section 4.2.4 explores Benedict’s argument that the principles of the STCC have an orientation to God. Finally, Section 4.3 presents a praxis of NoCh as love, gift and relationality in communities of faith, love, mercy and charity.

This dissertation fills in a significant gap in scholarship, by considering the phrase “networks of charity” for its significance in ecclesiology as well as in the fabric of society. Furthermore, it contributes to three significant related areas. First, its discussion of the relationality of the human person from three perspectives. Secondly, it explicitly develops an understanding of ecclesial realities as communities of love as and social realities of charity. Thirdly, it makes the case that the relational ground for STCC emphasises building subsidiarist social entities, as the key to developing social solidarity. Briefly, each part develops this contribution in the following ways.

Part 1 surveys the Ratzinger/ Benedict approach to ecclesial realities and the need for communities of faith, and then an analysis of CIV and paragraph 5. Part 2 presents a dialogue between the theology of Joseph Ratzinger, the Thomist metaphysics of Norris Clarke (Clarke), and the relational sociology of Archer and Donati, on the relational nature of the human being. This discussion is the first of its kind and comprises an important contribution to understanding the relational nature of the human person and, equally as importantly, of how persons are the authors, determiners - sometimes even destroyers - of the character, purpose and actions of social structures. These social structures include the family, religious and other communities, social realities of charity, and other social entities such as unions or corporations. This Part advances the argument that the relational human being is both the agent as well as the subject of social structures, by grounding that subject in an ontology of self-gift, where self-giving involves both personal and social actions of love.

Part 3 then explores the idea of self-gift as where a person becomes an ‘instrument of grace’. This Part explores the logic and fruits of such self-giving in ‘networks of charity’, in particular developing Benedict’s scattered reflections on the Shema and charity. This discussion captures the single character of the double love commandment, thereby developing a theology of social charity as the source of social
and economic renewal. This form of charity is more than diaconal. Part 3 further goes beyond ecclesiological boundaries and political polarities in its reading of the ecclesial realities as exemplars of ‘networks of charity’. This Part locates the ecclesial realities as important for the Church as well as for building up the social order towards a civilization of love. In addition, the part offers the draft of a taxonomy of ecclesial realities, based on the three elements of Caritas in Veritate 5, for a fuller understanding of the emergence, current practices, and possible future directions of these social structures.

The focus in Part 4 is on CIV 5.8 where Benedict reveals the dynamic of charity to the world. This dynamic of charity emerges from a community (NoCh) where there is self-giving to love in the single dimension of Shema—God and the other. The dynamic is the fruit of a community of faith and charity and is, as Benedict noted, nothing more or less than the proclamation that the Love of God is the Person of Jesus Christ—a proclamation witnessed by Christians in their vocation for the world. As dynamic witnesses of love in all its dimensions, NoCh illuminates Benedict’s command in CIV 5, directing Christians to adopt the formation of NoCh in their lives to renew faith and culture to the benefit all people.

In Part 4 the dissertation identifies that the logic of social charity (or love) is at the centre of the life of NoCh. This contributes to the dialogue on Social Teaching of the Catholic Church. It does so firstly through emphasising the relational nature of the human person to shape a deeper understanding of Social Teaching of the Catholic Church in relational terms. Further, the logic of networks of charity understood as communities of faith generating social love contributes to a deeper appreciation of the importance of the principle of subsidiarity in the contemporary world. Here the dissertation argues that formation and maintenance of communities of faith and charity as subsidairist entities is the key to building genuine human fraternity and solidarity. The Part then explores the various reflections of Benedict on STCC both in homilies and messages as well as an address to PASS. A further development of this deeper reading of Social Teaching of the Catholic Church, which falls outside of the scope of this work, opens up a path for future study.
Part 1. Caritas in Veritate

Part 1 introduces the background that is necessary for recognising the significance of CIV 5, by providing the context and summarising the links between Ratzinger’s thinking as a theologian, bishop and prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) and Benedict’s thinking as the Pope. Section 1.2 draws Ratzinger/Benedict’s work for a reading of CIV the Introduction and Conclusion in CIV and CIV 5. Section 1.1.1 presents the Shema as central to a Christian’s life. Section 1.1.2 provides a genealogy of Ratzinger’s call for a ‘new people’ to emerge who have a faith that can become a gift to others. Section 1.1.3 explores the welcome Ratzinger/Benedict gave to the ecclesial realities as expressions of a new mode of living faith. In a short review of CIV Section 1.2 gives some background for Section 1.3. Section 1.3 provides a detailed reading of CIV 5, particularly the two key sentences, CIV 5.7, and CIV 5.8.

Any reading of CIV needs to recall Campanini’s observation that ‘CIV represents a conclusive point of an ideal ‘triptych’, opening with DCE and continuing with SpS’.21 Each encyclical articulated an approach (or path) for Christians to follow in the twenty-first century. DCE points to how the relationship between Christ and the human person underpins all the actions of and for charity.22 SpS reminded every Christian that having faith and giving love requires them to live in full and open relations with others through love, where hope is always to hope for and with another, becoming ‘hope for me too’.23 It placed hope for a better world in Christ, the centre and grounding of Christian hope.24 CIV followed a different approach by celebrating the fortieth anniversary of Paul VI’s (Paul) ‘Populorum Progressio’ (hereafter PP) and the twentieth anniversary of John Paul II’s ‘Solicitude rei Socialis’.25 Paul VI wrote PP to advance a

23 SpS, 48.
24 SpS.
Christian and radical view about the need for integral human development (IHD) across the global world. Although it was issued beyond the expected date, CIV addressed the challenges arising from the Global Financial Crisis of 2008 (GFC) creatively and imaginatively. CIV is a treatise arguing for IHD that renews culture and society. A cursory reading of CIV may give the impression that it is merely a response to the Crisis. However, some readers will be struck by Benedict’s claim that PP is the ‘Rerum Novarum’ of our time. Others will be drawn to the later chapters discussing the economy and take their view of CIV from those discussions. Many fail to recognise that the Introduction and Conclusion are crucial to reading CIV as a spiritual and social encyclical.

The Introduction in CIV placed Christ’s Love at the centre of CIV. CIV 5, which detailed the obligations arising from the logic of his Love in how it called on those who know they are ‘objects of God’s Love, men and women’ to enter into ‘and accepting to ‘make themselves instruments from which to ‘pour forth God’s charity and to weave’ NoCh. NoCh, as communities of faith, generate a ‘dynamic of charity’ that gives ‘rise to the Church’s social teaching … the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s Love’.

1.1. Notes for Reading Caritas in Veritate

1.1.1. The Shema

Ratzinger understands the Shema as the summation of the Christian life—a life of loving the other. In his homily at the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of Gaudium et Spes, Ratzinger identified the virtue of justice as the Shema because justice is constituted by the inseparable elements of will and action, which ‘render to God what is owed to God, and our neighbour’. CIV along with DCE and SpS, was an extended

27 CIV 8. CIV was, in part, written to celebrate Paul VI’s Populorum Progressio.
28 As already indicated in the Introduction, the term Shema is used here to describe how the double love commandment of the New Testament is for Benedict a single commandment. See DCE, 18.

‘justice is the firm will to render to God what is owed to God, and to our neighbour what is owed to him; indeed, justice toward God is what we call the “virtue of religion”; justice toward other human beings is the fundamental attitude that respects the other as a person created by God.’
meditation on this truth. Ratzinger observed that ‘the Christian epitomisation of the Law in the double precepts of Love of God and the neighbour’ is ‘the kernel of the gospel’.30 Anyone who lives the Shema is a person who has love and is ‘a Christian [who] has everything’.31 For Benedict, the Shema is the commandment that characterises the believing Christian because it expresses ‘the fundamental characteristic of those who are the “living stones” of this new Temple. A people who become the total gift of themselves to the Lord and to their neighbour’.32 An example of such a living stone is the widow who gives her mite—her all. She is a living stone of the Temple in making a total gift of herself—a gift that is a summation of the Shema. In the Preface to Introduction to Christianity, Ratzinger defended biblical faith in God as a person.33 This defence arose from recognising that biblical faith in God is rooted in the Shema (Dt 6:4–9).34 Further, for Ratzinger, the Shema ‘was, and still is, the core of the believer’s identity, not only for Israel but for Christianity’.35 When Israel recognised the Shema as commanding the centrality of loving God in the life of faith, it became the essential daily prayer of a devout believer.

In the Books of Deuteronomy and Numbers is where this prayer is commanded. Along with this Israel knew and accepted God’s second commandment to love their neighbour, as set out in the Book of Leviticus. Although the people of Israel did not consider these two commandments necessarily joined into one overarching law, they did not understand them as so separate that the first did not inform the second and the second lived out the first. Israel’s debate was about what the second commandment meant—how, where and when to obey it. The question for Israel was related to understanding who the neighbour is. The debate sought to know the limits, if any, of
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this obligation. This was a question about how far the boundaries of the commandment of God extended.\textsuperscript{36}

Benedict discussed in \textit{Jesus of Nazareth} some of the debates in the Old Testament that sought to clarify the boundaries to the Shema.\textsuperscript{37} He noted the debates about who the neighbour is, what the neighbour was to be given or required and how the Israelites were to receive them. The search for answers was extensive, and over time, answers emerged that generally recognised the neighbour as being anyone within the community of solidarity.\textsuperscript{38} Though the community of solidarity was broad, it did have exclusions, such as that the stranger and the alien could not participate in liturgies such as the Passover meal (Ex 12: 37–49). However, there was no hard limit to the obligations imposed by the second commandment. The Book of Sirach gave detailed instructions about what the law taught:

\begin{quote}
Do not refuse the poor a livelihood, do not tantalise the needy. Do not add to the sufferings of the hungry; do not bait anyone in distress. Do not aggravate a heart already angry, nor keep the destitute waiting for your alms. Do not repulse a hard-pressed beggar, nor turn your face from the poor. Do not avert your eyes from the needy, give no one occasion to curse you…. Gain the love of the community, in the presence of the great bow your head. To the poor lend an ear, and courteously return the greeting. Save the oppressed from the hand of the oppressor, and do not be mean-spirited in your judgements.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

Here the neighbour was the person who lacked social and personal relationships to support them because their family had died, such as widows and orphans, or their family or clan was far away, such as aliens or strangers. Often, even where the people were isolated, poor and deprived of justice, they were still within the boundaries of the community of solidarity.\textsuperscript{40} These were the ‘rules on how to love the neighbour. There was a radical change in the New Testament when Christ fused Israel’s two commandments into a single commandment of love, the Shema or the Great Commandment. All four Gospels (Mk 12:28–31, Mt 2:35–40, Lk 10:25–28 and Jn
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13:31–35) present an account of this radical moment, which shifts the debate about who was the neighbour in Shema. When Christ answered the question, ‘who is my neighbour with the Shema?’, he gave it a universal character.\(^{41}\)

Christ illustrated his answer through the parable of the Good Samaritan. Benedict explored this parable in *Jesus of Nazareth*.\(^{42}\) He argued the parable extended the Old Testament boundaries beyond the community of solidarity because, with the Good Samaritan as Christ, the neighbour was not without but within a Christian person. This is where the Christian has ‘to become the neighbour, and when I do, the other person counts for me as myself’.\(^{43}\) The Good Samaritan is the person who helps and becomes the one who needs to avoid remaining separated from their neighbour. Benedict argued that the lesson of the parable was how ‘I have to learn to be a neighbour deep within … I have to become like someone in love … then I find my neighbour, or better, then I am found by him’.\(^{44}\) Further, for a person to find a neighbour who is searching for help and love requires the person to become good from within because neighbours are only found ‘from within’.\(^{45}\) That is, if people accept that the transformation that God’s Love offers them, only then do they come to know who the neighbour is for them because such a transformation arises from the gift of God’s Love where the people ‘can become “lovers” … [who are] Samaritans’.\(^{46}\)

This parable is a way of understanding what Benedict means by the transformation in CIV 5.7. Further, the parable implies the question of how a transformation leads to people becoming open to God’s gift so they ‘have an eye for the sort of service they can perform’.\(^{47}\) In saying this, Benedict emphasised the need to be ready to encounter the neighbour with the desire to search for the ‘poor one’.\(^{48}\) Further, although Benedict did not discuss this, it provides an understanding of how to serve the
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poor, whoever and wherever they are. It is a service called to love them, including their ‘ugliness and filth’—God calls people to perform many types of service, so there are many forms of charity. Moreover, many communities will arise from the obligation to love the neighbour. From this transformation, there is a new way of realising who the neighbour is. The invitation in CIV 5.7, provides a high intensity of practical activity, where the giver is also changed in how, why and what they give—love.

Benedict understands the idea of the neighbour by knowing who the giver is. However, what does this mean for the person who is the giver? In a short discourse on the Sermon on the Mount, in Jesus of Nazareth, Benedict wrote that the giver is the person who is a ‘companion of Jesus [and who] … lives by new standards, and [when] something of the eschaton’ is present. In the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5–7), the Community of the Beatitudes provided this new standard for how the Christian person should love the other, in that they are both a model of Christian life and existence and a summons to follow Jesus Christ. Although these standards are not a new law of direction, they are law—now they are the law of love. The CDF issued a ‘Note on Liberation Theology’ in 1984 which also observed how, ‘the requirements for “justice and solidarity [in the Old Testament] … are even more radicalised … [, as] shown in the discourse on the Beatitudes’. However, such a radicalisation is not in the form of a new commandment or an additional obligation on a Christian; rather, it becomes the measure of how a community follows Christ.

In following Christ, a community becomes more than a community of solidarity as Israel understood it or a community as understood by many in society today. Accordingly, following Christ takes charity beyond actions that relieve poverty or achieve some structural change. The new measure is in a new mode of existence in


50 Benedict, Jesus of Nazareth, 72.


which the gift of self is a sacramental act of love for the world and its people that is the source of the creative renewal of the world. A renewal where community leads to fraternity. In DCE, the first part of the triptych, Benedict explored the love of the neighbour as a Christian object of love.

DCE described a Trinitarian structure of Love where Christ is the face of God’s Love and the Holy Spirit acts in the human person to love the neighbour and open them to love God.\(^{53}\) Within this structure of love, a person carries through love in, with and for the neighbour, which signifies the love of and for God and ‘makes us a “we” which transcends our divisions and makes us one until, in the end, God is “all in all (1 Cor 15:28)”’.\(^{54}\) For Benedict, there is a unity to ‘Christianity [, which] is the community of the word, sacrament and love of neighbour to which justice and truth bear a fundamental relationship’.\(^{55}\) To love the neighbour is no less than to hear the Word of God and to receive his love through the sacraments. All three of these actions give unity to Christian life.

The unity in the Trinitarian structure of Christian life is the real content of Christianity. It is a unity that is echoed in the call in CIV 5, to start to live in a new way in our contemporary times. The call for a new mode of existence becomes the axial point of the Shema, in loving God through loving the neighbour.\(^{56}\) Benedict stated that the Christian living in faith is living the vocation of loving ‘our brothers and sisters in the truth of his plan’.\(^{57}\) Such a new way of life comes from when persons enter into a new relationship with God and the other. The radical depth in the Shema reaches to bring both the giver and receiver into communion in a new way creating a new body.

When the communion is returning the Love of God, ‘the whole of the Law is present and carried out. Thus, in communion with Christ, the entire Law is fulfilled in a faith that creates charity. And charity is the fulfilment of communion with Christ’.\(^{58}\) In the Introduction to CIV the Shema becomes the key to CIV confirming that the Shema is the centre of Christian life and the STCC: ‘the Church’s Social Doctrine is derived

\(^{53}\) DCE, 19.
\(^{54}\) Ibid., 18
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from charity as the “synthesis of the entire Law (cf. Mt 22:36–40)”.\(^{59}\) Charity is the centre and logic of CIV.

Moreover, charity is the heart of the praxis (which CIV 5 calls for), where people live in a new way in loving the neighbours as sisters and brothers, shaping the person’s actions in this activity and their social world. As Ratzinger stated in *Introduction to Christianity*, praxis is not just about action but rather ‘right action’.\(^ {60}\) Praxis is both the practical activities of the person and community and their understanding of why and how this organises and shapes their practical activities for the purpose they now envision for their lives. In this case, the praxis is the actions of Christians who, when they come to know of God’s Love for them, accept the invitation to become instruments for personal and social change through the dynamic of the charity of love. The praxis is a praxis of loving because God Loves us, and loving God in the praxis of loving the other through NoCh comes from relationality, self-gift and love.

### 1.1.2. For a People of Faith with a New Mode of Life

From early after his ordination, Ratzinger understood that the Church was facing a grave situation, particularly in Germany and Europe, that belied the apparent successes.\(^ {61}\) In 1958, he talked about how the Church is not so much ‘composed of pagans who have become Christians, but a Church of pagans, who still call themselves Christians, but have become pagans’.\(^ {62}\) He later noted, in a more sombre mode of expression, that there was a situation where sociologically, although though there were a large number of Catholics, ‘the numbers of genuine believers were much less’.\(^ {63}\) Yet sometime later, he noted the situation had not improved because the ongoing and widening divisions had heightened the crisis about the meaning and acceptance of the Council.\(^ {64}\) The crisis was magnified by what was understood of the Church—is it a
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63 ‘Even in those days there was a great mass of nominal believers and a relatively small number of people who had really entered into the inner movement of belief’. Ratzinger, *Introduction to Christianity*, 49.

human construction, historically immanent, or is it a supernatural reality understood as the body of Christ?\textsuperscript{65}

For Ratzinger, these issues had implications for the Church and the world. As he put it, the Church’s decline is not like the decline of an association of pigeon breeders.\textsuperscript{66} He held that it would be significant if the Church declined or disappeared because ‘the Church has sources of spiritual power for human life without which this life becomes empty’.\textsuperscript{67} Ratzinger’s response was not to become nostalgic, try to return to the past or trust institutional reforms. Instead, he identified a greater need than either of these two options—he put his trust in the holiness of the saints and Christians finding the path to holiness as the ground for reforming the Church.\textsuperscript{68}

Although Ratzinger understood the Church as the source of spiritual power and a place for holiness in the world, he recognised that appearances belied this. For Ratzinger, the question was: what is to be done? The answer did not involve leaving the Church because he disagreed with those who considered the Church no more than ‘a collection of sickness besmirched and humiliated by a history from which no scandal is absent’.\textsuperscript{69} Instead, he remained in the Church because of the truth of what the Church is. For Ratzinger, the Church is what ‘gives Jesus Christ to us’ and ‘the Church belongs to Jesus’.\textsuperscript{70} From this, he recognised the ‘truth’ that only the faith of the Church could redeem: ‘humanity’.\textsuperscript{71} This is because the ‘Church is the shape taken by grace in this world’.\textsuperscript{72}

To reveal the shape of this grace, Ratzinger thought the Church needed to become ‘a small flock, [which understands their] … duty is the proclamation of the Gospel’.\textsuperscript{73} Moreover, this meant that what was needed was holiness, not management.\textsuperscript{74} Holiness is when ‘the logic of faith [is made] visible in an equally compelling manner
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and in presenting it as a logic of reality, [that is], manifesting the concrete force of a better answer attested in lived experience’.75 Holiness is coming to God, whether in a search for God or accepting the gift of Love from God. However, all of this is only possible when people are ‘being together’ in a communal form.76

Ratzinger found evidence of this ‘being together’ in the new movements, with their life of prayer and full, undivided Catholicity and joy.77 He understood this experience only came from a decision to enter ‘a living structure [which] comprises the totality of one’s life plan’.78 He recognised that a totality of structure for a person in subjective terms occurs when the person is affected ‘to the core of [their] being’.79 Thus, where a person decides to enter into the totality of Christ, the decision is ‘not purely individualistic … [but] is communicated [, it is a decision] that forms community’;80 a community where faith is lived in a lifestyle that leads to a renewed culture81 and forms of life that are ‘units of brotherhood’, with their roots in the Eucharist.82 Moreover, these units allow the Church to become more concrete and challenge the market and state monopolies on practicality. With this analysis, Ratzinger provided an early outline of the call in CIV 5.

In this call for a new way of living, Ratzinger answered the implicit question of how this would come about. He argued that the answer could be found in recognising that ‘no one can be a Christian alone; being a Christian means a communion of wayfarers’.83 That is, no one can come to faith alone because it always requires others in a community of believers to bring another to have faith. Such a requirement arises because having a ‘relationship with God is first of all and at the same time also a relationship with’ other people; a relationship that ‘rests on a communion of human beings’.84 A necessary consequence for Ratzinger was that the Church had a significant task: ‘to create pilgrim communities … to form new ways of pilgrim fellowship; communities [that] shape each other more intensely by supporting each other and living
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He proposed this task for all Christians, not only those in ordained ministry; if anything, this is the primary task for the laity. Ratzinger envisaged, as if remembering the early Church, how Christianity in the future would be ‘characterised more by the mustard seed, where it exists in small seemingly insignificant groups … Nonetheless [these] live an intensive struggle against evil and bring good into the world.’ With this metaphor, he conceptualised that the work of Christians is to be a sign of Christ’s love in and for the world. However, Ratzinger insisted that the work of a Christian is always the work of God, with which Christians cooperate. Even when there are victories, they always come ‘under the humble sign of the mustard seed’.

The small size of the mustard seed remained an operative metaphor for Ratzinger. In an address given in 2001, he used it again in speaking of the Church experiencing a reduction in numbers through simplification.

Ratzinger, however, understood that the process of simplification has less about structural reforms than an opportunity to find ‘new ways of openness to the outside, … new ways of participation by those who are outside the community of believers’. Ratzinger was clear that this was the only way. The Church must remain open and not become closed-in and self-sufficient. For Ratzinger, this spirit of openness arises from his confidence in the fruits of the Holy Spirit.

Openness in the dissertation represents a key to the fullness of a person’s relationality. Further, it underpins the idea of a person’s self-gift to the other through the acts of loving the other. The significance lies in understanding that openness to the other in a spirit of service is necessary. Ratzinger argued that to be in the Church is to have an awareness, a consciousness of being open to the world and not a member of a closed club. When Prefect of the CDF, Ratzinger noted how charity ‘cannot be
conceived without openness to others and a spirit of service’. In the Conclusion of CIV Benedict tied the idea of openness to building a transformed civil society. Without an openness to what occurs through the formation of NoCh as centres of a more human way of living in loving the other, answers to the implicit question of what is to be done might have little meaning.

Ratzinger further addressed this question a few days before his election to the papacy following John Paul II’s death. At Subiaco, Ratzinger discussed the crisis facing Europe in particular and culture in general. At the end of the lecture, Ratzinger reflected on Saint Benedict of Norcia as if addressing what needs to be done. Ratzinger first noted how Saint Benedict was a ‘dropout who came from noble Roman society … [and] did something bizarre’. After some time living as a hermit, Saint Benedict noted the need for a spiritual body living in a community. He took young men from Rome into the wilderness with a purpose. The motivation was to ‘find Christ in a time when such a discovery was hard for those overwhelmed by the contemporary world in which they then lived’. The community of Norcia was not an escape from the world, but where the community went on a journey (as Benedict expressed it in the lecture given in 2008) with the goal of ‘quaerere deum’—of finding Christ—a journey to follow the path of the Word of God, which leads to a ‘pilgrim fellowship of faith’. He further stated that a journey to God is never ‘solely in the “I”, but it is a journey towards the future, a journey in the “we” of those called who call others’. All towards the renewal of the
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world. In the last paragraphs of the Subiaco address, Ratzinger described that what the Church and the world need are people to travel on a journey looking for God and who:

‘render God credible in this world … who have their gaze directed to God, to understand true humanity … whose intellects are enlightened by the light of God, and whose hearts God opens, so that their intellects can speak to the intellects of others, and so that their hearts are able to open up to the hearts of others.’

Ratzinger recognised how the fruits of the journey of the monks of Norcia were in how a ‘new culture slowly took shape out of the old’. A new culture that only came through building communities of faith where people lived seeking God. These words confirmed the call for Christians to have an adult faith to live in the spirit, if not the manner, of the monks of Norcia—a spirit of living with an orientation to ‘seek God and to let oneself be found by him’. For Ratzinger, this is ‘today no less necessary than in former times’. As if to emphasise this, Ratzinger, on his election as the Pope, took the name Benedict and thus, not only recognised the peacemaker of World War 1, Pope Benedict XV, but equally the importance of Benedict of Norcia. Moreover, in the homily given before the 2005 papal conclave Ratzinger, emphasised the need for an adult faith. He stated that a mature adult faith is rooted in friendship with Christ and how this links faith to truth and charity because faith ‘creates unity and takes place in charity … Truth and charity coincide in Christ. In the measure that we come close to Christ, also in our life, truth and charity are fused’. Benedict reflected on what Christians needed to do two months later.

Following his election to the papacy and two months after Subiaco, Benedict, when meeting with priests from Aosta, asked the question: ‘what should we do? People seem to have no need of us; everything we do seems pointless’. His concern here was
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not to lament or propose plans for different programs or suggest reforms of aspects of the Church or its teachings. This answer comes from listening to ‘the Word of the Lord’ because Christ transforms ‘the earth ever anew and opens it to true life’.\(^{109}\) Benedict anticipated this on the day before he signed CIV when he called for people to become new people who have a spirit to become ‘transformed into a new mode of existence’\(^{110}\). Benedict argued that ‘only if there are new people will there also be a new world, a renewed and better world … [and] only if we ourselves become new does the world become new’\(^{111}\). A call for new people to renew the world needs people who transform themselves into ‘newness’ with love. Newton observed that this call is at the spiritual heart of CIV\(^{112}\). The call made in the homily echoed Ratzinger’s desires for Christians to become new people where ‘conversion and renewal … occur in the depths of the heart’\(^{113}\).

The call for a ‘new man’ is a call for new people to emerge. This call only has a meaning if and when new people emerge in and through a community. Ratzinger argued that if Christians become these new people, they need to fully enter into the relationship with Christ they received in their baptism and into the Church’s life in a community of faith. The logic of Ratzinger’s argument was that unless Christians, as a community, come forward to create spaces in society and culture for Christ, no one else will. Alternatively, there will be others who will come forward to fill the empty spaces in the cultural and social world with different ideas and plans, many of which will be hostile to the integral development of peoples. For Christians, to become new people is to look for ways of living a model of this new life expressing Christianity’s social character.

In the 1980s, Ratzinger observed that the social nature of fellowship is at ‘the theological heart of the Christian concept of communion’\(^{114}\). Ratzinger stated that the community’s social character includes ‘mutual acceptance, giving and receiving on both sides, and readiness to share one’s goods’\(^{115}\). Moreover, in such a community,
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fellowship means the ‘pledge to give “life” to one another—spiritual and physical life’ because a community of believers ‘must never stop seeking’ to enter into ‘a mutual openness’. This openness poses the urgency of the task for Christians.

Their task is to show how ‘a Christian model of life … offers a livable alternative to the increasingly vacuous entertainments of leisure-time society’. Ratzinger described how the ‘Christian model of life must be manifested as a life in all its fullness and freedom, a life that does not experience the bonds of love as dependence and limitation but rather as an opening to the greatness of life’. With its ways of belonging, such a model has the energy ‘to renew the church and society as a whole … and where the model is ‘yeast’ it becomes a persuasive force that acts beyond the more closed spheres until it reaches everybody’. He concluded this brief discussion, noting that the ‘idea of creative minorities enrich[es] this model of life’. Such creativity enriches models of human living and is the ground for the creative renewal of all human culture. It is a renewal that is for all people in society, as well as Christians. For such a community, Christians cannot obtain their salvation in disregard of others. In SpS, he wondered how the idea of the soul’s salvation could have led to a:

‘flight from responsibility for the whole, and how people came to conceive the Christian project as a selfish search for salvation that rejects the idea of serving others.’

For Benedict, the Christian faith is necessarily a faith with profound social responsibility. Christians’ social responsibilities are not for disasters or suffering, instead to make their faith operative. A responsibility to proclaim and reveal the Love of Christ for the world and all its people. The question is: how is this responsibility to be discharged? The answer comes through the three elements: relationality, gift and love. These are at the heart of CIV and in concrete terms, at the centre of CIV 5. Before

116 Ibid.
118 Ibid., 126.
119 Ibid.
120 Ibid.
121 Ibid., 219.
123 Ibid., 219. ‘Social responsibility is an essential part of Christian social doctrine, which is “concerned with making the faith operative, that is relating the ethos of faith to economic and political reason”’. Joseph Ratzinger, Vom Wiederauffinden der Mitte:Grundorienteurngen, eds S.O Hron, V. Pfurn, et al, (Freiburg in Bresigaud: Herdr, 1997), 262. Quoted in Heim, Joseph Ratzinger, 219.
beginning Section 1.2 for a detailed examination of CIV and CIV 5, a brief discussion about love will assist with reading the encyclical.

A brief note on love is necessary because this theme runs through the dissertation and because Ratzinger was succinct in expressing the importance of love. For Ratzinger, love is not a matter of sentiment but truth. Love is the key to his faith and theology because a Christian is primarily in love with Christ. Love is, and always has been, central to Benedict, who expressed it in two themes: ‘the theme of Christ as the one you love … [and] the theme of the new love [as] the key to Christianity’.\(^\text{124}\) He recognised that love is vital for the human person because it is how they see the world around them and, most practically, how they interact with others. To know love is to know God and God’s Love. In being the object of love, or rather in knowing one is an object of love, a person sees love and, therefore, knows love and loves God in the effort ‘to love as God lives’ by loving the neighbour.\(^\text{125}\) Acknowledging the receipt of love is the basis for the world of Christian faith and action. Christianity is grounded in an ‘apprehension of transcendent reality in which we are the recipient of an unlimitable Love’.\(^\text{126}\) Further, faith emerges when there is a recognition of how much God Loves humanity.

Ratzinger understood that faith emerges when a person experiences the action of love as a gift while knowing it is what they need.\(^\text{127}\) The gift is the Love of a God who knows ‘we have nothing to offer him’, and if we did, we could not give it back because of our failings.\(^\text{128}\) In this, God’s Love opens a person to love the other and becomes the love that helps every person understand the ‘heart of that vision [that] is the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ who is a person [and who] we are called to meet and experience and know’.\(^\text{129}\)

Therefore, Christ becomes the basis for sharing the conviction of the need to transform people, communities and cultures in the ordering of their human living. Christ

\(^{124}\) The two themes that ‘accompanied him of which love, is the key to Christianity, that love is the angle from which it has to be approached’. Ratzinger, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church and the Signs of the Times*, trans. Michael J. Miller and Adrian J. Walker, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 102.


\(^{127}\) Ratzinger, *What it Means*, 75.

\(^{128}\) Ibid., 69.

is at the centre of this ordering. Moreover, with love as the primary, truth, gift, and relationality become necessary for understanding that CIV with DCE and SpS, teaches how love comes into the world through people who accept themselves because they know the truth of themselves as loved. Further, as loved people, they are called to give what they have received to another.

1.1.3. Ecclesial Realities

During his early days as a teacher and theologian, Ratzinger had meetings with young people from the ecclesial realities and witnessed signs of a new way of living that he had called for during the late 1950s. Just as Benedict’s call in CIV 5, for the formation of NoCh is a call on Christians for a new mode of life, the ecclesial realities are this new mode of life. Section 1.1.3 introduces the welcome that the popes from Paul VI onwards have given to the emergence of many different ecclesial realities. Cardinal Peter K. A Turkson (Turkson) commented on CIV 5 and said that there is a need for ‘agents of a new freedom and a new way of thinking … to build an earthly city which anticipates the heavenly city of God’ referring to the development of NoCh.

The first step is to understand ecclesial realities in the context of the many comments, observations and analyses of different popes. Particularly after the Council, they often spoke about their perspectives, hopes and expectations for the ecclesial realities and how these might contribute to building the Church through communities of faith. Making calls for the Church to build and be open to pilgrim communities of faith is not new to Benedict’s thinking about ecclesial realities. His analysis of the ecclesial realities in 1998 remains a new contribution to understanding these developments in the Church’s life.

130 Ratzinger, What it Means, 38–9.
133 The title given to each of the World Congresses consisting of representatives of the various ecclesial movements and new communities was World Congress of Ecclesial Movements and New Communities’. The first meeting was held in 1998, the second in 2006, and the third in 2013.
1.1.3.1. Communities of Faith and Ecclesial Realities

Ecclesial realities do not fall under a single concept, and there is no one word or phrase that captures the richness and variety of purposes, structures and activities of ecclesial realities. The Vatican used ‘Ecclesial Movements and New Communities’ as the title for the various congresses and gatherings of ecclesial realities it organised. Nonetheless, for simplicity and clarity, this dissertation uses the phrase ‘ecclesial realities.’ This term includes those entities that relied on Canon Law to receive a listing in the ‘Directory of Associations’. The term also encompasses those not formally Catholic or part of the Catholic Church. One example is L’Arche, though it is canonically recognised, there is sometimes a majority of non-Catholics and even non-Christians participants in their communities. Another example is the Catholic Worker Movement (CWM) [Section 3.3.1.]. The CWM has no canonical or even formal relationship with the Church. The phrase ‘ecclesial realities’ is defined further through a provisional definition developed centred on the three elements of CIV 5.7 in Section 3.2.1.

Along with Paul VI and John Paul II, Benedict welcomed the ecclesial realities as a sign of life for the Church and that the Holy Spirit was alive in the Church. These popes emphasised how the emergence of the ecclesial realities contrasted with the crises and divisions within the Church and the en masse disaffiliation from the Church, particularly in the broad anglosphere. In 1975, Paul VI issued ‘Evangelii Nuntiandi’, in which he reflected on the presence of ‘small communities’ in the Church. There were two types: ‘ecclesial communautes de base’ and ‘communautes de base’. He

---

138 L’Arche founded by Jean Vanier is now present in countries across the World. It has a model of communities based on living with severely intellectually disabled people. See History of l’Arche at https://www.larche.org.uk/history-of-larche.
welcomed the former for demonstrating solidarity with the life of the Church. He identified their ‘worship, deepening of faith, fraternal charity, prayer [and] contact with pastors’ and recognised that these present as a sociological quality found in village life. In short, these were communities with a living faith in Christ. Conversely, he noted that some types of communities, *communautés de bases*, were bitter critics of the Church. He forecast that these communities would be negatively affected by ideological thoughts when they viewed themselves through the prism of spirit versus institution and became instruments of a political party. Paul VI’s words still resonate in any discussion regarding ecclesial realities and the general factional tensions in the Church, where groups vie to proclaim that each is Catholic but espouse opinions that contest authority, doctrine and tradition.  

Paul VI identified several signs for recognising ecclesial communities, including how they meet their vocation to evangelise while seeking nourishment from the Word of God. While he warned about the need to avoid ideologies and the temptation to protest and criticise, he also identified that another sign is to maintain communion with the Church’s pastors and the communities never consider themselves sole agents of evangelisation. Paul VI thought these new communities should grow in missionary zeal, remain universal and never become sectarian. He did not talk about these communities as displaying signs of the movement of the Holy Spirit. This may have been because of their newness, the varying paths along which they emerged, the various forms they adopted for being in community and the lack of clarity in distinguishing between the two models of community he discussed. When Paul VI experienced a particular ecclesial reality, such as the Neocatechumenal Way (NCW), he reflected on this experience, observing that there were ‘new forms of charity … [where] culture and social solidarity are increasing the vitality of the Christian community and before the world are becoming its defence, its apologia and its attraction’. There is a resonance in this observation with the idea of NoCh and their possible fruits. The following paragraphs examine the views of both John Paul II and Benedict regarding ecclesial realities.
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142 Including movements such as ‘We are Church’ and campaigns seeking the ordination of women to sacerdotal office.
143 Paul VI, ‘Evangelii Nuntiandi’, 58.
145 Paul VI was familiar with Focolare, having met regularly with Lubich and gave her encouragement.
John Paul II and Benedict gave open and frequent recognition of the emergence of the ecclesial realities as the Holy Spirit’s work. John Paul II welcomed the emergence of the ecclesial realities. The post-synodal exhortation, ‘Christifideles Laici’ (1988), welcomed those ecclesial realities where they were in and close to the Church. However, he did offer a warning to the ecclesial realities to avoid two temptations. First, not to become so caught up in the Church (in its institutional forms and expression) that they neglected the world, and second, not to so deeply enter the world that they became separated from living the Gospel over time. He warned of the temptation for an ecclesial reality to go one way into self-aggrandisement and reflecting on itself or to disappear into their work and let their charism and communal spirituality wither. Both lead to a loss of balance.

Further, to avoid these two poles requires a constant looking for and at Christ, according to their charism. For Paul VI, a charism must be a source of ongoing refreshment in each member's spiritual and communal life and the community. The community must refresh itself through faithfulness to the charism of the initiator. This requires the community to maintain resilience in the chosen path of service of, and for, charity. Resilience means accepting any setbacks as in God’s plan and not judging or condemning those who engineer or author such setbacks, especially in any public disagreement with the decision of a relevant authority. This requirement becomes relevant when the community faces ongoing difficulties in living out their charism, or there is a decline in the rigour in upholding the charism’s spirituality. Temptations arise when perceiving the success of a community’s efforts as coming from the community rather than from God’s providence at work. A particular temptation is to believe that success comes from the communities. Ultimately, this form of Pelagianism may reduce the power of a person’s efforts, and with this, the community’s charism may die out.

John Paul II considered that a crucial aspect of the emergence of an ecclesial reality was the initiator or founder’s charism. He noted how the charisms given to people are for sharing to become the source of a ‘particular spiritual affinity among persons’. Ratzinger observed how a person needs to experience the charism ‘a deep personal

---

147 Ibid., 2.
148 Ibid., 24.
encounter with Christ’ before becoming a flame that attracts others.\textsuperscript{149} According to Rylko, a charism is ‘the force to unite within the same community’ many people with different cultures and vocations or at different stages of their lives.\textsuperscript{150} From this source, the ecclesial reality can grow by adhering to and living the charism.\textsuperscript{151} Rylko noted how, by fulfilling their vocation to holiness, the ecclesial realities had a cultural effect as a social reality in transforming their surroundings and culture.\textsuperscript{152} In this context, it is worth noting John Paul II’s encyclical, ‘\textit{Redemptoris Missio}’ (1990).\textsuperscript{153} John Paul II recognised ecclesial communities as a sign of vitality for the Church through their way of forming the faithful and showing signs of being a ‘solid starting point for a new society based on a “civilisation of love”’.\textsuperscript{154} However, these observations do not provide an answer to the question John Paul II asked when he addressed the World Congress of Ecclesial Movements and New Communities in 1998: ‘what is meant today by a movement?’\textsuperscript{155} It is crucial to address this question because it links to the proposal that the ecclesial realities exemplify NoCh. However, it is just as important to understand what these movements might mean for the Church in the twenty-first century—a sectarian dead end or a sign of the Holy Spirit at work.

John Paul II attempted to answer the question by highlighting several aspects of an ecclesial reality. First, he recognised that the communities have a predominantly lay membership. They are on a faith journey with a Christian witness, and there is a pedagogical method coming from the founder’s charism.\textsuperscript{156} Second, although he recognised the various forms and structures in the ecclesial realities, he recognised that all are ‘produced by the life-giving creativity of Christ’s Spirit’\textsuperscript{157} because it is the Holy Spirit that gives ‘a moving and convincing reminder to live the Christian experience fully, with intelligence and creativity’.\textsuperscript{158} Third, John Paul II understood the ecclesial

\begin{itemize}
\item Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial movements.’
\item John Paul II, ‘\textit{Christifideles Laici}’, 7.
\item Ibid., 15.
\item Ibid., 51.
\item Ibid.
\item Ibid.
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\item Ibid.
\end{itemize}
realities as a gift from the Holy Spirit. He saw the communities: ‘very existence is a hymn to the unity in diversity desired by the Spirit and gives witness to it’. In an address given at Pentecost in 1998, John Paul II emphasised that the Holy Spirit is at work in the emergence of the ecclesial realities. He further argued that their emergence is what the Second Vatican Council desired. For John Paul II, the ecclesial realities were not ‘limited’ to be in the Church (even if it is possible to do such a thing); instead, they were present in the world because the Holy Spirit does not work to create compartments in our lives. Finally, the ecclesial movements and communities “…embody the ecclesiology of the first two chapters of Lumen Gentium”. Paul VI and John Paul II’s observations and insights suggest reading ecclesial realities as a type of NoCh.

1.1.3.2. Ratzinger/Benedict on Ecclesial Realities

Ratzinger recognised that the emergence of ecclesial realities was in response to the challenges and needs of the times and circumstances. It is suggested that the ecclesial realities become a meeting point between the Church and the world. Further, Ratzinger agreed with John Paul II when he recognised the ecclesial realities as a significant fruit of the ‘springtime in the Church’ because their life reveals ‘the freshness of the Christian experience based on a personal encounter with Christ’. He perceived a shared awareness of how ‘baptismal grace brings to life’, noting how they demonstrate a ‘sound fidelity to the patrimony of the faith’ and that, through this, there comes a ‘renewed missionary zeal which reaches out to the men and women of our era in the concrete situations’.

However, Ratzinger offered further insights into the ecclesial realities and provided markers for understanding each reality as a NoCh. This is because,

159 Ibid, 3.
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as Raymond De Souza (De Souza) recognised, he saw the need for the ‘re-enchantment of the world’.166

There are several reasons why Ratzinger/Benedict has a personal level of appreciation and understanding of the ecclesial realities. First, he experienced these realities during his days as a theologian at the Eberhard Karl University of Tübingen. His experience of the realities differed from those of Paul VI and John Paul II.167 Further, his early life in a close-knit family with experiences of the domestic Church in a rural world made him open to the small groups he has met.168 Finally, his life in a small village community in Bavaria was in a profoundly Catholic part of Germany, with a high degree of ‘socialization of faith’ in the small communities of a rural and small-town world. The impact of Nazism both on him personally and the wider society in Bavaria and Germany probably strengthened his thinking on how to address authoritarianism, and as well as enhancing his trust in smaller local societies. These were communities of human persons with their warmth, a Catholic world that generated social movements of religious faith to assist others. These experiences gave Ratzinger a communitarian outlook.169 Further, as Emery de Gaál (de Gaál) highlighted, these communities’ religious faith and culture revealed signs of beauty and joy.170

The Marianischer Madchenschutzverein (Schutz) movement in Bavaria is an example of a social movement generated from Bavaria’s religious world. Schutz helped young women migrating from rural areas into industrialised towns.171 Ratzinger expressed his enthusiasm for Schutz because he considered it an example of ‘the open church’.172 In saying this, he compared it with the early Church, ‘with its combination of local community and universal openness’.173 He recognised a model that answered
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168 His openness to personalist thinkers gave him a sense of the importance of relationships in the community and to look for and encourage the signs of vitality in these relationships.
169 de Gaál, Theology of Pope Benedict XVI, 151.
170 Ibid., 13–20. The signs of beauty and joy were a real source of the resistance to Nazism, then the movement of paganism and materialist nihilism.
171 Ratzinger recalled ‘Schutz was as an initiative of the local Catholic church, working with the Lutherans, in Bavaria to establish an organisation to help young women coming from the countryside who were being abused and exploited, in the period Germany moved from an agricultural economy towards an industrial one. Joseph Ratzinger, ‘Anthropological Basis’, In Dogma and Preaching: Applying Christian Doctrine to Daily Life, trans, Michael J. Miller and Matthew J. O’Connell, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011), 210-221, 212.
173 Ibid.
humans’ needs in a world characterised by mobility and concentration. Therefore, Ratzinger’s call was for the Church to ‘lead this old model in a new way today’. Ratzinger’s view of the worth of small communities of faith in a sociological, personalist and spiritual sense is shaped by his personal history as seen above and in the Church’s history. The calls he made when Pope, for the formation of communities in faith, are not without a history. In the face of a bureaucratic body, he identified how ‘small communities could be one such path, where friendships are lived and deepened in regular communal adoration before God. There we find people who speak of these small faith experiences … and in so doing bear witness to a new closeness between Church and society.’ Thus, Ratzinger recognised the value of the philosophy of the intersubjective world of the human being, a person who lives in relations where ‘I’ and ‘I’ meet to become a ‘We’ - see Section 1.3. With this brief background, Section 1.1.3.3 considers what Ratzinger said about ecclesial realities.

1.1.3.3. Ecclesial Realities and the World

In *Faith and Future*, Ratzinger demonstrated a grasp of the Church’s difficulties when he called for a renewal that could be more than reforming the Church’s institutional structures. He envisioned a renewal occurring through ‘smaller’ groups of faith coming into existence. He contrasted this with the increasing bureaucratisation of the Church in Germany. For Ratzinger, this meant the parish had to become less anonymous and open to the contemporary world where communities could be ‘a “home” to the seeking individual of today’.
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174 Ibid., 215.
175 Ratzinger, ‘The Ecclesial Movements’.
178 Regarding the Age of Enlightenment’s effects on the Church, Ratzinger noted how this led to ‘a Church, reduced in size, diminished in social prestige, but a Church that had become fruitful from a new interior power, which released new formative and social forces’. Ratzinger, *Faith and Future*, 101.
180 For me personally it was a marvellous event when at the beginning of the seventies I first came into close contact with movements like the Neocatechumens, Comunione e Liberazione, and the Focolarini and thus experienced the enthusiasm and verve with which they lived out their faith and felt bound to share with others, from out of the joy of their faith’. Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith*, 17.
181 Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 309. The publication date of the English version in 1987 can make it appear that Ratzinger was speaking later than he was. The German edition of this book appeared in 1982, which means the essays within it appeared earlier. The comments are closer in time to those made in *Faith and Future*. 
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During his early days as a priest/theologian, Ratzinger met some of those who participated in ecclesial realities. He described those experiences as moments of joy and grace in a time of weariness. In these communities, he met people who wanted to live their faith ‘in a time of winter’. Ratzinger placed much hope in such developments. He gave encouragement, support and recognition to the movements when he moved to Rome. He welcomed the communities in the Catholic Church in Latin America as ‘living cells’ that provided a ‘milieu of faith’. Further, he conceived the ecclesial communities as ‘creative minorities’, taking his cue from Toynbee. Ratzinger spoke of the need for ‘convinced’ minorities—people who ‘should look upon themselves as just such a creative minority’. He thought these were necessary for the Church and the world. This was because with a ‘convincing model of life’, there is a possibility of ‘opening to knowledge that cannot emerge amid dreariness of everyday life’. Christianity is lived in communities that are such models of a life of faith.

For Ratzinger, mused Christianity needs to offer believers and non-believers alike ‘models of life in new ways … [which] will once again present itself in the

---


183 Ratzinger, New Outpourings of the Spirit, Movements in the Church, trans. Michael J. Miller and Henry Taylor, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007), 66–8. He meets: ‘…. at a moment when people were speaking of ‘a winter in the Church’, the Holy Spirit was creating a new springtime and that the joy of being Christian was being reawakened in young people, the joy of being Catholic, of living in the Church…’. Ibid, 68.

184 ‘… Ratzinger had watched the ecclesial movements with interest … He saw in them the possibility of new blood flowing into the somewhat sclerotic arteries of the old ecclesiastical institutions’. Guerriero, Benedict XVI, 508.

185 De Souza argued that: the new movements were central to Ratzinger’s life. When in the 1970s he and others launched Communio, the important theological journal, the Italian edition was not entrusted to the academic guild, but to bright theologians from Communion and Liberation, a young Angelo Scola first among them. De Souza, ‘How Joseph Ratzinger Saw’.

186 Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 298.
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191 Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 377.’…here there is a search for a new center that will give the lie to the diagnosis that ….. will open new ways of living a life built on faith…’.
wasteland of technological existence as a place of true humanity’ in the future. He then recognised how ‘this is already happening now’, nominating the Focolare Movement (Focolare) and the NCW as exemplars. Ratzinger thought these were where ‘Christianity is present as an experience of newness and is suddenly felt … as a chance to live in this century’. In one interview, Ratzinger emphasised how ‘no one can be a Christian alone; being a Christian means a communion of wayfarers … for this reason, it must be the Church’s concern to create these pilgrim communities’. Ratzinger stressed the need for new ways of doing things and for people to live and exist in fellowship because ‘we can no longer take for granted a universal Christian atmosphere. Nor that the parish structure is sufficient. Christians, therefore, must really support one another. Moreover, here there are, in fact, already other forms, “movements” of various kinds, which help to form pilgrim communities’.

He then linked the idea of these communities and their formation to the need for a catechumenate. He stated that the renewal of the catechumenate ‘is indispensable’. He had spoken before about the need for a catechumenate with communities to renew faith. He reflected on this over time, which lead to the address he gave six months later (in June 1998) on a theology of the ecclesial realities.

Ratzinger sketched out a hermeneutic of the ecclesial realities as apostolic movements in his address to the First World Congress of Ecclesial Movements. He first considered exploring the question through the alternative ‘dialectical of principles’, whether institution and charism, Christology and pneumatology or hierarchy and prophecy (or Law and Gospel). He concluded that these approaches were insufficient. He then reviewed the history of ecclesial realities during the life of the Church and the world. He described the emergence of ‘apostolic movements’ in the Church from its earliest days and noted that these were communities with charisms inspired by the Holy
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Spirit that arose in response to the new situations facing the Church during their era.\textsuperscript{201} In his reading of the early history of the Church, Ratzinger noted how Christians did not create new and separate institutions alongside the Church because their desire is not to seek ‘a community apart, but Christianity as a whole, a Church that is obedient to the gospel and lives by it’.\textsuperscript{202} He recorded how tensions resolved over time and how the reinvigoration of the ‘universalistic aspect of its apostolic mission’ developed, enhanced the ‘spiritual vitality and truth of the local churches’.\textsuperscript{203} The new movements become life for the whole Church.

Ratzinger’s approach to the ecclesial realities continued without alteration when he became the Pope. As the Pope, Benedict took his appreciation further by exercising the papacy’s authority through an important initiative in 2006. His approach enabled him to argue that the ecclesial realities are an integral part of the living structure of the Church\textsuperscript{204} because they have a universal dimension in the Church.\textsuperscript{205} ‘This is the Marian dimension that accompanies the Petrine dimension.’\textsuperscript{206} Benedict returned to this question when he addressed the ecclesial realities at a meeting in Rome in May 2006.

He sent a message to the participants of the Second World Congress on Ecclesial Movements and New Communities.\textsuperscript{207} A week later, he preached a homily at the ‘Solemnity of Pentecost’ to tens of thousands of participants of the ecclesial realities.\textsuperscript{208} In both the message and the homily, he gave a different emphasis from the Address in 1998, when he recognised them as’…as a luminous sign of the beauty of Christ and the Church’.\textsuperscript{209} However, together they frame an expansion of his vision that accompanied

\textsuperscript{201} ‘I must say quite clearly here that the apostolic movements appear in ever new forms throughout history—necessarily, because they are the Holy Spirit’s answer to the changing situations in which the Church lives’. Ratzinger, ‘The Ecclesial Movements’.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid., 171.
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{205} ‘The universal dimension, the element that transcends the local ecclesial ministries, remains indispensable … There must also always be in the Church ministries and missions that are not tied to the local church alone but serve universal mission and the spreading of the gospel. The Pope has to rely on these ministries, they on him, and the collaboration between the two kinds of ministries completes the symphony of the Church’s life’. Ratzinger, The Ecclesial Movements.
\textsuperscript{206} Emery de Gaál, \textit{O Lord, I Seek Your Countenance, Explorations and Discoveries in Pope Benedict XVI’s Theology}, (Steubenville, Ohio: Emmaus Academic, 2018), 108–10. See the section headed, ‘The Future of the Church is Essentially Marian’.
\textsuperscript{207} The theme of the Second World Congress was summed up in the heading, ‘The Beauty of Being a Christian and the Joy of Communicating This’.
\textsuperscript{208} Benedict, ‘Solemnity of Pentecost’
\textsuperscript{209} Ibid.
a more profound recognition of the purpose of the ecclesial realities. In 2006, he provided a Christological perspective when he called upon the faithful to encounter Christ. He saw in the ecclesial realities how they saw a glimpse of the face of Christ, created ‘a newness of life, of person and communities’ in their particular journeys. For only a newness of life grounds their capability to be ‘an incisive witness of love, unity and joy’. He urged the ecclesial realities to recognise that in Christ, ‘the beauty of truth and the beauty of love converge’. For here is a love which ‘calls for the willingness to suffer, a willingness which for those who love one another can even extend to the sacrifice of life’. He suggested that such suffering helps the ecclesial realities understand that they must ensure ‘they are always schools of communion, groups journeying on in which one learns to live in the truth and love’ because the task of these schools is bringing ‘Christ’s light to all the social and cultural milieus in which you live’. Moreover, with this, Benedict deepened his insight into ecclesial realities for giving signs to the world where:

‘the extraordinary fusion between Love of God and love of neighbour makes life beautiful and causes the desert in which we often find ourselves living to blossom anew. Where love is expressed as a passion for the life and destiny of others, where love shines forth in affection and in work and becomes a force for the construction of a more just social order, there the civilization is built that can withstand the advance of barbarity.’

Such an almost overwhelming vision is the mark of what it means to live the gift of the Holy Spirit. This vision reveals the power of love to transform the world. From
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210 ‘You belong to the living structure of the Church. She thanks you for your missionary commitment, for the formative action on behalf of Christian families that you are increasingly developing and for the promotion of vocations to the ministerial priesthood and consecrated life which you nurture among your members’. Benedict, ‘Second World Congress’.
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this, Benedict called upon the ecclesial realities to be communities that were ‘builders of a better world according to the ordo amoris in which the beauty of human life is expressed’. Benedict proposed that the ecclesial realities were where the Holy Spirit was the source of their openness to life, charism and how the communities live their faith and generate the fruits of this gift.

In summary, the elements include the willingness to suffer, show newness of life in bearing witness to love, unity and joy, and give signs of the Shema as a source for a ‘just social order’ with a ‘beauty of life’. Thus, the Shema becomes the hope that signs of creative and powerful holiness will bring the desert in society to the point of blooming will emerge. He addressed this theme again in his homily at Pentecost.

In the homily given on the ‘Solemnity of Pentecost’, he recalled how history reveals the monastic communities as places where ‘the brightness of the Creator Spirit has also been restored to the earth’. However, he did admit that with its splendour overcome, it faced elimination due to ‘the barbarity of the human mania for power’. The monastic communities are a counter reality to the situation in society ‘where the true course of life no longer flows’, referencing the disposal of unborn life. For Benedict, to protect such life and the life of creation, there is a need to rediscover its source—Christ. He called on those listening to recognised how ‘the more one gives life for others, the more abundantly “the river of life flows”’. In other words, the new communities counter the dominant ideas in the social reality surrounding them. He reflected on the hope and confidence of how those in the ecclesial realities, through their participation, commitment, energy, and faithfulness, were bringing life into the Church
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despite any weaknesses or failings. Benedict declared that this only happens because the ‘movements were born precisely of the thirst for true life; they are Movements for life in every sense’. To uphold this, he indicated the ‘need to who loves and freedom’, which means the ecclesial realities ‘must be schools of freedom’ not seeking gains at the disadvantage of others. He identified the need for the ecclesial realities to collaborate with others and the Church in opening doors to Christ because this is where the Church acts to offer the ‘best service for men and women and especially for the poor, so that the person’s life, a fairer order in society and peaceful coexistence among the nations may find in Christ the cornerstone on which to build the genuine civilization, the civilization of love’.

A review of the literature regarding CIV 5, in Section 1.2 reveals the limited discussion about Benedict’s two addresses in 2006. Many of those who have analysed the emergence of ecclesial realities in the Church have paid little attention to these addresses. Effectively, Benedict in the Message to the 2006 Second World Congress and his homily at the Vigil of the Solemnity of Pentecost went beyond discerning a ‘criterion’ for the ‘validity’ of ecclesial realities he sketched out in the address of 1998. Rather Benedict proposed a vision of the purpose of the ecclesial realities. Simultaneously, he provided a measure of the fruits that should arise when the ecclesial realities live as Christ in the world because the ecclesial realities are not just for the Church but are equally a response to the barbarity of the world. These ecclesial realities become locations of how and where to meet the cry of the poor through Christ. They are social realities for re-creating the world; a theme he returned to in a homily in 2012 when he reflected on the people in the ecclesial realities who are ‘beings filled with the joy of faith, the radicalism of obedience, the dynamic of hope and the power of love’. The contribution of ecclesial realities as exemplars of self-gift to serve the other
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in the Love of Christ is explored in Part 3; however, Part 1 continues by deepening an understanding of CIV (see Sections 1.2 and 1.3).

1.2. *Caritas in Veritate*: An Interpretation

Section 1.2.1 provides an overview and interpretation of CIV while Section 1.2.2 examines the literature on CIV. CIV was the first social encyclical ‘with an expressly theological title’, making it a radical and spiritual encyclical.\(^{230}\) In this sense, it was revolutionary. CIV was a celebration of PP; however, CIV went beyond PP because of the need to address the complexities and interwoven nature of globalisation in a world radically different from the time of Paul VI. Further, CIV did more than discuss the complex problems or complain about the current economic order; it was intended as a guide for Christians in the new situation of the twenty-first century.

Benedict put forward CIV as a guide for Christians and people of goodwill to transform the world. CIV is subtitled ‘Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth’, which indicated Benedict’s direction. Benedict adopted the concept of IHD from PP. The concept did not arise for Benedict by reciting various measures or warnings of an economic or political nature. Instead, he saw that such a development only came through the theological and spiritual shaping of the answers to the world’s problems. Paul VI saw IHD as more than providing material goods and services that he saw as necessary, for he emphasised that ‘authentic human development concerns the whole person in every single dimension’.\(^{231}\) The influence of this is evident in Benedict’s insistence that individualism, which is at the root of those who seek reliance on the state and the market, is not the answer to the social and economic crises facing humanity.\(^{232}\)

CIV challenged the pervasive individualism that emerged over the last few centuries, which became more intense during the era of postmodernity, particularly in the broad Anglo/Eurosphere. Against that culture, CIV insisted that humans are relational beings, and that love is the truth of that relationality. CIV argued that solutions to the economic and social problems require truth and a love for truth, where love is the nature of the human person as a being who receives a call to love others in God. With


\(^{231}\) CIV 11.

\(^{232}\) ‘Secularization, with its inherent emphasis on individualism, has its most negative effects on individuals who are isolated and lack a sense of belonging’. Benedict, ‘*Sacramentum Caritatis*’, 76.
this approach, CIV offered answers to the challenges and suffering of the current social and cultural order due to economic financialisation and the resulting Global Financial Crisis in 2008. Moreover, where ‘Rerum Novarum’ (1891) called the Church to address the consequences of rapid industrialisation and the new industrial proletariat’s immiseration, CIV undertook a similar task arising from globalisation and financialisation during the twenty-first century.233

Benedict understood the challenges posed by these changes. He recognised that these changes accompanied radical shifts in understandings of morality and mores in the social ordering where a heightened individualism leads to the emergence of radical technologised consumerism in the Western world (maybe better termed the ‘American/Eurosphere’).234 CIV addressed these challenges by indicating a horizon for Christians to live out their faith in communities of love and hope.235 Such communities are to ‘take up with confidence and hope the new responsibilities to which we are called by the prospect of a world in need of profound cultural renewal’.236 CIV also invited ‘those of goodwill’ to take up and share these responsibilities.237

1.2.1. An Overview of Caritas in Veritate

1.2.1.1. Introduction and Conclusion in Caritas in Veritate

CIV started with an Introduction, a feature adopted in ‘Laborem Exercens’ (1981) by John Paul II in 1981.238 Benedict used the Introduction to provide a perspective and framework with which to read CIV.239 Each paragraph in the Introduction offered an interpretative key for reading CIV. Franco Giulio Brambilla
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234 These are shorthand terms that cover many countries, including some in Africa, South America and Asia; however, the crisis originated mostly in the financial system dominated by the economies in the USA and Europe which had a global reach and impact.
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(Brambilla) argued the Introduction was bold because of its ‘twofold function: to link the social doctrine with the centre of the Trinitarian Mystery, showing how theological caritas radiates into social things’. Thus, Brambilla argued that one could grasp ‘caritas as the founding principle of social doctrine, which takes it away from a reduced and irrelevant understanding’.

Further, Brambilla insisted that the Introduction in CIV is of ‘strategic importance because it forms … the theoretical framework of the subsequent resumption of the notion of integral development’. Strauss also observed how the Introduction is a ‘sociology of love—charity—that serves as the infrastructure for the argument in CIV’. These comments open an examination of the paragraphs in the Introduction.

CIV 1, in the Introduction proclaimed that the core concept of CIV is ‘charity in truth, to which Jesus Christ bore witness … [and which] is the principal driving force behind the authentic development of every person and of all humanity’. According to CIV authentic development begins and ends with Christ, who is love, a force from the living God. Thus, Benedict centred the future of humanity in Christ rather than politics, economics or global institutions. He centred the future on people called to become an integral part of Him. For this reason, each person has the task to find their Good, know it is God’s plan for them, realise it, and know they are free with it. The task is not to search for a comfortable existence, but to ‘defend the truth, … articulate it with humility and conviction, … [and] bear witness to it in life’.

Benedict’s emphasis on truth was that it always comes from within the context of charity. The truth, the ‘the Face of his [Christ’s] Person’, defines our vocation as loving ‘our brothers and sisters in the truth of his plan’. To love in this way is the vocation given to Christians by Christ, which reveals how Christ is the ground of all actions of charity, where charity is the synthesis of the Shema.

---
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CIV placed the Shema at the centre of Christian life and the STCC because ‘the Church’s Social Doctrine is derived from charity which is the synthesis of the entire Law (cf. Mt 22:36–40)’. CIV insists charity is what ‘gives real substance to the personal relationship with God and with neighbour’. Charity becomes the principle of forming and sustaining both close relationships and friendships and broader relationships in society. Thus, Benedict removed charity from the realm of mere donations and almsgiving to reveal the power it has to shape how people can live together in a social setting. Benedict reinforced this when he insisted that ‘everything has its origin in God’s Love, everything is shaped by it, everything is directed towards it’. He was aware that this might be read and dismissed as having no meaning for achieving practical consequences. However, he rejected such a dismissal.

Benedict emphasised the task remains for the truth ‘to be sought, found and expressed within the “economy” of charity, but charity in its turn needs to be understood, confirmed and practised in the light of truth’. This may seem like an abstraction; however, Benedict showed how every person of goodwill, and especially a Christian, is under an obligation to demonstrate ‘its persuasive and authenticating power in the practical setting of social living’. Thus, he indicated that CIV is about the person of faith living in the practical world, not escaping into an abstraction of truth and love. Benedict knew that the task of living in truth and charity is not easy, and he recognised that to accomplish this is ‘a matter of no small account today’. In this short paragraph, Benedict summarised what Christians should do. He continued developing this in the paragraphs to follow.

Paragraph three (CIV 3) answered those who argued that Benedict was only speaking at a theological or philosophical level, not a practical one, or not even at a level from where real social change could arise. CIV 3 recognised that the Shema is central to the function of CIV when Benedict explored the meaning of ‘charity in truth’ in the human social world. First, he insisted that charity is ‘an authentic expression of

---

247 Ibid.
248 Ibid.
249 Ibid
250 Ibid.
251 CIV 1.
252 Ibid.
253 Ibid., 2.
254 Ibid.
255 Ibid.
humanity and … an element of fundamental importance in human relations’.\(^{256}\) Then, he defined the truth of charity in both the natural and supernatural dimensions as ‘gift, acceptance, and communion’.\(^ {257}\) In developing this definition, the three points that become more evident included: (1) gift is the gift of self out of love; (2) acceptance is where a person, in their relationality, because acceptance occurs with others, receives and welcomes entering into being a gift of self; and (3) how from the interaction of the gift of self and acceptance there emerges communion for loving the other.

Benedict understood how ‘the word “love” is abused and distorted, to the point where it comes to mean the opposite’; however, he insisted that love is charity.\(^ {258}\) Charity reveals both the personal act of biblical faith in a God who is present and the faith of a person who witnesses it in the public dimension.\(^ {259}\) He highlighted what needs to happen, how to do it and what it means to do it. The development of charity’s meaning opened a discussion regarding the praxis of charity in CIV 4.

Benedict continued his argument on the importance of charity for human society in CIV 4, by challenging the idea that Christianity is irrelevant for humanity’s development. He discussed what Christians can do and what Christianity does and argued that understanding what ‘truth in charity’ means can open the pathway to dialogue with all people. However, dialogue does not remove Christians from their responsibility to proclaim that ‘truth opens and unites our minds in the logos of love’.\(^ {260}\) For when Christians practise ‘charity in truth [it] helps people to understand that adhering to the values of Christianity is not merely useful but essential for building a good society and for true’ human development.\(^ {261}\) If there is a summary of CIV 4, it is that the first responsibility of a Christian is to live as a Christian. The link between the practical living out of love and CIV 5, is discussed in Section 1.3. The remaining paragraphs in the Introduction are discussed below.

CIV paragraphs 6 to 9, present a preliminary and practical discussion of the STCC. First, in CIV 6, Benedict emphasises how ‘charity goes beyond justice because to love is to give, to offer what is “mine” to the other’.\(^ {262}\) He recognises that ‘justice is the primary way of charity or, in Paul VI’s words, “the minimum measure” of it is an
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integral part of the love “in deed and in truth” (1 Jn 3:18). Thus, he emphasised how ‘charity transcends justice and completes it in the logic of giving and forgiving’. Moreover, he presented a vision of the earthly city and developed proposals or measures to a certain level of detail, which could realise this vision.

Therefore, promoting the earthly city is only possible at a fundamental level with ‘relationships of gratuitousness, mercy, and communion’. The dissertation reads CIV 6 as an emphasis on relationships between people and within the communities they create. This emphasis is acts as a reminder that building social structures that do not become sources of evil only comes from relationships built on love. CIV 6, echoed the definition of charity in CIV 3. Because relationships occur between people in communities, they become communities living out giving and forgiving as communities for justice and charity with the power to renew. With this understanding, charity is at the heart of the renewal of culture—a new culture where love is the organising principle and people relate to each other in relationships of love that become the driver towards the common good of human dignity.

CIV 7 began with what people desire—love. Benedict reminded the readers that they need to know that someone loves them to receive love. Love only comes through people. Therefore, the one who loves is the one who ‘desire[s] that person’s good and … take[s] effective steps to secure it’. Such a desire introduces the idea of the common good. Here, Benedict used the definition of the common good in the ‘Gaudium et Spes’, which was ‘the sum of those conditions of social life that allow social groups and their members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfilment’. Benedict rephrased this as the ‘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’. Benedict did not hand over the achievement of the common good to the responsibility of the state or the market. The task belongs to the people and communities informed by the three elements of relationality, gift and love. Although the communities build the common good, the state

263 Ibid.
264 Ibid.
265 Ibid.
266 Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 79–80.
267 Ibid.
269 CIV 7.
and the market have a role in supporting and not hindering this work of ‘justice and charity’.

Working for the common good is the responsibility of those ‘who belong to the social community’. These are the people ‘who can only really and effectively pursue their good within it’ and without it.\textsuperscript{270} The responsibility belongs to the people in a community because they are the only ones who access the ‘complex of institutions that give structure to the life of society, juridically, civilly, politically and culturally, making it the pólis, or “city”’.\textsuperscript{271} In saying this, Benedict’s argument about the transformation of the structures of oppression is logical. The task is to work for the common good, which meets ‘the real needs of … neighbours’.\textsuperscript{272}

Concurrently, Benedict accepted that the institutional or political path towards the common good is necessary for a complex and modern society.\textsuperscript{273} However, he went on to situate the search for the common good from a transcendental perspective. When inspired and sustained by charity, people’s activity ‘contributes to the building of the universal city of God’.\textsuperscript{274} This summary of the common good does not separate the work of shaping the earthly city from building the city of God. Instead, there is an anticipation and a prefiguring of the city of God when the common good is present and human dignity flourishes. When this happens, the common good emerges because the drive to love the neighbour extends to the whole human family. Moreover, it is in loving the human family as if they are the neighbour that helps build the city of God. The common good comes from living the Shema; that is, living the life necessary for the twenty-first century where the common good emerges, and this does the work for the common good in Christological terms.

CIV 8, centred Christ in integral development when Benedict recalled how in his PP, Paul VI identified that ‘life in Christ is the first and principal factor of development’.\textsuperscript{275} Moreover, Benedict highlighted how the grace that ‘opens our lives to gift’ comes from Christ. This gift is what allows the hope of progressing to more humane ways of living. Hope is central to the STCC because it comes from the Love of Christ.\textsuperscript{276}
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in a ‘world that is becoming progressively and pervasively globalised’. Benedict repeated the theme that in the face of this situation, there is only the ‘potential of love that overcomes evil with good … and only this guarantees authentic development … in a way that technical solutions cannot guarantee’. CIV 9, identified the task of the Church as a mission of truth, and this conveys that the STCC is ‘a service to the truth which sets us free’. Because without truth, ‘it is easy to fall into an empiricist and sceptical view of life, incapable of rising to the level of praxis’. 

The mission of truth requires more than scepticism or a reductionist view of the human person and their needs. Benedict argued that truth, which is Christ, is required to ‘judge and direct’ a praxis of charity—a praxis for a society attuned to the human person and their dignity is a service to truth. Benedict situated the STCC as a ‘particular dimension of this proclamation: it is a service to the truth’ within this framework. This task of proclaiming the truth continues ‘within the constantly changing life-patterns of the society of peoples and nations’. To answer this call requires the ‘practical tool’ found in CIV 5.

The Conclusion in CIV paragraphs 78 and 79, is not a summary of the encyclical but restates the core thesis of CIV that Christ is to be at the centre of life and human development because, with Christ, there is a new vision and energy for human development. God is necessary because with an openness to God comes an openness to others to guide the actions for building a new civil society. All of this requires courage, which comes from God. In the last paragraph, Benedict indicated to Christians the need for prayer and to trust in God and his providence, which constitute a spiritual life in fellowship with Christ—a fellowship that grows where there is mercy, forgiveness, love, justice and peace. These notes on the Introduction and Conclusion are the core of reading CIV for its contribution to the STCC (see Part 4). Section 1.2.2 examines the commentaries and critiques of CIV.
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1.2.2. Commentaries and Critiques of Caritas in Veritate

CIV was and still is the subject of commentaries, analyses and critiques. A survey of this literature can only be a sketch at best. The material discussed is in three broad categories: fragmentary, specialist and theological. The fragmentary approach reflects a reading over and against, rather than with, the encyclical. These readings often focus on some aspect that is absent from CIV. One example is Jessica Ludescher (Ludescher), who recognised that CIV advanced arguments for sustainability but then dismissed it as conservative. She was critical of the stance in CIV on sexuality, abortion and the family, and the non-critical stance on the question of the growth of the world’s population. Although she expressed a desire to be sympathetic, she placed herself at a distance from its primary thrust.286 Others, such as Johann Verstraeten (Verstraeten), challenged the integrity of the encyclical for not being within what he considered a post-Vatican II modality of taking up the ‘signs of the times’.287 Verstraeten defined this as the deciphering of the ‘authentic signs of God’s presence and purpose … in the concrete and laborious life’ of people. Further, he argued that there was a need to advance ‘strategies for change’.288 On this point, Verstraeten criticised CIV for its lack of an analysis of unjust structures and more so for its emphasis on personal conversions through changing relationships and advancing fraternity. He contended that these were insufficient.289 While Verstraeten called for lay Christian communities, including what he called the ‘movimenti’, to be part of the conversation in the STCC, he seemed to have only explicitly recognised political movements of a left-wing persuasion as being part of this conversation.290 In all of this, he missed the Introduction to CIV and CIV 5.

Although Lisa Cahill (Cahill) was somewhat more sympathetic to what Benedict said in CIV, seeing it as a move away from positions he held in DCE and Jesus of Nazareth, she argued that he failed to address specific issues. One of these failures was the lack of mention of the preferential option for the poor, although she did note that

288 Ibid., 330.
289 Ibid., 318.
290 Ibid., 326. Verstraeten only mentioned movimenti as ‘spiritual movements’, selecting the exemplars as Focolare and Sant’Egidio. He placed these alongside other ‘left wing Christian and secular movements’ though he rejected the strategies for community organising, inspired by Saul Alinsky, (a left-wing activist active in the USA from 1930s onwards) recommended by Austen Ivereigh. Verstraeten gave no references for this
Benedict adopted the phrase in an Address on World Peace later in 2009 after CIV had been issued.\(^{291}\) Further, Cahill was concerned about the lack of focus on building ‘more just social structures’.\(^{292}\) Although she recognised much of the actions of the Church rely on the laity, her focus was on working through its institutional structures. She argued that the Church’s structures should work in alliance with other international institutions to bring about ‘global justice and structural change’.\(^ {293}\) According to Cahill, these failings were due to Benedict’s Christology, which she argued is a Word Christology. She argued that CIV needs a Christology that recognises and emphasises ‘God’s proleptic transformation of human societies’; though, she was unspecific about the structural changes required.\(^{294}\)

David Hollenbach (Hollenbach) offered a more nuanced version of the argument that CIV failed to address structural changes. Although he welcomed CIV with its stress on Christian charity through loving the neighbour, he argued that if there is to be justice, then understanding love as ‘a gift gratuitously given’ or even self-gift is inadequate. However, he recognised that the love of neighbour could produce ‘equal regard and mutual relationship’ and that love helps alleviate poverty.\(^{295}\) A further omission by Hollenbach and Cahill was the lack of engagement with the idea of the Economy of Communion (EoC). However, Hollenbach did argue that only when charity is understood as meaning equality and reciprocity does it contribute to building solidarity and delivering justice. He concluded that CIV’s concept of love is inadequate to support radical social and structural innovations in the world.\(^{296}\)

Meghan Clark (Clark) was somewhat more sympathetic to CIV in how it linked charity to justice.\(^ {297}\) While she recognised that Benedict had developed a meaning of charity as ‘a theology of gift and the principle of gratuitousness’, she did not discuss this further.\(^ {298}\) She also welcomed Benedict linking charity to solidarity. Her brief article
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stressed justice over and against charity, presumably because it is perceived as limited to diaconal charity. Focusing on justice in this way seems to view a Catholic body as little more than an advocate on the state to achieve justice. While Benedict did not directly address this question, CIV focused on charity as the supreme virtue, as the gift of self to the other, from where justice will come. Clark identified the Vincentian Movement, notably the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul communities (conferences) in parishes, exemplifying the institutional path incorporating charity and justice.\textsuperscript{299} Thus, she identified community organisations and the large bureaucratic Catholic non-government organisations as the way forward.\textsuperscript{300} In this, she overlooked CIV 5, and the call to create NoCh. All these commentators, to some degree or other, shared a common approach to CIV. CIV though welcomed, it was with reservations. These reservations have been mainly about the failure to mention specific key phrases, such as ‘signs of the times’ or ‘preferential option’ for the poor or propose a need for structural changes at the institutional level. All seemed to share a perspective of the Church in institutional terms, such that they all have an immanent opinion regarding the Church’s role in the world. These stances reflected the argument that the Christocentric view of Ratzinger/Benedict is why he does not heed ‘the signs of the times and enter into a dialogue with the world on its terms’.\textsuperscript{301} The one constant in the articles is the lack of attention to the Introduction, to CIV 5, and Benedict’s call for communities of charity in CIV 5.7.

Though still fragmentary, a counter assessment came from George Weigel (Weigel). He complained that CIV read as if it had red and gold parts. He speculated that the red parts were not Benedict’s work and that the gold parts came from Benedict; however, he gave no examples.\textsuperscript{302} He seemed to designate red as some anti-capitalist, quasi-socialist tendencies in CIV and gold represents the theological dimensions of the encyclical. Further, Weigel argued that CIV was somewhat of a failure because it did not mention the successes of capitalism in extending average life spans by lowering global death rates. He further contended that ‘there are many more omissions of fact, questionable insinuations, and unintentional errors strewn through this encyclical. The
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staff work has been rather poor’. From an opposite political perspective, Eugene McCarraher (McCarraher) took issue with CIV claiming it was not bold enough; he commented that it was not:

'hyperbole to suggest that finding an economics rooted in abundance and friendship is the most urgent intellectual assignment facing Christians in the twenty-first century. Benedict XVI should recapture the magnificent folly of his own youthful views and galvanise the truths evoked in Caritas in Veritate into an economics of charity. If he succeeds at that, a better society of the future may someday view him as a spiritual and intellectual progenitor.'

In his comments, McCarraher argued there is little in CIV relating to perspectives, analyses and prescriptions for actions that challenge the prevailing social and economic order. When discussing what the economics of charity means, he did not engage with the ideas of EoC. A possible counterpart to McCarraher in Australia is Bruce Duncan (Duncan). He expressed his disappointment that CIV neither challenged the issue of overpopulation nor endorsed the United Nations Millennium Development Goals as a way of redressing the effects of globalisation on many countries. The Introduction to CIV and CIV 5, were not addressed.

David Nirenberg (Nirenberg) appreciated the questions about the current economic order and how CIV’s answers deserved critical attention. He did not oppose the centrality of the argument that there is a relationship between economics and love. He, however, identified the need for the logic of gift in all day-to-day economic activities. His core criticism was that the encyclical spoke in a language with concepts that did not speak to a broader non-Catholic or non-Christian audience. He considered it problematic that CIV claimed that Christ ‘is the truth’ and charity is only lived in this truth. Daniel Finn (Finn) indirectly raised the same point when he expressed frustration regarding how CIV moved from general principles on ‘the Trinity,
Christology, or Christian anthropology, to moral conclusions. All of the above however miss the significance of CIV and CIV 5.

Jennifer Morse (Morse) warned against a fragmentary response because one must read CIV ‘with a checklist of policy prescriptions: ‘I can almost promise you that the Pope will not conform to your whole list of policy preferences. If you read it this way, you will miss the larger point’. Along with Morse, Thomas Massaro (Massaro) also sought to readdress the balance against the negative assessments of CIV when he observed that those who highlighted the ‘failings’ or ‘lacunae’ in CIV for not mentioning ‘explicitly the terms “capitalism”, “socialism”, or “social sin” even a single time’ made too much of ‘these silences’. In the context of this dissertation, Massaro is correct in making this judgment because these criticisms avoid understanding what Benedict was addressing in CIV. It needs to be noted that Massaro believed that Benedict had ‘achieved an impressive analysis of our globalized economy’ His one criticism that there was an ‘aversion to the bottom-up style of social activism that finds its vitality at the grassroots’ is as at odds with the reading of CIV 5 of this dissertation. Like Hollenbach, Massaro held that the Church is an institution that has a significant role in promoting large-scale structural changes. The next step is to explore some more positive assessments of CIV.

Maura Donahue (Donahue) offered a helpful summary that framed the discussion on CIV 5 in this Section. She summarised CIV: (i) ‘as objects of this love, we can thus respond to the grace and love offered to us, by becoming ourselves subjects of love and by creating … [NoCh] … Questions of economic systems and the indirect employer will be resolved by the creation of [NoCh] … that arise out of a personal commitment to love’. This required ‘a web of relationships, [NoCh] … that begin to operate together, so that gifting can occur’, where people ‘embark on a journey toward new models for exchange’, if we desire’ to weave NoCh Further ‘Benedict
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calls the faithful to create [NoCh] … through which we pass on the Creator’s Love for us by sharing it with others. Lastly this invited an ‘experiment with cultivating networks of relationships that provide witness to the vision of the Kingdom of God and strengthen the church’ (113). Donahue adopted CIV 5 as a framework to explore alternative forms of doing business and highlights amongst others as exemplars the business experience within the framework of Economic of Communion, which is discussed later in Section 3.3.2.3 on EOC. Hers is one contribution that reads paragraph 5 in a way supportive of the line of argument in this dissertation.

Several writers have engaged with CIV to develop a deeper understanding of a chapter’s logic or a paragraph to consider how it informs or contributes to their speciality and how it may deepen the STCC. This cohort of writers has revealed aspects of CIV’s complexity and the ongoing contribution of Benedict’s ideas, which have offered fruits for future reflections. The group also contrasts with the earlier group of critics, viewing CIV as a source of creative ideas. For example, the economic aspects of the encyclical attracted attention because of the criticism of the current economic order that led to the 2008 Crisis and because Benedict proffered innovative ideas and ways to approach the current and ineffective economic ordering.

Several authors grappled with the idea of gratuitousness, particularly Benedict’s reference to the EoC when he suggested organising the economy along the gift lines. Stefano Zamagni (Zamagni) and Lorna Gold (Gold) provided a more comprehensive presentation of the concept. They recognised that CIV implied an economy where there could be quotas of gratuitousness and communion that do not ‘exclude profit, but

---

318 Ibid, 98.
319 Ibid, 113.
320 Section 1.2.2 could be longer to illustrate the depth of CIV through the wide range of commentators engaging with its ideas on the economy, gratuitousness, fraternity, reciprocity, social teachings and social justice. One example of an article not discussed here is Thomas Williams, Ever Ancient, Ever New. Caritas in Veritate and Catholic Social Doctrine, Alpha Omega 13 (1):45-66 (2010).
instead considers it a means for achieving human and social ends.\textsuperscript{323} As presented in CIV Luigino Bruni (Bruni) explored the logic of EoC in the context of the viability of the idea of gratuitousness and suggested that gratuitousness is not a revolutionary slogan; instead, it is proof of how things can proceed.\textsuperscript{324}

Adrian Pabst (Pabst) situated CIV and EoC within the economic thinking of Genovesi and introduced the link between these ideas and relationality.\textsuperscript{325} Pabst read CIV as seeking to advance practices of mutuality and reciprocity in society at all levels and referred to networks in civil society. Nevertheless, he did not engage with the ideas in CIV 5.\textsuperscript{326} Wolfgang Grassl (Grassl) analysed the economics of CIV in Trinitarian terms and identified three social agents—the market, community and state—that could serve IHD. Grassl was sympathetic to the concept of EoC in its form of gratuitousness. He welcomed CIV as innovative because it ‘presents one best way in economic reality—flooding all areas of society with ‘charity in truth’.\textsuperscript{327} Hittinger engaged with the economics of CIV and situated the debate on the associated questions in the development of the STCC since ‘Rerum Novarum’.\textsuperscript{328} He argued that the question of the common good is what animates CIV.\textsuperscript{329} Cecile Renouard (Renouard) took a different direction and drew on CIV as a call for an ‘ethical concern—the dialectic between justice and gift — within every aspect of business and economic activity … to steer the

\textsuperscript{323} CIV 46.
\textsuperscript{325} ‘Neo-Platonist metaphysics of relationality is closely correlated with the civil economy tradition of Genovesi’s civic humanism’. See Pabst, ‘The Paradoxical Nature of the Good’, 189.
\textsuperscript{326} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{329} Ibid. This observation by Hittinger addresses the understanding of the common good in the STCC which parallels Donati’s work on relational goods and the common good as a relational good (see Section 4.1)
globalization of humanity in relational terms, in terms of communion and the sharing of goods’; this led her to defend the idea of what she called ‘relational capitalism’.  

A critical theme in CIV was the insistence on the centrality of relationality. The concept appeared in Ratzinger’s treasury of thought on the human person early on in his career.  

Few commentators addressed this feature of CIV, despite its prominence in the text. A significant contribution came from David Walsh (Walsh) in his *The Priority of the Person*, where he addressed several aspects of CIV. His approach was predicated on reading CIV as an integrated part of a ‘quadtych’ composed of all Benedict’s encyclicals including *Lumen Fidei*. LF is more than a summation of the discourses on the theological virtues in the earlier encyclicals. For it offers what Walsh described as a ‘higher viewpoint’ and in this ‘completes’ the earlier encyclicals, not least because it is within ‘the relational perspective of the person.’ Walsh saw the quadtych as written to provide assistance and a guide to the new evangelisation. Walsh argued that Benedict prepared the ground for precisely this task, so that his successor, Francis could carry it forward. Walsh argued Benedict pushed forward his ‘theological personalism’ in his four encyclicals. Walsh then made what some might see as a radical claim that this is the “only viable foundation on which his successors can build.’ In other words, the theological personalism of Benedict is necessary for the Church in its approach to the world in the twenty-first century, for Benedict opened up a ‘vision of what a person-centred civilization would look like.’ In his reading of Benedict, Walsh does not enter into a debate over the way that metaphysics utilises a methodology of categories. Walsh’s imperative is to advance an understanding, one that Benedict
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most likely would agree with, that ‘each person, is prior to all else. There is nothing higher in the universe or of greater worth’.

A small group of writers also address and reached broadly similar conclusions about CIV as those reached by Walsh, though not sharing his starting point. Jeffery Nicholas (Nicholas) identified the importance to Benedict of the concept of the human person as relational. David L. Schindler (DL Schindler) discussed the idea of relationality in CIV where he insisted the human person’s first relation is with God as it is the ground of the person relationality. DL Schindler further pointed to how the ‘root meaning of the encyclical’s central category of relation as gift’. In this DL Schindler provided a reading of CIV that supports the argument that gift of self is central to the formation and mission of NoCh.

Daniel Stollenwerk (Stollenwerk) explored Benedict’s emphasis on reason in CIV in the context of his thoughts before CIV, where he concluded Benedict’s desire was for all people to be reasonable in all the spheres of academia, politics and economy. But to bring this about requires a ‘conversion—both intellectual and religious for … reason open to all questions—leads to the transcendent and ultimately to the Incarnation of God’. In her review of CIV Tracey Rowland (Rowland) placed Benedict’s idea of IHD in the context of his recognition of love as the critical element in the development of human persons and considered this as the intellectual centre of the encyclical. Finally, Giorgio Campanini (Campanini) argued ‘Benedict XVI calls believers to be actors and protagonists of authentic human development in the new scenarios of globalization’ which requires ‘a new humanism, the necessary foundation of what Benedict XVI poses as an ideal goal for humanity in the season of globalization, that is’, that is IHD. Although they were not discussing CIV as a whole, these
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contributions provided significant avenues for further reflections about Benedict’s contribution to the STCC. The following paragraph considers a group of thinkers who have viewed CIV through the transcendental and spiritual aspects rather than an economic, political or STCC perspective. Jane Adolphe (Adolphe) identified a long call for conversion at the core of CIV which is necessary if humans are to live in God’s Love through loving the neighbour. Adolphe situated the idea of NoCh as coming from animation in the human person of God’s Love and that to love in this dimension is to answer the call for universal holiness. Roberto Goizueta (Goizueta) shared this perspective when he declared that CIV is more than a social encyclical. He read CIV as ‘a spiritual treatise; … it is fundamentally a call to conversion’. Goizueta then highlighted that CIV calls people ‘to enter into a relationship with God who has a human face, Jesus Christ’. From this perspective, he argued that the STCC comes from a personal relationship with Christ, where ‘social justice is the consequence of new relationships … beginning with our new relationship with God’.

Douglas Farrow (Farrow) echoed this when he saw how CIV is ‘one long call to conversion. A “civilization of love” which requires willing participation in the divine economy open to man through the Incarnation. Moreover, where any such willing participation can come by the way only of a profound change in individuals, peoples, and nations’. Farrow identified a three step process in the relationship between CIV and Benedict’s earlier encyclicals:

‘In his first encyclical, he said the Church is the community of love that mirrors God’s own being. In his second, he noted the hope of salvation that the Church announces to the world … in his third encyclical, Benedict announces that, what the Church is, human society is meant to become … the Church [is] a sign of promise for the wholeness of humanity.’

These comments recognised CIV’s identification of the need for an integration of the social, liturgical and spiritual dimensions of the life of the faithful and to
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understand these as only different facets of faith in the person of Christ. In this regard, John Breen (Breen) indicated how:

‘the analysis goes beyond a superficial analysis of immediate causes. It goes beyond the language of practicality. It goes beyond structures and institutions and cuts to the heart of the matter, all the way down to the bedrock of the human condition—all the way down to the human person herself.’

John Milbank (Milbank) endorsed this when he argued that ‘our ethical lives are only complete in the light of the theological virtues’ and that we should be ‘insisting with a new boldness on the role of these virtues even in the social and economic fields’. In Milbank’s opinion, Benedict produced ‘the most radical and far-reaching social encyclical of the post-war period’, CIV. This radicality is not only in the social sphere but also theological.

Massaro later observed that ‘CIV concerns the depths of our relationship with God so that it can be called a ‘contribution to mystical theology’. Massaro added that CIV ‘proposes certain principles, which contribute to moral theology and social ethics. It addresses practical proposals to solve social problems of a specific historical moment, so it is a work of ‘policy analysis and advocacy’. For Massaro, ‘Benedict was eager to connect these failings to deep anthropological errors and even metaphysical misunderstandings so that progress toward a more stable and just future would depend on correcting this range of abuses’. Robert Imbelli (Imbelli) echoed this when he wrote that the Transfiguration is where ‘contemplating the beauty of the transfigured Christ makes the disciples desire that the entire world be enveloped by the transfigured light, and act boldly according to this holy desire’. Imbelli adopted the Transfiguration motif as the key to interpreting CIV when he noted that Benedict’s views on IHD were more than about material progress. Imbelli read the Conclusion to CIV to mean that declaring to live in the path of faith requires a ‘renewed commitment
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to follow Christ transfigured’. Imbelli noted that CIV 79, reiterated the theme of a relationship with God when it stated that development requires recognising the need for a life where there is a ‘spiritual fellowship in Christ, reliance upon God’s providence and mercy’. Imbelli further noted that in CIV 79, ‘“hearts of stone” are to be transformed into “hearts of flesh” (Ezek 36:26), rendering life on earth “divine” and thus more worthy of humanity’.

Taking note of these observations can point to how future reflections on CIV 5, will be shaped by Benedict’s recognition that for a person to undertake this requires a vision of how an ‘integral humanism must be incarnated in one integral spirituality in which prayer and action, truth and love, individual responsibility and justice social form an inconsistent whole’. Furthermore, Gregoire Catta (Catta) identified that ‘anthropological reflections will insist on the necessity of openness to transcendence and on Christian-framed categories such as gift and communion’, and in this way provide for a person ‘to enter more deeply into the mystery of “God for us”’. These reflections of Benedict and the degree to which he has addressed the world’s problems reveal that CIV has advanced the need for personal conversion and structural changes. Moreover, these are all significant theological contributions.

Their significance lies in the identification of CIV as a spiritual encyclical and only then as a social one. The logic of this requires that CIV 5, is also read as a spiritual call. The reading of CIV as a spiritual encyclical overcomes the concerns expressed earlier in Section 1.2 about CIV’s failure to make specific calls for action. Moreover, this perspective recognised how paragraph 5 called for shaping the social world, even if it takes various forms, to ensure a more humane character to the contemporary, cultural, social and economic spheres moving to a social ordering in which humans will flourish. However, where there is a denial that God has the power to shape the world through people who love him, then formulas for changes in social structures, in and of themselves, are insufficient, as is any reliance on institutional structures that draw their
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authority from purely human agreements and ideas seeking to effect change towards IHD.

This dissertation contends that CIV is a radical encyclical because it draws its coherence from the radicality of God’s Love and because, without it, there is no way forward, not even a radical one. With CIV understood as a spiritual encyclical, a reading of CIV 5 will reach beyond a view that saw it as merely an invitation to form a community to carry out some good work. Benedict wrote CIV with its spiritual and theological character to ensure Christians understand what they need to do if their lives are to be ‘salt of charity’. Following on from these observations, Section 1.3 works through the paragraph, and considers its contributions to the vision of CIV.

1.3. Paragraph 5 in Caritas in Veritate

Following the previous discussion in Section 1.2 about some commentaries on CIV Section 1.3 analyses the two key sentences. First, CIV 5.7 states: ‘As the objects of God’s Love, men and women become subjects of charity, they are called to make themselves instruments of grace, so as to pour forth God’s charity and to weave NoCh’. Second, CIV 5.8, states: ‘This dynamic of charity received and given is what gives rise to the Church’s social teaching, which is caritas in veritate in re sociali: the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s Love in society’. Sections 1.3.1, 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 review the literature that did or did not address CIV 5, in Section 1.2.

1.3.1. Some Reflections on Paragraph 5

A search of the academic literature, Google Scholar and other resources has revealed a dearth of references to or comments about CIV 5. Others have referenced the phrase NoCh or used it in a title for a document with no analysis. Some have only discussed possible meanings or implications or provided a straightforward
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interpretation, while others have quoted the text but offered a limited interpretation.\(^3\) Finally, some writers have mentioned it in passing, often only quoting CIV 5, in part or whole.\(^4\) Thus, an analysis of CIV 5 requires a discussion of those commentaries that have provided a more substantial engagement.

Russell Hittinger (Hittinger) touched on the sense of the ‘social’ in CIV 5, as signifying ‘the diverse modes and level of human fraternity, (friendship and communion) natural and supernatural’; however, he does not take this further.\(^5\) In a lengthy and impressive analysis of Benedict’s interpretation and adoption of PP on the development of peoples in CIV Brian Benestad (Benestad) offered an insight into CIV and its contribution to the STCC.\(^6\) Benestad summarised CIV 5, as where:


\(^5\) Hittinger, ‘Divisible Goods and Common Good’, 34.

\(^6\) Brian J. Benestad Church, State, and Society: An Introduction to Catholic Social Doctrine, (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 448 also stated that ‘they are happy to be “instruments of God’s grace, so as to pour forth God’s charity and weave’” networks of charity’
people motivated by gratuitousness and mercy are grateful for the opportunity to love and give of themselves without expecting anything in return, realizing that they have benefitted from other people’s gratuitous love, and such people are happy … ‘instruments of God’s grace, so as to pour forth God’s charity and weave [NoCh]’ (no. 5).

However, he did not reflect on what CIV 5, was seeking, probably because the analysis left little space for recognising God’s Love as the driving force for this action. Instead, Benestad equated NoCh with Catholic institutions, such as schools, charities and hospitals, arguing that Catholics love their neighbour through these entities. Benestad seemed to overlook Benedict’s concern that the weaknesses found in such institutions often derive from the lack of faith in Christ in many of the people who work in such entities.

Donati briefly referenced CIV 5, when discussing another part of CIV; he noted how Benedict observed that ‘the decisive issue is the overall moral tenor of society’. Donati developed this, highlighted that advancing and upholding the moral tenor of society required an effort to build something by coming to weave NoCh. However, he did not describe this concept further. Archer offered a more comprehensive understanding of CIV 5. She linked the call in CIV 5 to the reinvigoration of solidarity that comes from encouraging us in building (‘weaving’) NoCh. However, she cautioned that ‘weaving is slow work and the better the rug, the longer it takes. In the immediate future, it appears that we will have to live with gradualism and encourage it’. Her comment underpinned the idea that weaving is about human beings working together in a social structure that advances the changes needed. Her position recognised that the reality of gradualism in social change is a rebuttal to any who considers the STCC as the need for a radical direct action to bring about faster results.
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A further, though brief, comment on CIV 5 was presented in a doctoral dissertation on CIV by Roberto Puggioni (Puggioni).\textsuperscript{383} First, he noted ‘how Benedict XVI’s theology interprets God as the source of love. This love is then reflected among people, and people are considered instruments in building NoCh’.\textsuperscript{384} Unfortunately, in separating the elements of the sentence, he lost the logic of the sentence. The dissertation suggests Puggioni misunderstood how all people are both an object and recipient of God’s Love, which means that all people receive an invitation to recognise how they are equal subjects in that love. When one knows one is a subject of love means there can arise the possibility to cooperate in becoming an instrument of grace. The logic is that people do not become ‘instruments of grace’ without effort, not least because it requires a person to know they are recipients of this love. The knowledge of the gift of love is the knowledge coming from the experience of its reception. Only this can enable a person to become a gift of self for weaving NoCh. Further, it can be said that becoming an instrument suggests that what might come into existence is something though having the nature of a social entity is still going to be distinct from contemporary civil society.

Puggioni did not explore what NoCh might mean beyond reflecting that ‘without God’s Love we could not experience love among us … and that each time this is forgotten, there is a failure to realize charity’.\textsuperscript{385} It is not easy to know what Puggioni means by forgetting love. If love comes to a person, this is something they know and do not forget. Knowing how love comes from a giver is equal to knowing that it is a gift to accept. To accept and understand how this love is transformative is beyond forgetting.

In the same discussion, Puggioni recognised ‘if we interpret love at a social level … it means we are speaking about love as the main and principal force that leaves human beings to pursue fairness in society’.\textsuperscript{386} Puggioni did not consider the link in CIV between IHD and Christ. He recognised the link between the STCC and CIV 5, although without any development of the ideas in the paragraph other than to abstractly state that ‘charity in truth is the core principle from which grows the entire theology of Roman Catholic social teaching’ (STCC).\textsuperscript{387} He missed the link with the Shema in this equation, and he framed the STCC as only ‘a theoretical manifestation of that love’.\textsuperscript{388} He did not

\textsuperscript{384} Ibid., 90. Puggioni suggest that from this perspective, ‘the social doctrine of the RCC (Roman Catholic Church) is considered a theoretical manifestation of that love’.
\textsuperscript{385} Ibid., 89.
\textsuperscript{386} Ibid., 90.
\textsuperscript{387} Ibid.
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draw on the definition in CIV 3, where the truth in charity is a ‘gift acceptance, communion’. Instead, he used charity’s definition as ‘love, received and given’, where he understood charity in the form of ‘diaconal charity’. Puggioni’s contribution, unfortunately, adds little to understanding CIV 5. Other commentators who have referenced CIV 5, have also provided limited insights.

For instance, in the first chapter of *Catholic Social Teaching and Pope Benedict XVI*, Charles Curran (Curran) briefly mentioned CIV 5, by paraphrasing it in part and without referencing it. He emphasised one part of the sentence when he quoted that ‘we Christians who are the object of God’s Love are called to become the subjects of love and instruments of grace’. He did not refer to the call for weaving NoCh in this extract. Later, Curran offered a summary of the reference to NoCh, going no further than to say that ‘we who have received God’s Love are called to share that love with others’. He provided no commentary or analysis of what NoCh might mean or its implications for understanding CIV or the STCC.

Several papers from a Seminar, held at Australian Catholic University Sydney Campus in November 2009 on Globalisation and the Church: Reflections on ‘Caritas in Veritate’ were published in 2011. Only two papers mention CIV 5. The first contribution by Cornish did little more than extracting the text from CIV 5, adding no interpretation, nor did she place it in the context of the Introduction. Alternatively, McLaren’s contribution truncated the paragraph in his discussion on Christian anthropology. He followed this with an extract from a later part of the paragraph to suggest that NoCh means little more than ‘part of the vocation of being human is to be charitable to others and organise charity so it may be effective’. His confusion appeared to arise from a misreading of charity, where, instead of using the view of charity in CIV 3, he understood charity as referring only to that associated with ‘diaconal service’ to the poor. However, there are three thinkers whose attention to CIV 5, have
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contributed substantially to understanding this paragraph, not least in exploring the spiritual dimension.

Marcelo Sánchez Sorondo (Sorondo), at the very end of his address to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences (PASS) in 2013, quoted CIV 5, in a modified form.³⁹⁵ The substance of his contribution was in the footnote to this quotation, where he referenced CIV 5.7. He noted how ‘the notion of grace as “participation in the divine nature” comes from Saint Peter (2 Pt 1:4). Saint Leo the Great considered such participation the highest dignity of the human being (Sermo I, de Nativitate)’.³⁹⁶ In this observation, he indicated how it is possible to understand that divinisation is the ground for the transformation that Benedict believes will occur. Sorondo observed that Benedict ‘develops this decisive doctrine saying that authentic Christians are agents of a mutual flow and reflow of Christ’s grace’ when they become instruments of grace.³⁹⁷ This footnote gave a radical and Christological character to CIV 5.7.³⁹⁸

Christopher S. Collins (Collins) claimed that Benedict’s Christological vision suffused CIV.³⁹⁹ He quoted CIV 5, in a way that developed an understanding of the dynamics of CIV 5.7. He observed how persons who accept they are ‘objects of God’s Love … become, in turn, subjects of charity in our earthly relationships … and this leads to a change in them’.⁴⁰⁰ From this transformation, these people act ‘outwardly according to that love in the world for the sake of others’.⁴⁰¹ The transformation comes from being ‘drawn up into that divine dynamic of Trinitarian Love which gives and receives, which pours out without hesitation and without limit—this is the basis for a lasting and efficacious progress of peoples’.⁴⁰² It is suggested that Collins read CIV as more than a social encyclical because of how it spelt out the Trinitarian roots of a renewal of culture and society.

³⁹⁶ Ibid.
³⁹⁷ Ibid.
³⁹⁸ Leithart, ‘Ratzinger and Public Theology’, 137, footnote 2, quoting from Rowland, Benedict XVI, 20, who identified the question that is raised by Sanchez’s interpretation of CIV 5: ‘The common theme running from Newman and the Tubingen scholars through … and ultimately Ratzinger is an interest in how the human being is situated in time and in a specific cultural milieu connects to the divine’.
⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.
⁴⁰¹ Ibid.
⁴⁰² Ibid.
Turkson offered additional and insightful commentaries that complement those of Sorondo and Collins. In an address at Durham University, he offered a summary of CIV 5, without directly referencing it. He noted how the Word of God transforms people who come from a new social reality of the ecclesial community. They come forward when they are ‘resocialised in His Love … [to be] agents of a new freedom and a new way of thinking, instruments of grace and communion, spreading the Good News of God’s Love, weaving networks of love and of truth [and] builders of an earthly city which anticipates the heavenly city of God’. Turkson suggested that networks as entities conduct actions that are more than acts of diaconal charity but become agencies for a broader renewal of society. Later in the same year, he gave a paper addressing PASS in 2011. He reiterated Benedict’s view that the dynamic of charity received and given produces CIV ‘in re sociali’, rooted as it is in the truth of faith and reason. Turkson argued that even those without faith could discover natural law, with its understanding of people’s rights, and reflect on social issues. He equated the person of reason with a person of faith because in the same way as reason leads to natural law, Christians are to practice charity. He stressed it is the ‘faith experience of the ecclesial community … [that] those people responding to God’s Love in Jesus Christ are transformed, resocialized by the power of God’s word and Love’. In a footnote, he argued that the experience of a social reality promoting truth and love generates people who spread the Good News of God’s Love and weaving networks of love and of truth. Although Turkson’s argument identified that the ecclesial communities are where such NoCh are most likely to arise, there is little reason to limit the idea to ecclesial communities.

Turkson explored CIV 5, again in an article published in 2012, where he writes (considering the matter from a personal and abstract level) that ‘the human person receives God’s Love as a gift and is further endowed with a vocation to become a gift and a source of love in return’. In this, Turkson came close to the understanding he had of CIV 5, in 2011. When this paper was published, he offered a slightly different
emphasising that people emerge from a faith community who are ‘agents of a new freedom and a new way of thinking’ and who, as ‘instruments of grace and communion’, become the ones that weave NoCh.\textsuperscript{409} Thus, Turkson offered a radical reading of the critical sentence in CIV 5, although he did not resolve questions about the character of such networks. Turkson’s grasp of CIV 5.7, contrasts with the many critiques of CIV (see Section 1.2). The three thinkers discussed here understand NoCh as a radical perspective beyond diaconal charity. This is a significant perspective because various diaconal entities have ended, the religious orders that built them have declined, and the Catholic populations that sustained them have shrunk.\textsuperscript{410} Any future reading of CIV needs to begin with Sorondo’s, Collins’s and Turkson’s reflections to clarify the meaning and logic of the call in CIV 5.

The call Benedict issued in CIV 5 was one of the few he made in CIV. Benedict reiterated the call made by Paul VI for the Christian person ‘to develop and fulfil himself, for every life is a vocation’.\textsuperscript{411} This call reminds people about goodwill and to take up their ‘new responsibilities’ because the world needs ‘profound cultural renewal, a world that needs to rediscover fundamental values’.\textsuperscript{412} Benedict then reminded Christians about their responsibility to practise ‘charity, in a manner corresponding to his vocation and according to the degree of influence he wields in the pólis’.\textsuperscript{413} Practising charity requires undertaking further efforts to build ‘a more human world for all’.\textsuperscript{414} He demanded that the state ‘enact policies promoting the centrality and the integrity of the family founded on marriage between a man and a woman, the primary vital cell of society, and to assume responsibility for its economic and fiscal needs while respecting its essentially relational character’.\textsuperscript{415} He later appealed to trade unions to consider ‘wider concerns than the specific category of labour for which they were formed’ and address ‘some of the new questions arising in our society’.

Additionally, Benedict identified needs that should be met, presumably by all people of goodwill, including sustaining the commitment ‘to promote a person-based and community-oriented cultural process of world-wide integration that is open to
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transcendence’. Importantly, Benedict highlighted the need for a new trajectory of thinking ‘to better understand the ‘implications of our being one family’. Benedict’s last call was for people to pray, to raise their arms ‘towards God in prayer’. Benedict combined his earlier pleas in DCE for prayer to be part of social action with his call to pray in CIV.

Benedict told Christian people that their first responsibility is to pray before undertaking any action, to pray for their proposed action and invite people of goodwill to join in this prayer. He insisted that this was important and urged Christians to remember that prayer is necessary to draw strength from Christ even in the face of opposition from those calling for immediate action to address urgent issues. For Benedict, ‘people who pray are not wasting their time, even though the situation appears desperate and seems to call for action alone’. He insisted that prayer is not to be pushed aside and expressed concern for Christians who are secularist in their thinking and activism. The call in CIV 5, was of a different order to these calls. Nevertheless, it was central and critical for the direction of CIV because of how it ties the relationship of God’s Love for the person to the actions they undertake to express a love of the other. It is necessary to examine how this observation helps understand the relationship of CIV 5.7, with CIV 5.8, and its emphasis on actions.

1.3.2. A Reading of Paragraph 5: Logos before Ethos

In Principles of Catholic Theology, Ratzinger discussed how to create unity among people, leading to real communion. His discussion was in the context of debates with those who wished to transform Christianity into a political catalyst for unifying forces to generate social change. Ratzinger’s concern was that this was a barbarisation of a spiritual vision, in that it appeared to offer a way to a new society without a need for conversion. He argued that the opposite was required because we cannot draw close to one another without a ‘radical change in our inner thinking and being’. He then

416 Ibid., 42.
417 Ibid., 53.
418 CIV 79. DCE, 36. As if to emphasise this, Benedict (DCE, 37) repeated it, stating that ‘it is time to reaffirm the importance of prayer in the face of the activism and the growing secularism of many Christians engaged in charitable work’.
419 DCE, 36.
420 Ibid., 37.
421 Section 1.3.2 was stimulated by Tracey Rowland, Catholic Theology, (London: T&T Clark, 2017), 34–6. This comment would not have surfaced without reading her text.
422 Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 51.
stated that ‘it is only when men are united inwardly that they can be really united outwardly’. He argued that it is necessary to discern the conditions for ‘a communion that goes beyond that of the collective; a unity that reaches deep into the heart of man’. These conditions require pursuing what creates communion, to the final point where it is ‘no longer a question of doing but of being’. What does he mean by this?

Ratzinger argued that God brings communion with humanity in Christ through an invitation to convert, transform and recognise this as the basis of communion between people. The Logos, which comes before creating our being in his love, was central to Ratzinger/Benedict’s theology. Several writers have clarified this. In Catholic Theology, Rowland discussed these concepts and their interrelation when she explained that the dynamic is where ‘Logos tends to be shorthand for the ideas and intellectual logic behind something, while ethos refers to the practical embodiment of ideas in institutional or social practice’. Maximilian H. Heim (Heim) explained Logos as when ‘the very worship of God becomes the “heart of our perceptions and acceptance of the truth, which in turn means, according to Ratzinger, the precedence of Logos before this, of being before doing’. James Corkery (Corkery) noted how ‘the priority of Logos over ethos, of receiving over making, of being over doing lies at the heart and centre of Joseph Ratzinger’s theological synthesis’. Likewise, Roland Millare recognised that, for Ratzinger, the need was to place Logos before ethos.

Thus, the idea of placing Logos before ethos is understood by considering Ratzinger’s reflections on Romano Guardini’s (Guardini) call to recognise the primacy of Logos over ethos. Ratzinger noted about himself how it only became ‘clear to me only through the development of the years how fundamental this question actually is’. He further noted that ‘primacy means the meaning of Christocentrism consists in transcending oneself and … making possible an encounter with the being of God’.

---
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For Ratzinger, understanding *Logos* as reason, meaning and word helped to see it is also creative because there is intelligibility in the world:

‘The God, who is *Logos*, guarantees the intelligibility of the world, the intelligibility of our existence, the aptitude of reason to know God and the reasonableness of God … The world comes from reason, and this reason is a Person, is Love.’

Otherwise, Ratzinger argued that Christianity might become a religion with a moralism in which ‘believing’ is replaced with ‘doing’.

The structure of CIV 5 demonstrated opposition to such moralism, and the theme of *Logos* before *ethos* opens an insight into how to read CIV 5 and understand STCC. CIV 5, reflected Ratzinger’s insight when Benedict wrote that ‘Love comes down to us from the Son. It is creative love, through which we have our being; it is redemptive love, through which we are recreated’. Here, a person’s being comes from receiving redemptive love, which constitutes the person for a mission and orientates them to Christ. Christ is not an object but the Person from whom human beings receive an invitation to encounter Him. When there is acceptance on the part of the person, this encounter opens into CIV 5.7.

CIV 5.7 understood the *Logos* as when a person comes to know of God’s Love, which calls them to enter into a transformation to give themselves to be instruments of God’s grace in the world. In this, the person turns towards the *ethos* but only where it comes from the *Logos*. The proclamation of the truth of Christ’s love is not an action per se. Nevertheless, such a proclamation is more than words because it only arises when in lives give a witness that conforms to this love in the contemporary world—where these are self-giving acts in loving the other. The witness is from, through and in NoCh as a witness of love as the truth of Christ. The proclamation is the revelation of this truth in people living under the *Logos*. Without *Logos*, the *ethos* of proclamation and witness has no meaning and no effect on history. The *ethos* for STCC becomes understood as the social action of giving out this love for creating a new way of living. CIV 5.8 provides that the doing is the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s Love in the world,

---


435 CIV 5.
which is the truth that ‘gives rise to the Church’s social teaching’.\textsuperscript{436} The link is the dynamic of God’s love that brings people to weaving NoCh. From this, the self-giving of the person in the community is a witness to life in NoCh. It is a self-giving that proclaims love which creates a community of charity. Moreover, it witnesses how God’s Love has freed a person to enter into a transformation that is a charity with the power to change people because, as Benedict insisted, ‘charity’s power liberates’ in all eras in history.\textsuperscript{437}

The dynamism of charity is the \textit{Logos} of God’s Love, the truth of that love in a person’s life and what this causes the person to do. Thus, love is the \textit{Logos} that creates our being. \textit{Logos} is made visible in love, from which comes the action. Therefore, our dignity is our state of being. The human person’s dignity is proof that the person is created by, for and in love. So then, the human person only constitutes NoCh for one purpose: to love the neighbour as the other in God.

Further, this is a truth that needs to ‘be loved and demonstrated’.\textsuperscript{438} Benedict reminded his readers that ‘it is the very life, man himself living righteously that is the true worship of God; the idea is that the time in Sinai was necessary for the people to come to possess interiorly the covenant before possessing the land exteriorly, otherwise the land would have no meaning’.\textsuperscript{439} These principles apply in the operation of CIV 5.

The interiority of knowing God’s Love through accepting it as a transformation of the self in order to become a gift for God’s grace comes before the proclamation of Christ’s love in the STCC. This proclamation comes before and grounds any movement to actions for renewal because ‘without trust and love for what is true, there is no social conscience and responsibility, and social action ends up serving private interests and the logic of power, resulting in social fragmentation’.\textsuperscript{440} Being is reliant on grace. Doing comes from whatever grace gives us the power to do. Without God, there is no worthwhile social praxis, and a community of fully relational human beings cannot emerge. Only grace offers the basis for a relationality that is creative of others.

Moreover, it is only with and through this relationality people can generate communities of self-giving. Thus, the structure of CIV 5, is not a series of steps but rather an expression of our being, of who we are. A being whom a lover creates to love

\textsuperscript{436} Ibid., 7.  
\textsuperscript{437} Ibid., 5.  
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{439} Ratzinger, \textit{Spirit of the Liturgy}, 18.  
\textsuperscript{440} CIV 5.
Him and others. There is an invitation to discuss the elements of CIV 5.7, that arises from this analysis. CIV 5.7 summarised a movement of people from coming to know the Logos, who pours out His love in a proclamation of the truth that Christ’s Love is in the world to renew the world through love.

1.3.3. Caritas in Veritate: Paragraph 5.7

The Trinity is the foundation of CIV 5.7, where charity is love and grace. Moreover, the characterisation of love’s source and movement is Trinitarian and Christological in love made present through Christ. The Trinitarian character is echoed in the structure of the three segments of CIV 5.7. These elements reiterate the theological virtues of faith in God’s Love as real and transformative and that there is hope in how the transforming actions of God can open and enable a person to live charity in loving their neighbour and God. The renewal of the social order comes from those who, with others, create NoCh as communities of ‘relationships of gratuitousness, mercy and communion’.441 This structure is the foundation for analysing the three segments of CIV 5.7. Each of the three segments reflects, even if only partially, the actions of the Trinity. The first is where God is Love. Moreover, it is where Christ pours out His life in His Love as the gift and mission to and for the world and where the spirit of life is the agent of transformation. A transformation which is charity’s pattern of love, gift and relationality, echoing the Shema in its threefold form.442

CIV 5.7, proposed a movement out from God and a return to God with this pattern. Ratzinger wrote about the movement of ‘God’s free act of creation’—of human beings as exitus.443 Such a free act invites a response from the human who, as the creature, ‘existing in its own right, comes home to itself, and this act is an answer in freedom to God’s Love’.444 The answer to the hope for God’s Love comes because humans were created for a return to God in the moment of reditus.445 As Andrew Kaethler (Kaethler) stated, the person is made complete during this return because ‘we are made to be a unity—we are loveable’, and through this, the person comes to love

441 Ibid., 6.
442 This tripartite structure echoes the Shema in its tripartite form: ‘the Lord is our God and the Lord is One—In Oneness is Love’; ‘you must love the Lord your God’; ‘with all your heart, all your soul, and all your mind’. Mt 22:37–39.
443 Ratzinger, Spirit of the Liturgy, 33.
444 Ibid., 32–3.
self. From self-love, the person can then love the other.\textsuperscript{446} When God’s Love transforms a person into a life open to the other, the subject moves in an action of love towards God, a movement within the horizon of God’s Love. This is a movement for the generation of NoCh as the gift of this movement through the three segments of CIV 5.7.

1.3.3.1. Men and women as subjects of charity

In this first segment, the human person, as the object of God’s Love, enters a relationship with God as a subject, or rather, the person understands that they are in a relationship already present because they are ‘imago Dei’. The person realises what this means for their life by understanding themselves as objects and subjects of God’s Love. God invites us to respond to a relationship by pouring out love because He ‘loved us first’; thus, love can blossom as a response within the person.\textsuperscript{447} Benedict noted in DCE that ‘man cannot live by oblative, descending love alone. He cannot always give; he must also receive. Anyone who wishes to give love must also receive love as a gift’.\textsuperscript{448} When love is received, it is ‘through the power that is most basically that of the giver [and] becomes effective in the gift’.\textsuperscript{449} Love reveals its objective nature by recognising that God’s created being is the object of love, and that each person’s creation is from and in a continuing action of love. From this, the human person is a being whose basis is love.\textsuperscript{450} A person comes to be a person who is ‘in being’ because of love; love affirms their existence.\textsuperscript{451}

Further, the Love of God is not passive but is ‘re-creative’ because it is redemptive in bringing people back to this love when they turn away from it or reject it in falling away from God. Nevertheless, the Love of God has a more profound effect on the person because, as CIV 5 it is not only creative but is redemptive in how it recreates the person.\textsuperscript{452} Further, it is a redemptive love in creating the human person into one who

\textsuperscript{446} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{447} DCE, 17.
\textsuperscript{448} Ibid., 34. See also Ibid., 7.
\textsuperscript{450} Roland Millare, ‘‘The Wedding Feast of the Lamb Has Begun: The Relationship Between Eschatology and the Liturgy in the Logocentric Theology of Joseph Ratzinger’ (PhD diss. University of St Mary of the Lake, 2018). See Section 1.3 of this dissertation.
\textsuperscript{451} ‘Love is the affirmation of one’s existence. There are two sides to this coin. First, the lover delights in the very being of the beloved and not simply in her attributes. This is the ecstatic outward movement that is directed to the other and for the sake of the other. Here the lover is blind to his own needs or wants, and this brings us back to creation’. Kaethler, I Become a Thousand Men and yet Remain Myself, 151.
\textsuperscript{452} CIV 5.
‘rather than being absorbed by the other, in giving itself … becomes fully itself’.\textsuperscript{453} Accepting creation from God in his offer of Love means that the subject realises that they are a subject of this love and receive an invitation to enter a dialogue with it.\textsuperscript{454} The person’s response is to accept that their creation is a ‘command to love’.\textsuperscript{455} A person comes to be a subject of charity because they are the one whom God freely chooses to follow Him.\textsuperscript{456} It is through his Love, He opens the lives of people to receive it.\textsuperscript{457} However, a person’s fundamental stance needs to be ‘receptive of this love, for it is only this that lays the ground for participation in God’s way of loving’.\textsuperscript{458} Participation informs and shapes a person to act.

As a human person comes to know they are an object of God’s Love, this Love becomes a force that ‘urges’ them to act and live through and in charity—\textit{Caritas urget nos} (2 Cor 5:14). Everything changes when a person comes to know the reality of being an object of God’s Love. There is now a path towards love that opens in a new horizon.\textsuperscript{459} To enter this horizon is to love God in loving the neighbour, whether friends or enemies.\textsuperscript{460} Moreover, love opens a person to respond as a self-realising subject of love and become an instrument of grace.\textsuperscript{461} This comes from ‘the love which God lavishes upon us and which we, in turn, must share with others’.\textsuperscript{462} Love for the other witnesses a giving of God’s Love as it is received. The act of pouring out love is only possible because the human person is a relational being who exercises their relationality grounded in God’s image. To receive and accept the gift of God’s Love in freedom is to

\textsuperscript{453} Ratzinger, \textit{Spirit of the Liturgy}, 32–3, quoted in Peter John McGregor, ‘Joseph Ratzinger’s Understanding of Freedom’, \textit{Radical Orthodoxy: Theology, Philosophy, Politics} 2, no. 3 (December 2014): 335–78, 377. ‘The creature accepts its creation from God as an offer of love and thus enters into a dialogue of love, with the new kind of unity that is the unique creation of love. Rather than being absorbed by the other, in giving itself the creature becomes fully itself’.


\textsuperscript{457} It is the ‘truth of the love of God for us, lived and proclaimed’. Benedict XVI, ‘Message for Lent 2013’. The Holy See. 15 October 2012. https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/messages/lent/documents/hf_ben-.

\textsuperscript{458} To become a ‘participant in God’s way of loving’. DeLorenzo, \textit{Work of Love}, 136–37.

\textsuperscript{459} DCE, 17.

\textsuperscript{460} This note draws on the reading of the Sermon on the Mount discussed in Section 1.1 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{461} CIV 78.

\textsuperscript{462} Ibid., 5.
transform oneself into cooperating with it, and to love the other is to invite them to accept the gift and enter into the same love that God also has for them.

Accepting the gift of love brings the person to themselves, where, as Ratzinger argued, the human person ‘comes in the most profound sense to himself, not through what he does, but through what he accepts’. \(^{463}\) Love, as a gift, is received and not made by the person alone; others need to be involved. \(^{464}\) Benedict argued that God’s Love is not abstract but deeply personal, even passionate, while also forgiving. \(^{465}\) His Love grants the human person the ability and power to act in this world because it is creative and re-creative. When love is a creative gift, a person receives an invitation to go beyond what they believe is their limit. Love is redemptive in how it invites a person to become more than they think they are and to be more in actions of love.

These arguments suggest that actions of love occur when a person witnesses how, from God’s Love for them, they can overcome their limitations and equally challenge those limits imposed by the cultural, social and economic world. The freedom to go beyond these limits comes from accepting the person’s re-creation of themself into someone who acts in love. This acceptance opens a dialogue of love with others. \(^{466}\)

This dialogue of love reveals Christ when his Love pours into a person. \(^{467}\) Benedict identified that such a response leads to their ‘real and intimate participation in the divine nature of the Word’. \(^{468}\) ‘An encounter with the living Christ, who is the source of holiness’ comes with this participation. \(^{469}\) However, there is a mystery in how people do not consider themselves a subject of God’s Love with the capacity to encounter Christ. After all, when a person loves God, it is because they have ‘a capacity … [for such love] as a constitutive element of our rational being’. \(^{470}\) This capacity awakens when there is the understanding that God’s Love constitutes human beings in their nature and limitations. It is revealed in the freedom to love or the refusal to love, which
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enters into the reality of who a person is and what they should do. Moreover, a refusal denies the meaning of themselves and the purpose of their lives.

God ‘speaks’ and a person ‘hears’ His voice, leading the person to reflect on their life’s purpose in their concrete context, which encompasses their suffering and difficulties, joys and pleasures and fears and hopes. Communities shape these experiences to hinder or open a person to hear and reflect on the Holy Spirit’s movement within themselves. However, there is no easy formula to capture how a human person becomes ready to act for God. Acting for God in love always occurs in a moment of history; it is always a concrete point in a person’s life and their social world. Everyone has a history, as does every community. In these histories, God comes to meet the person in their context and community. With this meeting, the history of all who are in that communal world comes together, and the history of the journey they have together opens into a new history. Further, because this is a history of God’s actions in the world, it is where the person enters into the relational world that they have been partially constituted in and that they have in return partially constituted. The truth of this is only known where and when they are with others and not alone.

Benedict’s observation that a person never believes alone means that they come to know Christ’s Love only with others. Through and with others, there is the awareness of the experience of this love within each human being. The pattern of the movement of the gift of love as grace is communal. This movement is communal from when receiving the gift and where there is the gift of self. The movement of grace is the history that shapes, conditions, and constitutes a person. However, there are differences in how grace affects people. It varies from person to person and community to community, partly because grace is mediated through people and communities and because it shapes those people’s and communities’ histories in their particular suffering. Thus, grace is specific to the events and history of the people receiving it; the consequence is specific to their sufferings.

Further, in suffering, a person either closes themselves off against grace or opens themselves to it, in order to love the other because they see God’s powerful Love. Suffering is a person’s key to knowing their history in the light of this Love and how they come to find a way out of the restrictions imposed by suffering to become open to

---

471 This is inspired by the dramatic words at the start of Gaudium et Spes, which are often talked of as signalling some sort of break from the Church’s past, rather than understanding it as confirming that God’s actions are always in the world through His Church and His People as followers of Christ.
the other. When a person suggests they have no suffering, they do not believe or know they are loved for who they are. People who are suffering come to know and believe they are loved only within a community. In a community, people learn to understand hope as the answer to suffering.\textsuperscript{472} Moreover, when God meets people in their suffering, he answers it with His Love.\textsuperscript{473} Without this knowledge or experience of being an object of love, the call in CIV 5.7, has little meaning.

This analysis of the experience of being loved by another raises the question of ‘being’. The relational aspect of being is the vehicle, as it were, carrying a person to the knowledge of being a person who is loved. To know this love is an existential experience because knowing love is not an intellectual exercise. However, the person cannot act without this knowledge of being loved; with it, a person can act. Ratzinger understood that when the recipient recognises the relational aspect of being loved and how they are subjects of this love, [cháris/grace], they become free to act. For Ratzinger, this knowledge becomes real in the action of creating and re-creating love because it leads the person to cooperate in becoming an instrument of grace.

\textbf{1.3.3.2. Transformation into instruments of grace}

The reality of God’s action of Love is transformative; it is \textit{metanoia} because it ‘affects one’s entire existence … and requires far more than just a single, or repeated act of thinking, feeling or willing’.\textsuperscript{474} Reflecting on this, Ratzinger noted how a ‘transformation, which … takes place throughout their life … [is] primarily a journey

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{472} ‘To suffer with the other and for others; to suffer for the sake of truth and justice; to suffer out of love and in order to become a person who truly loves—these are fundamental elements of humanity … it was the Christian faith that had the particular merit of bringing forth within man a new and deeper capacity for these kinds of suffering that are decisive for his humanity’. SpS, 39.
\item \textsuperscript{473} The lives of the saints demonstrate this point.
\item \textsuperscript{474} This Section only provides a brief note on transformation. The key text is Ratzinger, \textit{Principles of Catholic Theology}, 55–67. Two other texts have illustrated the depth of the literature on transformation. First, on transformation in a monastic setting, see Piccardo, \textit{Living Wisdom}. Second, an ecumenical and theological perspective, see Oliver Davies, \textit{Theology of Transformation, Faith, Freedom and the Christian Act}, (Oxford: OUP, 2013). For a different perspective, see Bernard Lonergan, \textit{Method in Theology}, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972), who argued that conversion means the self-transcendence of the person in the religious, moral, intellectual and psychic levels.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of purification, of suffering’. A transformation is a conversion into Christ and leads to giving themselves through their relationality. This transformation leads to an ongoing dialogue between God as the Lover and the human person as the beloved through Christ. A dialogue is a ‘communication with Christ … [and] a communication with all who belong to him’. Christ is a dialogue of Love as a gift that overwhelms the human person towards a ‘grace actioned’ impulse to pass love to the other. This action comes through giving themselves over into the ‘whole Christ’.

Ratzinger argues that Christ calls all people into a journey of transformation, which is a passage into a dynamic new life. Through this transformation, the person enters history with ‘a new horizon and a decisive direction’. This is an entry into a new history that overcomes but does not deny their earlier history. Now, their history is no longer a limitation on what occurs with Christ or on what happens when serving the other because knowing the Love of Christ is equally love for the other. The limitations are removed because the person becomes the ‘image and instrument of the love which flows from Christ’. In this transformation, the person begins to enjoy a ‘lived inward experience’.

---


476 ‘If I have become inwardly broad, open and large; if I have received the other through my co-believing and co-loving so that I am no longer alone, but my whole essence is characterised by this’. Joseph Ratzinger, The Holy Spirit and the Church, Images of Hope, Meditations on Major Feasts, trans. by John Rock and Graham Harrison. (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2006), 71.


478 ‘The totus Christus, as Augustine beautifully puts it’. Imbelli, Rekindling Christic Imagination, xxvi.

479 ‘He involves us all in this transformation, drawing us into the transforming power of his love to the point that, in our being with him, our life becomes a “passage”, a transformation … he simply gives to us [what] must then be transformed within us into the dynamic of a new life’. Benedict, ‘Mass of the Lord’s Supper’.

480 DCE, 1.

481 Ibid., 33.

482 This insight comes from Benedict reflecting on how the ‘I’ is the inward nature of the person that leads to outward actions: see Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 52–4. This recalls the study of Edith Stein’s phenomenology in Antonio Calcagno, Lived Experience from the Inside Out: Social and Political Philosophy of Edith Stein, (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2014).
As Ratzinger noted, the person ‘bears the stamp of a community that provides him with a pattern of thinking, feeling and acting’. Thus a lived experience of transformation can occur even when a person lives within the structures of their social life and the world around them. Sometimes the experience and reflections, though lived inwardly, are not always lived or communicated outwardly. Because no one receives God alone, no one enters or passes through a transformation separate and apart from others. This experience belongs to the person and is understood by them through an inward contemplation in its fullness (if it is ever really understood before death). This inward experience, which can never be entirely spoken about fully or with complete clarity, receives some form of expression in a community. In a community, the sociality of the experience lived outwardly with faith can be a genuine indication of the acceptance of the transformation. However, to live the change is to live in the structures of the social world that the transformed person inhabits, which frames and shapes the outward expression of their experience.

The transformation challenges what it means to live out God’s Love because there is no clear road map for what comes from accepting and cooperating with the gift of transformation. The gift is the dynamic of love that creates people who are a gift for the other. It is the gift of an ‘interior bond, a configuration to Christ … who came not to be served but to serve’. In this union, the ‘configuration to Christ is the precondition and the basis for all renewal’. The transformation that Benedict called for comes from experiencing the Christ of the incarnation and resurrection. The transformation should bring a person to fully enter into life by giving themselves when they are ‘struck and opened up by Christ’. Christ calls us into the transformation, so our lives become a passage into a dynamic new experience.
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484 On people coming together: ‘They come outwardly to one another only if they came to one another inwardly’. Ratzinger, *Images of Hope*, 71.
485 ‘I cannot construct my own personal faith in a private dialogue with Jesus. If faith does not live in this ‘We’, it does not live at all’. Ratzinger, *Christianity and the Crisis of Cultures*, 114–15.
487 DCE, 10
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This encounter with Christ challenges those who ‘build a wall around’ themselves to escape meeting the other and, in effect, to deny their relationality. This comes from the understanding for Benedict that ‘the liberation of man consists in his being freed from himself and, in relinquishing himself, truly finding himself’. This liberation is a philosophy of freedom and love where people go out of themselves in their transformation. Ratzinger argued that the transformation creates freedom for the human person to find themselves ‘emerging from the confinement of the ego’. Moreover, in emerging from their ego, they can find their good.

A person’s good lies, as Benedict put it, in ‘adherence to God’s plan for him, in order to realize it fully: in this plan, he finds his truth, and through adherence to this truth he becomes free’. The ‘good’ is the good of loving oneself in this transformation. This new experience enables the person to reorientate their lives differently because they become an instrument of God for God to pour out love in their life, and not an instrument for their own plans or desires. The person becomes open to God’s Love as the energy that transforms communities and even nations. Their life becomes one where they are now an image of love and an instrument of love flowing from Christ. When a person cooperates with this new way of living, their life responds to the ‘call to holiness’. The person’s response then blossoms into a path of and towards holiness. Such a response comes from ‘an encounter with the living Christ, who is the source of holiness’. The giving of self from receiving Christ’s loving and entering into the
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499 ‘The Council’s chosen sketch of holiness … is both communal and individual … incarnated through each person’s relationship with the Divine and lived out in charitable service to one’s neighbour’s’. Timothy W O’Brien, “‘If You Wish to be Perfect’: Change and Continuity in Vatican II’s Call to Holiness’, *Heythrop Journal* 55, no. 2 (2014): 286–96, 287.

500 ‘A proper way to think about love, a love that is the fullest blossoming of the human precisely because it is Christian’. D. C Schindler, ‘The Redemption of Eros: Philosophical Reflections on Benedict XVI’s First Encyclical’, *Communio: International Catholic Review* 33, Fall 2006, 375–39, 396. See also DCE, 17: ‘since he has “loved us first”, love can also blossom as a response within us’.

transformation raises the question, ‘is the promise of love so great that it justifies the gift of myself?’ because such a gift becomes a source of real suffering.\footnote{SpS, 39.}

Benedict found the answers in the great certitude of hope, held firm by the indestructible power of love. Only this kind of hope gives the courage to act and to persevere in action.\footnote{Ibid., 35.} Such hope enables people to become givers of love to others. The logic of the gift is the dynamic of love creating us into a gift for the other. It is a hope held firm by the indestructible power of love, where only this kind of hope gives the courage to act and persevere.\footnote{Ibid.} This hope enables a person to give this love to others. In this way, the reality of love allows the person to accept the transformation and the logic it implies for their future.\footnote{Benedict, ‘First Vespers’.}

To enter into this mode is to become a force of renewal because ‘only if we ourselves become new does the world become new’.\footnote{Ibid.} CIV 5 provided a call to become new people to renew the world’s needs—a people transformed into ‘newness’ by love. The pouring out of charity and creating networks arises from God’s providence coming as a gift. However, an instrument does not direct the flow of grace or the outcome but is only a co-operator, a co-worker with God. Cooperation shapes this new pattern of existence through a lifetime of a relationship with God.

1.3.3.3. ‘To pour forth charity and weave/create networks of charity’

Benedict addressed those who know what the Love of God means for them and how it creates a new reality. In doing this, he identified how God’s Love and a person’s response to it will generate a new order for the world at this time. When they come to know this new reality, a new horizon will open. Knowledge of this horizon fundamentally orientates the person to the source because they come to know the nature and extent of the gift.\footnote{Ibid.} Such knowing is ‘biblical’ in how a person in love knows they are a loving lover, and they hope there will be a love of them in return; only then can one knows they are loved.\footnote{Ibid.}

\footnotetext[502]{Is the other person important enough to warrant my becoming, on his account, a person who suffers?}
\footnotetext[503]{Ibid., 35.}
\footnotetext[504]{Ibid.}
\footnotetext[505]{Benedict, ‘First Vespers’.
\footnotetext[506]{Ibid.}
\footnotetext[507]{‘All our knowledge, even the most simple, is always a minor miracle, since it can never be fully explained by the material instruments that we apply to it. 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’}. CIV 77.
\footnotetext[508]{Ibid.}
Although God is always the Lover, human persons are often blind to his love. However, such blindness is not always culpable. Blindness sometimes comes from not being able to ‘see’ how limited the horizon of one’s life is because they have no belief God is Love or Loves them. It is, one might say, a practical form of atheism. Further, even with the faintest recognition of God’s Love, the person often believes they cannot respond. Benedict’s answer to this was that God is the one who ‘makes us see and experience his love’, and since he has ‘loved us first love can blossom in us’. Therefore, those who accept this love are responsible for helping those who do not see or experience this love through becoming an instrument of grace. However, what does this mean?

Benedict gave the Christian person the responsibility to live out their vocation as an ‘instrument of grace’ and undertake the mission to ‘pour forth God’s charity’. This means beginning to construct a world through weaving NoCh. Benedict grounded this in the principle that charity as the truth of the Love of Christ is necessary for the success of liberation in history, human development and social wellbeing. There is a liberation that comes from communities of charity as centres of human life in which there is a demonstration of love as ‘the praxis of love in the world’. Thus, the dynamic of charity is the basis of IHD. A dynamic that affirms transcendence is essential for all human beings for their IHD. In this, NoCh have a divine origin, although their praxis is the work of human beings. Within NoCh, there are relationships ‘of friendship, solidarity, and reciprocity’. These relationships are active within and without, before and after, and apart from any economic activity. The relationships arise in all spheres of human action.

In conclusion, CIV 5.7 becomes an extended meditation on how and when the human person becomes the centre of knowing themselves as an object of immense and unlimited love. Knowing this generates a person who is also a subject and free to give themselves. As a subject, the person becomes someone who desires to give back what little they have, no matter how limited. As the subject responds in returning this love in a vertical movement, in an upwards direction towards God, there comes a turning point

---

509 DCE, 17.
510 Ibid.
511 See also DCE, 1.
512 CIV 5.
514 CIV 36.
within themselves, and they return to the same horizontal plane of those who are around them.

Benedict sets out the tasks in the horizontal plane in two steps. First, it is to make oneself an instrument of grace (i.e., to want it, pray for it and act with it). Second, through active engagement with the gift of love, to give one’s life to the other in whatever degree of fullness is possible. What follows is that the other, as a recipient, learns the mercy of God for themselves. They witness it in the vertical/horizontal turning point, which arrives in social structures for an ‘opening of grace into the world’. These are NoCh. However, an associated question is: what does Benedict intend when using the Italian word ‘rete’, which translates into English as ‘networks’?

1.3.4. ‘Networks’: A Meaning for ‘Rete’

A preliminary understanding of NoCh reads network as a concrete call to the Christian faithful to create social realities, although the nature of these realities is unclear. To address this requires an analysis of the words used. In particular the word used in the Latin text: ‘Ad Dei amorem destinati, homines caritatis obiectum sunt facti, qui ipsi vocantur ut instrumenta fiant gratiae, ut Dei caritatem effundant iique caritatis retia texant,’ is retia.\(^{515}\) This translated into English reads as ‘net’, a fishing net or ‘comb’, as in a honeycomb with its complex structure. A suggested translation from Latin of CIV 5.7, is: ‘Destined to the Love of God, men have been made the object (bearers?) of charity, who themselves are called to pour forth the charity of God and weave nets of charity’. This translation alters the meaning of the relationship between the person and their transformation. as a vessel of God’s Love. Further, the translation uses ‘object’ but does not give any other meaning than the idea that there is something or someone towards which God directs their attention. In this sense, it suggests God’s action in loving the human person.

\(^{515}\) CIV, 5.7. One translation of the word ‘retia’ is better translated as a ‘net’, with the text reading ‘weaving a net of charity’. Although the textual issue is not critical, the metaphor of a net includes the idea of catching/protecting, and a net is made up of knots that are linked. A network consists of nodes linked to many other nodes across which there is a communication, and where a node is a point at which a message passes through but is not an entity by itself; cf. a virtual world based on a computer-based network. I sought the assistance of colleagues and others with foreign language expertise to provide the translations from Latin, German, French and Italian versions of CIV.
The English translation of the Italian word ‘rete’ is a ‘network’; however, what might this mean? The contemporary meaning of a network describes a series of connections between separate points or nodes, where there is no social body at the nodes. Thus, a social network only has a social aspect insofar as it is a part of the social order, but it is not a social body. Examples include a telephone network or the internet, which electronically facilitates activity, connecting various points or nodes. The Italian ‘reti’ is the plural of rete. Misunderstandings can occur because ‘rete’ as an adjective is used, for example, in rete telematica, which translates as ‘the internet’. When used as a noun, ‘rete’ is any system of strings and knots. This usage suggests that figuratively, ‘rete’ may refer to human relationships in general.

The outcome may be clearer when CIV is translated into a language other than English. English equivalents of the German, Italian, French and Latin translations for ‘rete’ produce different wording, with implications and questions regarding their meanings for the sentence and the sub-phrase. For example, an English translation of NoCh in the German version of CIV ‘Als Empfänger der Liebe Gottes sind die Menschen eingesetzt, Träger der Nächstenliebe zu sein, und dazu berufen, selbst Werkzeuge der Gnade zu werden, um die Liebe Gottes zu verbreiten und Netze der Nächstenliebe zu knüpfen’ reads as ‘to weave nets of brotherly love’. The word ‘brotherly’ emphasises the relationality inherent in a body. Conversely, ‘networks’ reduces the idea of relationality to communication, to a flow or a process. The next step

516 ‘Rete, noun: grid - a set of vertical and horizontal lines drawn on a map; goal - in football, rugby, hockey etc the act of kicking, hitting etc a ball between the goalposts; the point gained by doing this activity; net - (any of various devices for catching creatures, e.g., fish, or for any of a number of other purposes, consisting of) a loose open material made of knotted string, thread, wire etc; netting - material made in the form of a net; network - anything in the form of a net, i.e., with many lines crossing each other.


518 See footnote 504 above.

520 A colleague provided this translation of the German version of CIV 5.7. ‘Men (Mankind) are set up as recipients of the love of God, to be bearers of brotherly love and, with that, themselves to become tools of grace, in order to spread the love of God and to weave nets of brotherly love’.

61
Benedict’s use of the word ‘network’ to seek further clarification on his use of term in CIV 5.7.

Benedict used the word ‘network’ several times in CIV when referring to social entities. For example, ‘traditional networks of solidarity have more and more obstacles to overcome’.521 He later talked of ‘a network of economic institutions’.522 From this, he moved to define social capital as a ‘network of relationships of trust, dependability, and respect for rules’.523 Going on he defined social capital as a ‘wider network of relations within which it [the market economy] operates’.524 Ratzinger also used work’. It occurred in his 1986 Lenten homilies when he referred to a ‘network of relationships’.525 Here, he described a set of relationships that may have a connection at some point with other people without involving close relationships. A further example of this type of use of the phrase ‘networks of things’ is in The Yes of Jesus Christ.526 Another example was in the article: ‘Communio: A Program’.527 Here, ‘network’ was used when he criticised an ecclesiology that viewed the Church as only a connection of local churches, or as he expresses it: ‘the Church appears as a network of groups, which as such precede the whole and achieve harmony with one another by building a consensus’.528

Benedict used the word ‘network’ frequently, including in 2005 in his homily at The Cathedral of the Most Holy Saviour and of Saints John the Baptist and John the Evangelist in the Lateran, the day after his election to the papacy.529 He discussed the role and position of the Pope as a bishop among bishops. He described bishops as a ‘chorus of witnesses’ that ‘is endowed with a clearly defined structure: the successors

521 CIV 25
522 Ibid., 27
523 Ibid., 32. See also Benedict XVI, ‘Message for the 45th World Communications Day: Truth, Proclamation and Authenticity of Life in the Digital Age’. The Holy See. 5 June 2011. http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/messages/communications/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20110124_45th-world-communications-day.html. The ‘dynamic inherent in the social networks demonstrates that a person is always involved in what he or she communicates. When people exchange information, they are already sharing themselves, their view of the world, their hopes, their ideals … Invite Christians, confidently and with an informed and responsible creativity, to join the network of relationships which the digital era has made possible. This is not simply to satisfy the desire to be present, but because this network is an integral part of human life’.
524 CIV 35.
525 Ratzinger, In the Beginning, 73–4.
526 Ratzinger, Yes of Jesus Christ, 6.
528 Ibid., 442.
of the Apostles, the Bishops, who are publicly responsible for ensuring that the network of these witnesses survives … [and in which] the successor of Peter has a special task’.530 He then stated that the Church ‘is none other than that network—the Eucharistic community’.531 These uses of the word ‘network’ reflect a more communitarian perspective because they emphasise a communal character rather than merely the interconnectivity between individual nodes, the basis of a network, such as a telephone system or the internet. On other occasions when Benedict used the word ‘network’, the context was different.

In 2006, he talked about a ‘network of Eucharistic communities that embraces the earth, the whole world—a network of communities that constitutes Jesus’ “Kingdom of peace”, which extends from sea to sea, to the ends of the earth’.532 Here, the Church is composed of Eucharistic communities linked in such a way that they are a kingdom. Later, in July 2006, Benedict used the word ‘network’ as a series of connecting points for supporting people in need of help, in which ‘parishes play an important role, as do the various ecclesial associations … as networks of support’.533 The context validated the use on this occasion. A year later, in an address to the clergy of the Dioceses of Belluno-Feltre and Treviso, he highlighted the need to promote ‘communion in the journey [of faith and] … the presence of a network of families that help one another’.534 This is read as a gentle push for communities to be at the centre of the parish because he recognised that the parish is not and cannot be an undifferentiated community.

In 2007, Benedict issued ‘Sacramentum Caritatis’, in which he observed how ‘Christianity, from its very beginning, has meant fellowship, a network of relationships constantly strengthened by hearing God’s word and sharing in the Eucharist, and enlivened by the Holy Spirit’.535 The phrase here is much closer to the concept as it occurs in the concept of NoCh because it suggests deeper interconnections between

530 Ibid. See also Ratzinger, Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith, 89—note his description of the ‘institution of the “apostolic succession” ’ as a ‘great network’. Recognising the Apostolic Succession is the core of the institutional structure of the Church, this usage of the word network is at odds with this understanding.

531 Benedict, ‘Mass of Possession’.


535 Benedict, ‘Sacramentum Caritatis’, 76.
believers. There is in this the idea of a connection with a ‘social weight’ and a substance in relationships sharing a particular character—fellowship. A corresponding usage was connected to the idea of communion. The first usage gave fellowship the connotation of communion when he used the phrase ‘outside of this great network’, referring to how within that context, each Eucharistic celebration of a community stands ‘within the one and the whole body’.

A further example is when Benedict suggested ‘we now have to work our way farther into the network of relationships’, referring to the relationship between the Eucharist as the worship of God and mission. In Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith he connected the idea of a network to the concept of communion when he discussed ‘the network of service and ministry, the coexistence of unity and multiplicity, which is already suggested in the term “communion”’. However, a thinner use of the term arose when he talked about a ‘whole network of problems’. The various times in using different meanings of the word network (alongside the difficulties of translating texts from one language to another) suggest that a full clarification may never be possible. However, the above analysis has provided the basis for concluding that Benedict understands relationships as expressing the meaning of network in CIV 5. Accordingly, the reading of CIV 5.7, is where NoCh expresses relationships based on a common grounding in sharing a sense of a joint mission. This conclusion can be reached because Benedict does not consider the Church a ‘network of groups’. The logic points to NoCh as social realities which can emerge when persons are grounded in the love of the other.

1.3.5. A Preliminary Conclusion

The textual approach used above, though limited, supports the argument that the action ‘to weave’ is the action of creating social realities, whether within or outside an ecclesial context. However, it is necessary to qualify that these are not every day social realities because their purpose comes from the ‘driver’ that leads to the creation of NoCh

536 Ratzinger, Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith, 132.
537 Ibid., 173. See also Lumen Fidei, 40. ‘The sacraments communicate an incarnate memory, linked to the times and places of our lives, linked to all our senses; in them the whole person is engaged as a member of a living subject and part of a network of communitarian relationships.’
538 A question arises about the nature of the ‘nets’ cast by the Apostles as fishers of men. The argument in the dissertation considers the answer lies in recognising how all evangelisation is announcing a relationship of love and building this relationship in the Church. The ‘casting of nets’ is the invitation to enter into a new relationship with God and necessarily a new relationship with other human beings.
being ‘networks’ constituted by ‘gift, acceptance and communion’. This dissertation argues that the networks in CIV 5 exhibit a Trinitarian character that emerges when people accept how God Loves them. Further, with this, the Trinitarian truth emerges.

The Trinitarian truth is at the centre of the key sentences in CIV 5. Further, the truth is a relationship with God in his love—to love God in return calls for an engagement and dialogue with Christ. The love and dialogue both orientate and constitute the subject of love outwards towards the other. The subject of love is the human person who comes to themselves in the logic of love. The person receives an urge to create what is necessary to live out this logic in new realities of love with and for the other. Heim noted how Benedict identified a need for the human person to meet their responsibility in their life to answer the call that God makes to them. As Benedict put it in opening CIV ‘all people feel the interior impulse to love authentically: love and truth never abandon them completely, because these are the vocation planted by God in the heart and mind of every human person’. The call in CIV 5, is a task for people to fulfil in the world. The mission is to live and act with a sincere love of neighbour. A mission that requires one to live not in the world that has to pass or in a world they choose for themselves as if creating a future from their desires, but instead to live and to love within the contemporary global society’s difficulties.

By extension of this personal logic of love and vocation, CIV 5.7 calls for the formation of social realities (communities) whose origins lie in God’s Love, manifested in the Holy Spirit. In his 1998 address, Ratzinger described how during each age of the Church, social realities have emerged from a founder’s charism. By experiencing the gift of the Holy Spirit, these were founders who knew how they were objects of God’s Love and aimed to discover how to live that love in the circumstances and difficulties of their world. Further, the communities they created became ones where God’s Love was active in that broader world and was a creative force for the renewal of human culture.

CIV 5.7 follows these steps and provides a path for people who, with the experience of God’s Love, aim to become personal instruments of this Love, from which

539 CIV 3.
542 CIV 1.
543 ‘I must think of the fact that God has a task of mind for me in the world and will ask me afterwards what I have done with my life’. Ratzinger, *To Look on Christ*, 100–1.
545 See further discussion in Section 2.2.
there emerge NoCh in the order of social reality. When NoCh are social realities, their character is shaped and determined by the nature of those humans who generate social realities in their concrete context. This raises a question as to who and what is the human person. The Council posed the same question as to the focus of the ‘*Gaudium et Spes*’ when it declared that the human person ‘deserves to be preserved; human society deserves to be renewed. Hence the focal point of our total presentation will be man himself’. Part 2 of this dissertation examines the theological, metaphysical/philosophical and sociological foundations for understanding the human person as a relational being, the author of social realities and a co-operator with God’s Love.

---

546 ‘Gaudium et Spes’, 3.
Part 2. The relationality of the Person

The human person is at the centre of STCC and thus also CIV. In CIV 5 Benedict provided a task for Christians to take up their vocation as human beings, who with other human beings understand the need for NoCh and work to build NoCh. Nevertheless, what is the nature of the person called to undertake this work of generating NoCh? It is suggested that understanding the person as a monadic individual or a mere element in a crowd undermines the idea of community and thus the argument for creating NoCh. Further, such an understanding denies that individuals can be sources of social renewal. Although CIV 5 is grounded in the human as a relational being who builds communities, this aspect of Benedict’s thinking is rarely appreciated. Part 2 addresses this deficit by explaining the human person’s relational nature as the author of changes in the social world and NoCh. In CIV Benedict called for ‘faith, theology, metaphysics and science to come together in a collaborative effort in the service of humanity’. This effort should be based on a ‘metaphysical understanding of the relations between persons … [that is a] great benefit for their development’. Part 2 examines an approach to understanding the person in three dimensions: theology, metaphysics/philosophy and relational sociology.

As Section 1.3 noted, the human person is at the centre of CIV 5.7, as someone who realises and accepts themselves as a ‘subject of love’ and makes themselves an instrument to generate social realities that reveal this love to, for and in the world. In turn, knowing the gift of love, the human person also knows the call to give this love to the other through a gift of their life. Such gifts create social order because just like the gift of God’s Love constitutes the human person, people in their making of themselves to become the gift that constitutes the other. Therefore, through their mutual interaction, both create NoCh. By using the word ‘create’, Ratzinger highlighted how the network arises and how it continues. The social order connects to the Trinity through the human person whose grounding is in Trinitarian relationality. Why does the dissertation go in this direction?

547 CIV, 31.
548 Ibid.
549 Ibid.
550 Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, 267. See also CIV 8: ‘It is the primordial truth of God’s love, grace bestowed upon us, that opens our lives to gift’.
551 Ibid, 68.
Firstly, CIV and the STCC are fundamentally about Christian people being ‘socially and politically responsible’ for God’s creation of the human person and the world.552 Secondly, these actions are what God uses to transform the world across all its dimensions, from the natural ecology to human ecology, with the human person at the centre. To ask a question about the person, who is the author of social realities, is to ask in what sense a person is truly human. Benedict argued that ‘human beings are relational, and they possess their lives—themselves—only by way of relationship … [so] to be truly a human being means to be related in love, to be of and for’.553 Benedict’s theological understanding of the human person’s relational nature opened into the metaphysical and sociological explication of the person. The theological articulation of the human person as relational extends to the ‘we’, though not beyond. The metaphysical understanding of the person sees the person as an author and influencer of social orders. Thus, the human person is a relational being who, but only with others, creates and shapes social realities These different categories: theological, metaphysical and sociological are discussed in Part 2.554

Section 2.1 discusses Benedict and his explication of the human person as a relational being, grounded in Trinitarian love who can, with others, form a ‘we’. Section 2.2 introduces Clarke’s metaphysical/philosophical ideas regarding the person as the one who has the capacity in their relationality to generate social realities drawing on their person and being.555 Section 2.3 outlines specific ideas from relational sociology that recognise human persons as relational subjects who are the causal agent in the social world, whether for progress or regress. Together Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 identify the human person as the generative source and maintainer of NoCh.

2.1. God and Person

Understanding the human person as a relational being was a central feature of Ratzinger’s reflections from his early days as a theologian, with many references to his

552 Ratzinger, God and the World, 449
553 Ratzinger, In the Beginning, 72.
554 CIV 53.
555 Clarke, Person and Being.
writings, speeches and homilies. In his memoirs, Ratzinger observed how he became open to the philosophy of personalism and against Thomism, which Ratzinger considered ‘too closed in on itself’. This sympathy for personalism arose from his desire to ‘listen to the voices of man today’. Ratzinger’s early engagement with Buber’s ideas left a spiritual mark on him and enabled him to enter into the horizon ‘of the metaphysics of dialogue’. The encounter was ‘a spiritual experience’, not least because it reminded him of Saint Augustine and what he said about the human person. When considered in the context of Ratzinger’s concern with the ‘impersonality’ of the Thomistic way of thinking, this comment about Augustine illuminates the insight into the weakness of the Boethian concept of the human person. Boethius’s definition of person is ‘as naturae rationalis individua substantia’ (the individual substance of a rational nature). This understanding follows Aristotle in relegating relationality to an understanding of relationality as an accidental aspect or a lesser quality of the human person.

A theological perspective on the human person focuses on the spiritual transformation of human beings who come to know their vocation in a community of

556 Without access to material in German that might indicate otherwise, it would appear Ratzinger’s texts on the relational nature of the human person have the following chronology: ‘The Dignity of the Human Person: Introductory Article’; Introduction to Christianity, published in 1968; "Zum Personenversthdnis in der Theologie," from Joseph Ratzinger, Dogma und Verkiindigung (Munich: Erich Wewel Verlag, 1973), 205-223; Joseph Ratzinger, Concerning the Notion of person in theology, Communio 17, (Fall, 1990, 439-454. Thereafter, there have been no significant works on this matter other than references to the idea of human beings as relational beings in the speeches, addresses and messages of Benedict, including CIV in 2009.
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560 Ibid. Here Collins refers to Ratzinger, Milestones, 108 where he talks of Augustine’s Confessions.

faith that reveals God’s Love. They become new people through their transformation into instruments of grace.

Chapter 5 of CIV opened with the claim that ‘one of the deepest forms of poverty is isolation’. Benedict recognised the experience of isolation suffered extensively by people, many of whom he saw were in a vast desert of isolation. Moreover, he argued from this inner poverty comes the external deserts of hunger and thirst, of abandonment, which make poverty materialise. Ratzinger held that isolation derives from a lack of love, which is the source of people’s wretchedness. These remarks introduced his reflections on the human being’s relationality as the framework for identifying how communities of faith and charity are what authentic IHD requires. A discussion on IHD arising from the relational nature of the person is discussed in Part 4. The following sections in 2.1 take the discussion on the theological aspect of relationality forward. Section 2.1.1 explores relationality in CIV. Sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 examine Ratzinger’s thoughts on the Trinity as the basis for an ontology of the human person. Following this, Section 2.1.4 discusses relationality and sin, Section 2.1.5 explores the human person as imago Dei and Sections 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 examine how this informs a person’s dignity.

2.1.1. Relationality in Caritas in Veritate

In the early paragraphs of Chapter 5 of CIV Benedict stated the need for a metaphysical understanding of the human person. He insisted that the person’s character is essential and social structures should not absorb the person and equally insisted that

562 ‘Christianity must not be relegated to the world of myth and emotion but respected for its claim to shed light on the truth about man, to be able to transform men and women spiritually, and thus to enable them to carry out their vocation in history’. Benedict XVI, Address to the Participants in the First European Meeting of University Lecturers, Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007, http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2007/june/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070623_european-univ.pdf.
563 Benedict, Homily, Solemnity 2009. The two decisive words of this verse are “transformed” and “renewal”. We must become new people, transformed into a new mode of existence. Only if there are new people will there also be a new world, a renewed and better world. In the beginning is the renewal of the human being. This subsequently applies to every individual. Only if we ourselves become new does the world become new…”.
564 CIV 53
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566 Benedict, ‘Imposition of the Pallium’.
568 ‘The root of man’s wretchedness is loneliness, the absence of love—is the fact that my existence is not embraced by a love that makes it necessary’. Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 52.
569 D. C. Schindler, in his ‘Enriching the Good: Toward the Development of a Relational Anthropology’, Communio: International Catholic Review 37, no. 4 (Winter 2010): 643–59. Schindler uses the same words as the starting point for a discussion about the common good (see Part 4 of this dissertation).
relations are of ‘fundamental importance’ because the human person is ‘defined through interpersonal relations’. 571 A person’s worth comes from placing themselves in ‘relation with others and with God’. 572 Nevertheless, the person’s relation and community is still of ‘one totality to another’. 573 However, in SpS, Benedict argued that ‘our lives are involved with one another’. 574 Thus, the reality of communal life is how it constitutes the person as a person, even when this is fragmentary, weak and distortive. 575 Ratzinger’s emphasis on relationality was a recognition that human beings become transparent when they enter into creative and supportive relations. 576 He knew the reality of a close relational world and how this prevented isolation. 577

Benedict argued that the closure ‘into oneself and closing off from God’s love’ causes isolation. 578 Such a double closure creates an alienation from God and, thus, from others. Alienation arises when there is ‘too much trust … in merely human projects, ideologies and false utopias’. 579 Only when there is the perspective of eternal life is there the possibility of a person coming to the fullness of their embodied relationality. This fullness of relationality can provide the basis for human progress through loving the other in a community. For Benedict, Christianity has provided a different answer to a person’s alienation; he highlighted how progress towards actual development relies on relationality grounded in love. 580
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575 ‘In many pre-modern, traditional societies it is through his or her membership in a variety of social groups that the individual identifies himself or herself and is identified by others. I am brother, cousin and grandson, member of this household, that village, this tribe: These are not characteristics that belong to human beings accidentally, to be stripped away in order to discover “the real me”. They are part of my substance, defining partially at least and sometimes wholly my obligations and my duties. Individuals inherit a particular space within an interlocking set of social relationships; lacking that space, they are nobody, or at best a stranger, or an outcast. To know oneself as such a social person is however not to occupy a static and fixed position. It is to find oneself placed at a certain point on a journey with a set of goals; to move through life is to make progress—or to fail to make progress—toward a given end’. Alasdair C. Macintyre, After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory, 2nd ed., (London: Duckworth, 1985), 33–4.
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578 CIV 53. Ratzinger knew from the 1970s of the threat to humans of loneliness and isolation leading to poverty and of how the Church could answer this loneliness, even as a ‘little flock of believers’, who can be discovered by men, and who, living in a ‘totally planned world, will find themselves unspeakably lonely’. Ratzinger, Faith and Future, 105.
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580 ‘Without the perspective of eternal life, human progress in this world is denied breathing-space. Enclosed within history, it runs the risk of being reduced to the mere accumulation of wealth’. CIV 11.
For Christians, the human race is a unity, beyond the biological and apart from cultural differences, and is the basis for the human family to reach its fullness. This unity is grounded in the ‘metaphysical interpretation of the “humanum” in which relationality is an essential element’. Benedict adopted Paul VI’s call in PP for a new way of thinking, observing that such a new trajectory of thinking involves a ‘critical evaluation of the category of relation’. Benedict stressed that to conduct this evaluation required both metaphysics and theology if there is to be a fuller understanding of people’s transcendent dignity.

This evaluation challenged the modern view of the human person as mere materiality. Instead, for Benedict, a human creature is ‘a spiritual being’in their interpersonal relations. The human person is not an entity with an ‘individualistic and utilitarian nature’. With this, Benedict laid the groundwork for his continuing reflections on relationality, where the centre of growth in maturity and sense of worth of a human person lies in living ‘more authentically … these relations … with others and God’.

Benedict recognised the centrality of relations for human life and authentic development lay in ‘inclusion-in-relations’ of people which echoes the absolute unity of ‘the three divine Persons [who] are pure relationality’. Analogically, Trinitarian relationality helps to understand how people’s relationships lead to an openness to the other. Openness is not a denial of identity; instead, people reach a fuller openness of their humanity through mutual interpenetration. Further, without relationships, a person ‘would destroy himself’, because the ‘basic structure of his being … reflects God’. The openness, which bases itself on mutual giving, is a source of growth and conversion with no loss of individuality. Benedict referenced the life of Saint John Henry Newman to illustrate this point. Benedict noted how Newman’s life was one long ‘process of conversion; he “transforms” himself often, and in this way remains always himself while

\[581\] Ibid., 55.
\[582\] Ibid., 53.
\[583\] Ibid.
\[584\] Ibid.
\[585\] Ibid., 42.
\[586\] Ibid.
\[587\] Ibid.
\[588\] Ibid., 54. See also Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, 187.
\[589\] Ratzinger, God and the World, 111.
becoming ever more himself’. Benedict reinforced this with the observation that relationality in a spousal relationship is analogical to truth and spirit. Understanding the person from this perspective recalls Ratzinger’s earlier writings on the theological origins of the development of the idea of the Trinity as the basis of the human person as a relational being.

2.1.2. Trinity and Relationality

In Introduction to Christianity, Ratzinger sketched an understanding of the Trinity as the relationality between three divine Persons, and he drew from this to understand the human person as a being with a relational nature. He highlighted the struggle of the early Church and the patristic fathers to grasp the nature of the God of Scripture and what God is and of who Christ was. According to Ratzinger, the early Church, coming from its biblical roots, chose the God of the philosophers over the various gods across the ancient world. God is understood to be the one who ‘speaks to man and to whom one can pray … moving him from the academic realms and thus profoundly transforming him’. In trying to grasp the nature of Christ as God, the early Church fathers turned to Greek concepts. This developed over several councils in the early Church. Ratzinger drew on this background to develop his idea of the person.

Ratzinger based his explanation of the human person in understanding the nature of the relationships between God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit as the Trinity through conceptualising a notion of the person. He observed that the ‘fathers of the Church drew on the Greek word prosopon (which captures the idea of

591 ‘This also emerges from the common human experiences of love and truth. Just as the sacramental love of spouses unites them spiritually in “one flesh” (Gen 2:24; Mt 19:5; Eph 5:31) and makes out of the two a real and relational unity, so in an analogous way truth unites spirits and causes them to think in unison, attracting them as a unity to itself’. CIV 54.
592 Ratzinger, ‘Dignity of the Human Person’.
593 Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, 162–90.
594 Ibid., 143.
595 Ibid., 118–20.
596 ‘The early Church and patristic fathers, drawing on biblical faith and their Eucharistic centred communities, engaged with Greek thought to answer the questions “What is God” and “Who is Jesus Christ”. The doctrine of the Trinity emerged from a struggle … helping clarify the answers expressed in the formulations on Christology at the Council of Chalcedon’. Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 439-441.
597 Ibid.
“outward facing”). Protophraph means the "role" which was recognised in the mask of the actor. The word mask ('prosopeion') defined the dramatic role in Greek theatrical performances, behind which is the actor, who is not witnessed to avoid his face displacing the role. This word, though insignificant in itself, gained a new meaning. From this, there came an opening for the Fathers of the Church to begin grasping the nature of the Trinity. The equivalent of proton in Latin is 'persona' ('sounding through'). The use of this word led the Fathers to think of God as 'relatedness, communicability, as fruitfulness'. With this, there came an understanding that led to a formulation whereby God is one in substance, with three divine Persons (the Father, Son and Holy Spirit) who exist entirely in a relation of love to and with the other people; each is fully constituting and constituted in pure relationality of and with the other. This confirmed the earlier understanding of God as una essentia tres personae (one being in three persons).

Ratzinger argued the debates among the Fathers of the Church provided the background to the emergence of the concept of the person. As Ratzinger put it: ‘the only way that the concept and idea of person dawned on the human mind is in the struggle over the Christian image of God and the interpretation of the figure of Jesus of Nazareth’. The idea of the ‘person’ is an outcome of Christian theologians debating about who Christ is. Further, this idea of the person is the idea of dialogue grounded in God as the dialogical being. In such a dialogical being, ‘person means relation’ because the relation is not ‘added’ in God but is the person—a person only exists as

598 Ibid, 441.
599 Ibid., 439–42. A word taken from ancient Greek theatre. Mask in Greek is ‘prosopeion’.
600 Christopher S. Collins, ‘Joseph Ratzinger’s Theology of the Word: The Dialogical Structure of His Thought’. PhD thesis, Boston College, 2012, 116. Collins suggested the patristic theologians viewed Christian faith as the playing out of a literal drama at salvation; therefore, showing the link with Greek theatre was not remote.
601 Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, 180.
602 Ibid., 179–80.
603 See Joseph W. Koterski, Boethius and the Theological Origins of the Concept of Person, American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly 78, no. 2 (2004): 203–24. This article introduces the background of this complex and fascinating debate. However, its focus is the definition of a person as an individual by Boethius, showing how it is counterintuitive to the relational nature of the human person.
604 Ratzinger, Concerning the Notion 440. See also John D. Zizioulas, Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church, (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2004), 5–40. Zizioulas noted that the idea of person in 'tres personae' was known since Tertullian’s time; however, it lacked an ontological content, which, by itself, posed the danger of the heresy of Sabellianism, suggesting that God was manifested in three ‘roles’.
605 Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 451.
606 Ibid., 439.
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relation and is the ‘pure relativity of being turned toward the other’. Section 2.1.3 explores how Ratzinger presented his views about human personhood.

2.1.3. Ontology of the Person

Ratzinger did not consider the human person a singular or monadic entity unconnected to others, where relations with others have the character of arbitrariness. Collins recognised how this provided Ratzinger with the perspective to explore and appropriate the patristic sources in his development of the relationality of the Trinity and human personhood. Ratzinger examined how the term ‘relatio’ became significant for understanding how God is dialogue, differentiation and speech, and where there is a reciprocal exchange of His Word and Love. Ratzinger held that ‘the dialogue, the relatio, stands beside the substance as an equally primordial form of being’. For Ratzinger, this revealed how in God, the ‘person is the pure relation of being related … Relationships is not something added as it is with us; it only exists at all as relatedness’. With this, the Christian existence is radically confirmed as relatedness because Christ is living in the open as a being ‘from’ and ‘toward’. Thus, we are called to be like the Son. Collins argued that Ratzinger demonstrated ‘the Trinitarian shape of the relations that provides the foundation for authentic human relations’; and that through this, Christ is ‘the ‘integrating space’ in which the ‘we’ of humans gathers itself towards the ‘you’ of God’. From this, Ratzinger offered a theological argument about the nature of the human person.

Ratzinger argued that ‘the idea of person expresses in its origin the idea of dialogue and the idea of God as the dialogical being’. The person is a being who ‘lives in the word and consist of the words as “I” and “You” and “We”. In the light of this knowledge of God, the true nature of humanity became clear in their [the patristics] new way’. The human person is the event or being of ‘relativity’, and to be ‘truly a human being means to be related in love, to be of and for’. Thus, in an event of relativity, the
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more the person is ‘relativity’ when aiming directly and totally towards their final goal—transcendence—the more the person is themself.619 This is because, in Christ, ‘who is completely with God, human existence is not cancelled, but comes to its highest possibility, which consists in transcending itself into the absolute and integration of its own relativity into the absoluteness of divine love’.620 Ratzinger argued that the dynamism inherent in humans comes from Christ because he is the arrow directing where a person belongs and must go.621 The human person is called to become like Christ, to enter into a relationship with Christ because ‘relating to God is at the heart of what it is to be a person, not an annihilation of the person’.622

Using this Christological sense of the human being, Ratzinger emphasised that Christianity is more than a dialogical principle of an ‘I–thou’ relationship. Christianity is the ‘we’ into which love, namely the Holy Spirit, gathers people and simultaneously binds one to the other, directing them towards a common ‘you’ of the Father.623 Ratzinger demonstrated how the call to be Christological is in three directions: ‘as a promise of eternal community with God, as a promise of the new communication of man with one another in Christ, and finally as a reference to Christ’s community with us’.624 The glory of humans entering into a partnership with God is where they are ‘called to enter into a community of love, created to see and to love him’.625 A community is created through the activity of seeing and experiencing God’s Love. Further, humans in relationships with others deny their relationality in their actions that are sins when there is an absence of the love that any relationship needs to survive and grow.

2.1.4. Relationality and Sin as Dis-Relationality

Ratzinger understood that there are threats to the idea of the human person’s ontological nature as a relational being. This view extends back to how he thought about the first sin. In a ‘General Audience’ on 6 February 2013, Benedict observed that ‘being

619 Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 452.
620 Ibid.
621 Ibid.
622 Ibid.
623 Ibid., 453.
624 Ratzinger, ‘Dignity of the Human Person’ 142. Adrian Pabst, Metaphysics: The Creation of Hierarchy, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2012), 251 considered this relationality in three dimensions: ‘horizontally’, in that all beings share a ‘common being’; ‘vertically’, in that there is an ‘asymmetrical relationality of created being to God upon which the horizontal relation depends’; and ‘absolutely’, in that at the origin there is ‘absolutely symmetric relationality between the Trinitarian persons’.
human is a relationship: I am myself only in the “you” and through the “you”, in the relationship of love with the “you” of God and the “you” of others.\(^{626}\) He then warned that ‘this relationality can be destroyed, undermined or closed off for an individual, such as one who is in the deepest isolation from the other’.\(^{627}\) Therefore, ‘to be truly a human being means to be related in love, to be of and for. Conversely, sin means the upset or the destruction of the relation’.\(^{628}\) Therefore, the person’s relationality is open to destruction and death because sin is the source of destruction and death.\(^{629}\)

The destructiveness of the ‘original sin’ is rooted in the ‘dis-relational’ actions of Adam and Eve. In a quotation from The Catechism of the Catholic Church, Benedict noted that sin occurred when a person ‘chose himself over and against God, against the requirements of his creaturely status and therefore against his own good’.\(^{630}\) Where a person chooses themselves over God, they do so against others with whom they have a relationship because the logic of spoiling the relationship between God and humans is that the ‘other relational poles are also jeopardized or destroyed’.\(^{631}\) This is because we are relational beings for whom sin ruins relationships. From the Fall, Benedict argued that the structures of human relationships are in disorder because the penalty for the original disordering is that ‘every human being comes into a world marked by a relational distortion, as the initial sin tarnishes and wounds human nature’.\(^{632}\) In four sermons Ratzinger gave in 1981, he addressed this topic when he entered into a discourse regarding the connection between relationality and sin and the damage it
causes, including death - ‘sin means the damaging or the destruction of relationality’.

For Benedict, death is understood through the prism of relationality. Death is a wall that ‘prevents us from seeing beyond it’.

Benedict offered his insights into sin and death as the destruction of the human person’s relationality as a way to engage with the debate on structural evil. In CIV Benedict noted how ‘the Church’s wisdom has always pointed to the presence of original sin in social conditions and in the structure of society’. Such evil occurs when social structures directly urge people to commit evil actions, but more so when the structures shape the cultural world such that dis-relationality is the consequence, if not the object, of the schemes of thinking, advertising, entertainment or propaganda. This concern regarding the evil in structures is not a basis for rejecting the idea that people reshape these structures, even if this only comes through creating new structures drawing inspiration from NoCh. However, Benedict’s response was different from those who discussed the need to destroy oppressive social structures, even though history shows such actions can lead to something different in practice.

Benedict argued that the destruction of social structures does not result in new structures that destroy sin. The destruction of social structures only causes new ones to emerge in which the human person is still the author and maintainer and where sin does

---

633 Ratzinger, *In the Beginning*, 71–3. In a Lenten Homily entitled Sin and Salvation, published in ‘In the Beginning’ 59—77, Benedict observed how: ‘Sin is a rejection of relationality because it wants to make the human being a god. Sin is loss of relationship, disturbance of relationship, and therefore it is not restricted to the individual. When I destroy a relationship, then this event—sin—touches the other person involved in the relationship. Consequently, sin is always an offense that touches others, that alters the world and damages it. To the extent that this is true, when the network of human relationships is damaged from the very beginning, then every human being enters into a world that is marked by relational damage. At the very moment that a person begins human existence, which is a good, he or she is confronted by a sin-damaged world. Each of us enters into a situation in which relationality has been hurt. Consequently, each person is, from the very start, damaged in relationships and does not engage in them as he or she ought. Sin pursues the human being, and he or she capitulates to it.’


635 CIV 34.

636 Not all sinful structures direct or pressure persons into evil actions, despite personal intentions. Often, the structure is more of a hindrance or obstacle to efforts to avoid sin or it fails to address needs by simply ignoring them. The causes may be historic, cultural or defensive on the part of those within the structures.


638 See Section 1.2 of this dissertation, which briefly explores the reactions of Johan Verstraeten, David Hollenbach and Lisa Sowle Cahill on this point.
not disappear.\textsuperscript{639} The new structures do not generate a ‘new man’ free of sin because ‘structures, whether they are good or bad, are the result of man’s actions and so are consequences more than causes’.\textsuperscript{640} Therefore, new structures cannot guarantee that the human person will be free of sin.

Ratzinger argued that people need to be both free and responsible for their freedom to bring about changes in social structures. CIV 5.7 revealed that this means people are converted by accepting the grace of God’s Love ‘to live and act as new creatures in the love of neighbour’.\textsuperscript{641} Arguably, history is on Ratzinger’s side in this argument.\textsuperscript{642} This debate, though necessary, is not a task for this dissertation. However, it is necessary to understand the outlines of this debate because Benedict’s analysis has provided a background for the radicality of CIV 5.7. At the heart of CIV 5.7 is relationality under God’s Love as the creative source of the new person who acts in cooperation with this love to renew society.\textsuperscript{643} Nevertheless, there is always the challenge of dis-relationality.

Dis-relationality is present in every human relationship and all social structures, communities and associations, despite the efforts to overcome it. If NoCh are to emerge and serve the other then, as dis-relationality is always present, it always needs to be overcome. Sometimes, dis-relationality is a refusal to enter into the promise of God’s Love; other times, it occurs when the struggle to sustain NoCh, despite difficulties and persecution, is abandoned and a person walks away from Christ, or when the NoCh are used for a private interest, whether self-aggrandisement or in meeting personal desires.\textsuperscript{644} Thus, to not enter into the offer of God’s Love, which CIV 5.7, identified as God’s action, may lead a person to deny their relationality; this is the dis-relationality of sinning against God’s Love. The rejection of God’s Love undermines the person’s

\textsuperscript{639} The ‘New Testament revelation teaches us that sin is the greatest evil, since it strikes man in the heart of his personality. The first liberation, to which all others must make reference, is that from sin’. CDF, ‘Instruction on Certain Aspects’, IV, 12.

\textsuperscript{640} Ibid., IV, 15.

\textsuperscript{641} CIV 5.7.

\textsuperscript{642} During the twentieth century, there were massive social experiments that led to the extensive destruction of people and all their related ecologies, whether social or natural. Three examples can help illustrate this: the development and use of nuclear weapons and their use in WW2 as the consequence of a utilitarian outlook; the ideologically driven experiments in trying to create new social, economic and ecological structures in the Soviet Union from 1917 onwards; and the Holocaust as the logic of the consequence of Hitler’s drive for ideological racial purity.

\textsuperscript{644} ‘The acute need for radical reforms of the structures which conceal poverty, and which are themselves forms of violence, should not let us lose sight of the fact that the source of injustice is in the hearts of men. Therefore, it is only by making an appeal to the “moral potential” of the person and to the constant need for interior conversion, that social change will be brought about which will be truly in the service of man’. CDF, ‘Instruction on Certain Aspects’, XI, 8.

\textsuperscript{644} For example, sexual abuse of other people in the community.
relationality, which is the way to an openness to God’s love and the transformation it offers, and further denies the source of the turn necessary to lead to the generation of NoCh.

In theological terms, arguably generating NoCh is more than generating social realities through the person as a relational being. The acts of generation are in response to God’s Love. For that reason, Section 2.1.5 discusses the idea of imago Dei. In conclusion, at the centre of the turn to generate NoCh lies a response to God’s Love coming from understanding that the human being is imago Dei because this is how a person understands that the other is as they are and as God is. At the heart of the idea of imago Dei is the understanding that all have equality before God. This equality is radical because it overcomes every difference, making it the proper basis for loving the other as radically as God Loves all people. Thus, people are equal because they share the one thing that cannot be altered or taken away—all are like God and made in God’s image. Although Ratzinger considered the human person ontologically a relational being understood in Trinitarian terms, he did not discuss what it means for the human person to be imago Dei.645

2.1.5. The Human Person as Imago Dei

This Section addresses the question what it means for the human person to be ‘imago Dei’. Ratzinger understood the human person as a relational being who is ‘a being on the way’ and argued that the more a person’s relativity aims at transcendence, the ‘more the person is itself’.646 Both these aspects of the person suggest that the idea of the person as imago Dei is not present in the person in a passive way. Instead, imago Dei is to be considered an active principle that reflects the reality that God acts, and further, that God acts through persons who are like God as imago Dei. Anything that reverses or undermines this response, such as a drive to enter a ‘non-relational mode of passivity’, leads to an attack on human dignity—an attack that disfigures or covers the imago Dei and is a ‘sin’ against it.647 Conversely, the argument is that insofar as God Loves the person unconditionally, the person ‘transforms’ into an image of God, enabling the human person to love as imago Dei.
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645 See Section 2.1.3 of this dissertation.
646 Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 452.
647 ‘Man, who is created in God’s likeness, falls in his God forsakenness into the “zone of dissimilarity”—into a remoteness from God, in which he no longer reflects him, and so has become dissimilar not only to God, but to himself, to what being human truly is’. Benedict, ‘World of Culture’.
The dissertation proposes imago Dei is the mark or sign of the relational dimension people share with God as God’s created gift. This is a gift from God which constitutes the human person as a creature of God. Nevertheless, as God’s created gift, the human person is the creator of the social realities through which the gift from God is given back to God in the acts of loving the other. In this dialogue of love, the likeness of God reveals itself as the second person of the Trinity—Christ. The revelation of Christ is the image of the one who loves all.\textsuperscript{648}

Ratzinger was clear in his argument that it is because Christ is ‘the image of God in its dynamic aspect, man is the image of God to the extent in which he directs himself to God; man disfigures his likeness to God by turning away from God’.\textsuperscript{649} When Ratzinger argued that humans are relational beings, he was providing more than a description.\textsuperscript{650} Rather it is what humans seek and receive is a relationship with God: ‘When we say that man is the image of God, it means that he is a being designed for relationship; it means that, in and through all his relationships, he seeks that relation which is the ground of his existence’.\textsuperscript{651} What is that relation, and what do we receive from it?

To answer this, Ratzinger described how in ‘this context, covenant would be the response to man’s imaging of God; it would show us who we are and who God is’.\textsuperscript{652} Christ is the starting point for grasping the nature of the human person’s greatness as God’s image; as the ‘second Adam, from whom alone the picture of man can be

\textsuperscript{648} ‘For he first he loved us, and by the example of love that he sets before us, he has become a seal by which we are moulded to his image’. Baldwin of Canterbury, Treatise Tract. 6: PL 204, 451-453, in Vol. 3 of The Divine Office: Daily Prayer for Weeks 6–34 of the Church Year. English translation approved by the Hierarchies of Australia, England and Wales, Ireland. (London: Collins, 2006), 393-395, 394.

\textsuperscript{649} Ratzinger, ‘Dignity of the Human Person’, 121.

\textsuperscript{650} ‘God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them’ (Gen 1:27) … both man and woman are human beings to an equal degree, both are created in God’s image. This image and likeness of God, which is essential for the human being, is passed on by the man and woman, as spouses and parents, to their descendants’. ‘Apostolic Letter: Mulieris Dignitatem’. On the Dignity and Vocation of Women on the Occasion of the Marian Year’. The Holy See. 15 August 1988. http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1988/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_19880815_mulieris-dignitatem.html, 6.

\textsuperscript{651} Joseph Ratzinger, Many Religions, One Covenant, Israel, the Church and the World, trans. Graham Harrison. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999), 76–7.

\textsuperscript{652} Ibid.
correctly developed’. In the Christian vision of humans, it is not sufficient that the human is a relational being, where the ‘we’ is added to the ‘I’ and the ‘you’. Instead, the circle of human solidarity needs to be open to a third who is wholly other—God’, because this is where the ‘We’ occurs.

Ratzinger emphasised how Christianity does not promote a dialogical principle limited to an ‘I–thou’ relationship. Instead, for Ratzinger, the human person, the ‘I’, is integrated into the greater ‘we’, because the Trinity is the ‘we’ of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; therefore, the fruit of this ‘we’ is in how it becomes the path to new and profound socialisation of all human beings. This is a path wherein the ‘we’ is an active social force that directs the need ‘to transform unjust structures and to restore respect for the dignity of all men and women, created in God’s image and likeness’. In this way, Ratzinger, drawing on ‘Gaudium et Spes’, linked the idea of the human as the image of God integrally to the concept of the dignity of the human person. In light of this link between imago Dei and the dignity of the human person, Section 2.1.6 discusses Ratzinger’s reflections regarding the concept of human dignity.

2.1.6. Dignity of the Human Person

Clarke argues there are three roots to human dignity. The first is the person as an image of God. The second root of ‘each human person is ordered, as to his final end to direct personal union with God himself’. The third root for Clarke lies not in ‘obeying the commandments of God … but precisely by freely exercising providence over his own life’. The logic of these from within a relational framework is that the
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653 Joseph Ratzinger, ‘Dignity of the Human Person’, 120. See further ‘In fact, one of the great accomplishments of theology in the decades leading up to the Second Vatican Council was its concern to show that Catholic doctrine was not simply an elaborate impersonal “system” of truths, but rather a call to the fulfilment of the authentic dignity of the human person, because Christ, the second Adam, is the long-awaited manifestation of what it means to be truly human, the definitive revelation to man of his own human nature: “it is only in the mystery of the Word that the mystery of man truly becomes clear.” [Gaudium et Spes, 22]. Joseph Ratzinger, Deus locutus est nobis in Filio: Some Reflections on Subjectivity, Christology and the Church. Meeting with the Doctrinal Commissions of North America and Oceania, Menlo Park, California, 9 February 1999. https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/incontri/rc_con_cfaith_19990209_california-ratzinger_en.html, (accessed July 26, 2021).
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dignity of the human is the dignity of the person who is a relational being, where the dignity is in the relational. This is because the person is relational in two ways. First, they are relational to the source of all life, expressed as the Trinitarian relational activity of love as argued in this Chapter. Second, they are relational to the presence of one person and vice versa to the other person. Therefore, when the self is in a relationship with the other, the other constitutes them even as they are co-constituted in return, whether or not the outcome is to the same extent. To deny or try to destroy the other’s dignity means to set them apart from others, denying them the possibility to be in a relational world. Discrimination is the denial of another’s dignity arising from breaking the relational bond with another. This places them outside the other and attempts to put the other beyond the pale—effectively outlawing them. To be an outlaw is to be more than not under the law; it is to be excluded and cut off from the relational ties that might protect, support or enable one to live practically and spiritually. Where Law is a way of social ordering, it ensures that people can experience fullness in their relationality in peace and without harm. Nevertheless, the difficulties of building a contemporary relational society only exist because there is a crisis concerning what it means to be a human person at the roots of the effort to build such a society. This crisis exists because human beings are not perceived as God’s image, and it is a crisis of the meaning of the human person and the communities they constitute.

The resolution of this crisis lies in recognising how dignity and imago Dei shape the person and constitute an outward flowing activity from the person. However,
dignity is not passive as in the case of only wearing a coat on a cold day—it is intrinsic and continuously in operation. One might think otherwise because English speaks of ‘having’ dignity, causing dignity to become property, which, once owned, needs little done with it. Instead, it is suggested that imago Dei is the reality of who we are. We are not an imitation of the Trinity, though the human person comes to their fullness as a created being through the participation in the Trinitarian relational ongoing movement of love between the divine persons.

Moreover, this participation only occurs in communal form. Millare quoted Ratzinger to the same effect. Ratzinger considered imago Dei an image of the activity, of an ever-deepening, ever-loving and ever-communicating relationship. That is what human beings are. Even natural death cannot end the relational ground of a person’s being. Instead, death ends the human’s capacity to enter, as a relational being, into a relationship with other human beings where such relationships create and maintain earthly social structures. The passage into death is, in faith and hope, into a relationship with the Trinity. The logic of the relationality of a human person is that all human beings can enter into a relationship.

Further, it includes those who may not exercise their abilities to enter fully into a relationship with another, though the possibility of a relationship remains. This is because every relationship is an exercise of a person’s dignity, even where it is fragmentary in its expression. There is always the possibility to be in a relationship that allows the person to give back even limited responses, such as a wave of a limb, a

667 Roland Millare, ‘Wedding Fest of the Lamb’. Millare quoted Ratzinger, Many Religions, One Covenant, 76–7, explaining God’s covenant with humanity in terms of relationality: When we say that man is the image of God … it means that, in and through all his relationships, he seeks that relation which is the ground of his existence. In this context, covenant would be the response to man’s imaging of God; it would show us who we are and who God is. F/n 16, 148.
668 ‘Christ, the one, is here the “we” into which Love, namely the Holy Spirit, gathers us and which means simultaneously being bound to each other and being directed toward the common “you” of the one Father’. Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 453.
669 Ratzinger, Introduction to Christianity, 352.
670 However, saints inspire a ‘we-ness’ between people, a relationality that opens into the creation of social structures.
671 This is the profound truth that many who work in L’Arche communities repeatedly talk about. See Hans S. Reinders, Receiving the Gift of Friendship: Profound Disability, Theological Anthropology, and Ethics, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2008).
grunt or a noise because all such actions are a response to the signs of love and care coming from another who is a ‘friend’ and a response that is constitutive of the other.672

A person’s actions reveal and express their dignity as imago Dei when they are giving to the other or receiving from the other. If an action cannot occur, or nothing happens, this does not mean there is no dignity and no imago Dei. There is no ‘lessening’ of the imago Dei in the person who, from receiving a gift of love, does not live out this gift of love in actions of service or care for another. On the contrary, where love does occur, there is a giving in the fullness of the imago Dei, ensuring the building up of the human person in society and of the community itself for the good of all.

The reality of the activity of the imago Dei ensures that all people can know their dignity because of the actions of love. At the root of the call in CIV 5.7 is the call to know oneself as the person called to fulfil the mission of the gift of their imago Dei by living out their dignity. With this comes an understanding of imago Dei as both a stamp impressing the mark of God’s ownership of the human person and a seal confirming the gift in how the person’s nature is grounded in a Trinitarian relationality.673 The dissertation envisages imago Dei as a stamp and seal of the relationship between God and human beings that is always open from God’s side; however, the person must enter into it freely if it is to bear fruit in their own lives. Freedom comes from accepting oneself as being imago Dei, and the truth of a person’s dignity as a fullness of relationality comes from the relationship with God and others. This is because dignity is the capacity for relationships, the freedom to fulfil the person’s relationality.

In his discussion regarding Ratzinger’s ideas about analogia entis, Joshua Brumfield (Brumfield) remarked that a person’s ‘relationality is a kind of reflection of Trinitarian life.’674 In other words, a person’s relationality as a human being is a reality only because of the relationality of the three people in the Trinity. The most profound source of relationality is grounded in the Love from God, and that love constitutes all people. In a certain sense, the imago Dei generates the human person’s dignity from
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672 See Peter A. Comensoli and Nigel Zimmerman, In God’s Image: Recognizing the Profoundly Impaired as Persons, (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2018), 95–100. Comensoli, currently the Archbishop of Melbourne, discussed this question through the lens of a friendship with a profoundly impaired person from whom recognition could be as little as a wave of a limb, a grunt or a noise. L’Arche works to assist those most deeply impaired in their abilities to be in a relation that is constitutive of them and the assistant who is in a friendship. In L’Arche, the more able assists the less able; they are not called a ‘carer’ or ‘support person’.

673 Impressing as a stamp of the image of the Trinity as love; a seal is of an ownership in love. One is passive and the other is active. One is the permanent reality of the person, and the other is what the person fails to carry through and which the person denies in rejecting the relationship inherent in being owned.

God’s Love for the person. Dignity grounds the human person as a relational being because it is the Love of the Trinitarian God loving the person. Thus, Imago Dei and the dignity of the human person are ‘fused’ (not blended) within the human person. Dignity is not a separate quality of the human person. Thus, in the image of God, the person is the one who has the dignity of a relational being.

The conclusion of this discussion leads to the view that imago Dei is dynamic in how it informs and shapes the human person’s dignity. It comes to its fullness in the maturity of the human person’s dignity as the active principle of its relationality—in love and self-giving to the other—making it a life that is love. The dignity of one person is the dignity of the other within the mutually operating relationality. A relationality which is the activity of coming towards the other and then returning from the other. However, as Miroslav Volf (Volf) argued, both remain caught in the tragedy of their individuality. Benedict highlighted in DCE that to love the other is only possible ‘because we are created in the image of God’. This love makes possible what seems impossible.

Ratzinger argued that when this impossibility is removed and the human is perceived as the image of God, the meaning of this doctrine transfers to ‘Christ as the definitive Adam’. For Ratzinger, this dynamism stood against the seemingly passive view in the account of ‘Genesis’, with its four references to ‘image’: (1) ‘let us make man in our own image’; (2) ‘God created them in his image’; (3) ‘God gave him life sharing His own breath’; and (4) ‘He made him in the likeness of God’. Ratzinger adopted Augustine’s view that the human as God’s image is a human who can know and love God. Thus, Ratzinger recalled Augustine’s identification of the human as God’s image where there is movement. This is because movement involves a dynamism in how the human ‘is the image of God [, it is] to the extent in which he directs himself to God’, and, in the obverse, he ‘disfigures his likeness to God by turning away’. Commenting on article 22 of ‘Gaudium et Spes’, Ratzinger noted that ‘the
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675 According to Zizioulas, human personhood, a person’s being as imago Dei, is present both in a disrupted fashion and as an unfulfilled tendency. This is the “tragedy” of human beings, namely, that as biological hypostases they tend toward personhood while necessarily remaining caught in their individuality as a result of their specific creaturely constitution. Hence, salvation must consist in an ontological deindividualization that actualises their personhood’. Miroslav Volf, After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998), 83.
676 DCE, 39.
677 Ratzinger, ‘Dignity of the Human Person’, 121.
678 Ibid.
679 Ibid.
dignity of man culminates in Christ who is now presented as the true answer to the question of being human’. Therefore, what does it mean to be a relational being with God-given dignity?

### 2.1.7. Dignity and Relationality

Being in the image of God is more than being a pale imitation or a shadow of a God who does little, rather it is because God is all. Human persons are called to imitate God in both who we are and how we live and serve others. The invitation to imitate follows the Trinitarian relationality by living out the constitutive relationality inherent in the person’s dignity. The invitation is most concrete in the call to imitate, to follow, Christ, where, in imitating Christ, there is a path of suffering. The relationality inherent of a person’s dignity comes to fruition in creating a world of social structures of love and mercy that become not only a reflection of God’s glory but are God’s glory. Dignity is not a product of a transaction in the market, a creation of the state arising from some social act or legislation or a dormant capacity that requires a person to act to be authentic. Instead, dignity gives the person the truth of their identity as a human person living in their social lives and sexual natures within the horizon of their own mortality. Adjectives become superfluous for understanding what the human person is. Even where the human person is given the status of a ‘rights bearer’ by society, to be a ‘rights bearer’ is less significant than the recognition that the dignity of the human person is a freedom to give themselves to others and receive from the other a gift of their self. This is not a freedom to be apart from the other. To be apart denies the inherent relationality of the human person, of which imago Dei is the marker. Human identity is a relationally based dignity. As humans, people are relational persons first and foremost.
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680 Ibid., 159.
683 Andrew Kaethler, Freedom in Relationship: Joseph Ratzinger and Alexander Schmemann in Dialogue’, New Blackfriars 95, no. 1058 (2014): 397–411. Both theologians insist that human freedom cannot consistently carry meaning or be maintained without a theological understanding of personhood in which personhood is constituted through human participation with God, in Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. That is, human freedom is ontologically grounded in the three persons of the Holy Trinity.
In a homily on the Book of Genesis and creation given in the early 1980s, Ratzinger emphasised how human life is under God’s protection because each person has God’s breath in them, making them the image of God.\textsuperscript{684} He argued that this is ‘the deepest reason for the inviolability of human dignity, and upon it is founded ultimately every civilization’.\textsuperscript{685} Further, he held that not understanding the human person as one that carries God’s breath reduces the person to a utilitarian object, and from this, ‘barbarity appears that tramples upon human dignity’.\textsuperscript{686} Conversely, there is a reversal when we understand the human person as a carrier of God’s breath because the ‘high degree of spirituality and morality is plainly evident’.\textsuperscript{687} He went on to discuss how the image of God implies relationality. A relationality which is more than a passive relationality but rather:

‘It is the dynamic that sets the human being in motion toward the totally Other. … They are more profoundly themselves when they discover their relation to the Creator. Therefore, the image of God also means human persons are beings of Word and of Love moving towards the Another [sic] oriented to give themselves to the Other, and only truly receiving themselves back in real self-giving.’\textsuperscript{688}

This dynamism of self-giving towards the other when loving the other and receiving something in return, even if it is not equal love, reflects the movement to God. However, God never returns conditionally in the proportion to the love God receives from human beings. Here, again, we find the relational roots of social realities. Benedict developed this dynamism in a message for the World Day of Peace in 2007.\textsuperscript{689} He noted that a person’s dignity is in being ‘capable of self-knowledge, self-possession, free self-giving and entering into communion with others’.\textsuperscript{690}

David Kirchhoffer (Kirchhoffer) reframed these four qualities or capacities into a series of statements: what a person is, what a person is capable of, what the person’s purpose is and to what end the person should direct their energy.\textsuperscript{691} Kirchhoffer

\textsuperscript{684} Ratzinger, \textit{In the Beginning}.
\textsuperscript{685} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{686} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{687} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{688} Ibid., 47–8.
\textsuperscript{690} Ibid.
reworked these as: (1) self-knowledge, which reveals a capacity for reason; (2) self-possession, which is an expression of freedom; (3) free self-giving, which comes from the love of the other; and (4) entering into communion with others so that a community is created. 692 From this reframing, he emphasised the human person’s relational nature and linked it closely with the human’s dignity as originating in imago Dei. He argued that there is a ‘duty to respect the dignity of each human being, in whose nature the image of the Creator is reflected’. 693 In arguing this, Kirchhoffer insisted that ‘the essential equality of human persons’ springs ‘from their common transcendent dignity’. 694 Moreover, it is a dignity that is more than a copy; instead, it is ‘impressed’. 695 An impression made into the person’s ‘very nature and [their] inalienable dignity as a person’. 696 Only when ‘God’s splendour shines on the human face, is the human image of God protected by a dignity’. 697 Dignity becomes more than a sharing of some fundamental features of a person’s biological makeup. Dignity is the ‘dimension of the person which makes him or her unique and unrepeatable’. 698 Moreover, although all persons have dignity and it belongs to each person singularly, Ratzinger suggested that there is still a social dignity. 699 He connected the dignity of the human person to the idea of the person with an eternal destiny and proposed that with this, certain obligations arise.

Benedict insisted that these obligations include an obligation on Christian people to learn ‘to know one another ever more deeply and to respect one another’. 700 When people do not live out this obligation, they deny their relationality and others in practice.

692 Ibid., 591.
694 Ibid., 6.
695 Ibid., 7. A seal is impressed into something such as wax.
696 Ibid., 13.
699 Benedict XVI, ‘Letter to the Hon. Mr Pier Ferdinando Casini, President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Republic’. The Holy See. 18 October 2005. https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/letters/2005/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20051018_on-casini.html. In this letter, Benedict introduced the idea that we have an individual dignity that carries with it a social dignity: ‘Such a centre must be the human person, with the values inherent in his or her individual and social dignity, whom the Church, through Christ’s mandate, desires ardently to serve’. However, he has not developed this idea in other publications.
Thus, they deny their dignity and the dignity of the other.\textsuperscript{701} Such a rejection has consequences for the people involved and their social context. Just like the relational human being is a ‘we’, God is ‘the Trinitarian “We”’, and ‘the fact that even God exists only as “We” … prepares at the same time the space of the human “we” … [that] binds us into the “we” of God and at the same time into the “we” of our fellow human being’.\textsuperscript{702} However, Benedict’s recognition of a ‘we’ created by relationships between human persons did not go further in his message.

A serious challenge to the Christian understanding of human dignity being rooted in imago Dei comes from denying sexual differences. Further, any claim that another identity (e.g., race, sex, political, ideological, social or social subject) is more significant than the dignity from imago Dei is also a denial of the person’s relationality in its fullness.\textsuperscript{703} Such a denial supports the claim that one can or should have power over another. The desire to seek to be ‘above’ the other is a denial of relationality and dignity. Such denial points away from the common good and undermines the human person in their dignity.\textsuperscript{704}

Benedict’s desire for a new trajectory of thinking about relations was to ensure that people’s ‘transcendent dignity is to be properly understood’.\textsuperscript{705} However, while Section 2.1 has explored the logic of the person as a relational being who bears God’s image with a corresponding dignity, it has not articulated the basis for how NoCh are built by persons who accept and seek to live the grace they receive. Thus, the question remains: how does the person begin their ‘weaving of NoCh’? Further, how can NoCh be understood as a source and ground of social renewal? The answer, in part, comes

\textsuperscript{701} Benedict, ‘Imposition of the Pallium’. Benedict described how a negative feature of a person losing their dignity is the entry into ‘the desert of God’s darkness, the emptiness of souls no longer aware of their dignity or the goal of human life’.

\textsuperscript{702} Ratzinger, ‘Concerning the Notion’, 453–54.

\textsuperscript{703} While discussing John Paul II, ‘Mulieris Dignitatem’, para. 6, Scola argued that: man is not an image of God only by virtue of his humanity. He becomes image, too, by virtue of the communio personarum between man and woman. In other words, what visibly makes man and woman similar person is their body, inasmuch as the body manifests their integral humanity. The body thus reveals man to himself. Masculinity and femininity lead him to a full recognition of his own body as principle of reciprocal enrichment. Angelo Scola, The Nuptial Mystery, trans. Michelle K. Borras. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2005), 39.

Less than four pages later Scola insists that: ‘The man-woman relation can therefore be seen as that singular experience in which the impossibility of man’s realising the imago Dei on his own, outside of a relationship with the other, appears most evident’, Scola, Nuptial Mystery, 43.

\textsuperscript{704} This is why the ‘dignity of the human person’ is a key principle of the STCC. I proffer that it is an active principle in the structure of this doctrine. That is, dignity is why the other three principles exist, and the relationship between the common good and dignity is a test of the success of the operation of subsidiarity and solidarity. This discussion is developed in Part 3 of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{705} CIV 53.
from considering the human person as a relational being from the perspective of metaphysics/philosophy which is discussed in Section 2.2.

2.2. Being and Person

The theological basis for the person as a relational being concludes that a ‘we’ is formed. However, because this ‘we’ is insufficient as a source of communities, Section 2.2 examines a metaphysical/philosophical understanding of the human person as a relational being and a social builder of NoCh. Section 2.2 explores Clarke’s Aquinas lectures given in 1993 and published as Person and Being. Clarke, a Thomist metaphysician, read Ratzinger’s Introduction to Christianity during the mid-1980s. He began the lectures acknowledging his debt to Ratzinger as a necessary, though not the only, stimulus for his thinking. He noted that while many had developed a relational notion of the person in Trinitarian theology, they had not exploited ‘their philosophical analyses of the person’ to develop ‘a new, explicitly relational conception of the very nature of the person’. Specifically, he noted Ratzinger’s identification of the need for a philosophical development ‘wherein relationality would become an equally primordial aspect of the person as substantiality’. As a result, he developed a metaphysical understanding of the person as a relational being.

Clarke developed Ratzinger’s insights within the Thomist tradition, taking Ratzinger’s ‘we’ from the ‘I’ and ‘thou’ and raising it to the level of social structures. Clarke worked through the implications of these ideas and, to a lesser degree, other thinkers in the personalist and phenomenological tradition, although he warned against a one-sided emphasis on relationality. He argued that these writers lacked a metaphysical grounding in disregarding ‘substantiality’. Nevertheless, he declared his desire to integrate the Thomistic view of the person with the phenomenological development of relationality.
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709 Ibid. Other thinkers have included Christian and secular personalists and phenomenologists and certain ‘process thinkers’ but gives fulsome praise to Hans Von Urs Balthasar for his insights.
710 Ibid.
711 Ibid., 4, 19, 86.
The integration Clarke considered was to graft ‘the self-communicative, relational dimension of the person right onto the Thomistic metaphysics of being as existential, self-communicative act’. He rejected the ‘moderate’ approach, which reduced the person to a reality constituted by the relationships surrounding them. Likewise, he opposed the ‘radical’ approach, which, in practice, denied the individual character of a person by emphasising that only the communal ordering is real. Section 2.2.1 discusses Clarke’s ideas on ‘being’ and explains his application of these to the human person as a relational being that creates and maintains social realities.

2.2.1. Being

In the first chapter of the his Clarke examined how ‘real being’ (i.e., an existing being) is intrinsically active and self-communicating, where self-communication is a natural consequence of ‘possessing an act of existence’. He quoted Etienne Gilson (Gilson) that ‘to be is to act’, confirming that being is not a passive existence. Instead, there is dynamism and energy in the act of existence, leading it to self-communicate its goodness to others. For Clarke, the corollary of this dynamism of being is relationality. He stated that relationality is ‘a primordial dimension of every real being, inseparable from its substantiality, just as action is from existence’. In this way, being is intrinsically active, self-manifesting and self-communicating, meaning that ‘to be’ is to be actively present. Thus, although relationality, like self-communicativeness, is a primordial dimension of being, there is however an order of ontological dependence, where relationality follows substantiality and the self-communicative aspects of being.

Clarke referenced Saint Thomas to emphasise that substantiality and relationality are equally primordial elements of being at its ‘highest intensity’. This is not to say that being is God, although lower beings (whether angels or humans) manifest both their relationality and substantiality because they are ‘all in some way

712 Ibid., 5.
713 Clarke, Person and Being, 59. Clarke warned against the idea that a person is constituted in being as a person by others. He argued that the person is awakened to personhood by the actions of others.
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images of God’. Clarke argued that those thinkers in the personalist and phenomenological tradition whose ideas and positions stressed the extent to which others constitute the person also tended to think that human beings’ interior lives were ‘swallowed up’ in the extraverted activity. The logic of this leads to the idea of the priority of the community over the person.

Clarke argued against this, stating that substance, ontologically, provides a unifying centre for being from which relationality emerges. He insisted that a being, with its overflowing self-communicating action towards others, is the recipient of what they give back because a being cannot but ‘help generate a network of relations with all its recipients’. Note that while substantiality and relationality go together as distinct but inseparable modes of reality, the substance remains the primary mode because everything else, including relations with others, is in and rests on this ground. Clarke offered a concise summary of being: ‘To be fully is to be substance-in-relation’. He then discussed other aspects of being.

Clarke identified ‘reality as a whole’ though he noted there are six dimensions to being. The first of these is being as active, self-communicative and relational. The next dimension was an analysis of being as receptivity, community and communion. Clarke identified several corollaries while undertaking an ‘explicit thematization of what is implied in the Thomistic understanding of being as dynamic and self-communicative’. First, Self-communication and receptivity are fundamental aspects of being because they are complementary. Therefore, self-communication is a primordial aspect of being, but receptivity ‘follows substantiality and self-communication’ in the ontological (but not temporal) order of dependence. Second, he recognised receptivity as a positive aspect of being because love will be incomplete without it. At the highest level of being, receptivity is a primordial aspect of being, although, in the ‘lower levels of being’ (i.e., humans), this diminishes due to the ‘poverty, incompleteness and process of change in human beings’. However, he insisted that, in the higher scale of being, receptivity turns into an ‘active, welcoming, gratefully responsive attitude which is a positive joy-bringing aspect of personal
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Finally, he highlighted how the second person of the Trinity is equally receptivity and gift. Receptivity was significant for Clarke because it raises the question of love. Love is the positive aspect or perfection of being. Without receptivity, however, this love is incomplete.

Clarke acknowledged a range of sources for his thinking regarding the question of receptivity. First, however, he gave great weight to the influence of Hans von Balthasar’s (Balthasar) speculation on a connection between Aquinas’s metaphysics of being and the phenomenology of the love of friendship. A second corollary was how relationships are the fruits of real being in their self-communicative and relational aspects. The interactive nature of ‘communicating and receiving’ forms community in the broadest meaning and becomes communion at a deep and intimate level that shapes togetherness, whether in small intimate unions, more general communal gatherings or associations, which is to say groups or systems of social ordering. Clarke summarised this in the aphorism, ‘to be is to be together’.

Clarke ended his chapter on being with the third corollary, where he took another step to identify how ‘all being tends naturally towards self-transcendence’. He argued that self-transcendence on the horizontal plane is the tendency towards togetherness. In human persons (finite created beings), there is, alongside the action in the horizontal, a dynamism towards a person’s own goodness—towards the good and, by extension, the infinite good. The orientation towards togetherness is an orientation to a ‘we’, as is shown later in Section 2.2.2-2.2.3. Togetherness is the desire or development towards the community, as discussed later in Section 2.3 on relational sociology. Above all, this affirms the earlier reading of NoCh as more than a process of seeking to interconnect nodes or aspects of social life. The same arguments reaffirm the centrality of the person and community. A communal form lived out in the pattern of God’s Love is the holiness of giving love to the other, which is the Christian option put forward by
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Ratzinger/Benedict. Section 2.2.2 now considers the person as being according to these considerations.

2.2.2. Person as Being

Although Ratzinger’s ideas regarding the human person remained in the theological domain, Clarke moved to develop his ideas on the human person as a relational being from a different perspective—the metaphysical/philosophical. Clarke applied his understanding of being as dynamic and self-communicative to the human person. In the first section, he argued that the human person ‘is by nature a finite embodied spirit, in search of the infinite, in social solidarity with its fellow human beings, on a historical journey through this material cosmos towards its final trans-worldly goal’.\(^{737}\) This was a prelude to his analysis of the human person’s nature, where he carried through the work of integration promised in his Introduction to the lectures. He emphasised ‘the main ways in which the human person manifests or gives expression in actual living to the inner structure of its personalized being’. These attributes are self-possessing, self-communicative and relational, and self-transcending.\(^{738}\)

Section 2.2.2 examines each of these attributes in the order adopted by Clarke. Self-possession is the person present in and to themselves, as the conscious outward, showing off who they are, where there is an awareness of themselves being ‘present’ as the source and driver of their actions.\(^{739}\) Moreover, self-possession manifests first, as ‘self-consciousness in order of knowledge’, where a person says ‘I’ to themselves and others, and secondly, as ‘self-determination in order of action’ through the person exercising their free will.\(^{740}\) From these two aspects, a person says, ‘I am responsible’.\(^{741}\) For Clarke, self-possession was the manifestation of a person’s ‘in-selfness’ or substantiality. Through self-possession, a person is a distinct self, where only such a self gives or shares itself, whether in love, friendship or activity in a broader social reality. Self-possession is the centre without which the person has no anchor to engage in self-communication.\(^{742}\) And when communicating, the dynamic self-communicative notion
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of being it means a person knows ‘who I am … [and] what I am doing’ when communicating. In simple terms: ‘to be … is to be-in-communion’.743

The second of the three attributes is ‘self-communicative and relational’. Clarke claimed that this attribute might have two components but can be considered almost one from the outcomes and consequences. Such outcomes occur where ‘the active self-communication of the human person engages in and with other (real beings) human persons to see fruits of this outflowing emerge in and generate relationships, friendships, and common activity leading to community’.744 Thus, this is where the person faces outwards. However, from this comes the understanding that there is a polarity of being present, to self and to others, within a person.745 In other words, a person is a ‘living synthesis of substantiality and relationality’.746

Clarke proposed that the third attribute of the person is ‘self-transcending’. Here, the person is understood as a dialogical being operating through substantiality and relationality. Clarke did not explicitly discuss the human person as a being who is a dialogical being. Instead, he described the person’s nature as revealing a ‘dialectic’, a dialogue, between the poles of substantiality and relationality.747 Clarke characterised these poles as self-possession and self-communication. In any form of non-verbal interaction, the importance of ‘internal’ communication depends on how it lays the basis for the human person to become an outwardly engaging agent in the world. Such a ‘dialogue’ between the two poles of being becomes a ‘spiral of self-development [that] should ideally go on alternating between the two poles’.748 With this, Clarke captured the idea that ‘the whole life of a personal being revolves around this basic polarity of presence to self and presence to others’.749 This polarity of presence is a dynamism that drives one towards the other. The dialogue between humans requires active engagement with others. For this to be a complete dialogue, and to hope there is a fruit, it is necessary for the person as an ‘I’ to seek the other and to treat or accept them as a ‘thou’. Thus, the dynamism moves towards the ‘we’. In this Clarke went beyond Ratzinger’s

743 Clarke, Person and Being, 82.
744 Ibid., 42.
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747 Ibid.
748 Ibid., 68.
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observations about the ‘I–thou’ to explain that the human person orientates towards social movement.\textsuperscript{750}

Such a movement is a dynamism of moving to the ‘we’, where this occurs in a social matrix of ‘I–thou–we’. Thus, the seeds for a community are planted and germinate. Clarke offered a metaphor to dramatise this dialogue when he stated that ‘the breathing of being … spins out a whole web of relationality in all directions growing more intricate as the lives of both persons and whole communities evolve’.\textsuperscript{751} He concluded that this is a ‘we’ term. Clarke believed this development advanced Martin Buber’s (Buber) emphasis on the ‘I–thou’ character in the dialogue between humans.\textsuperscript{752} In a sense, Clarke rejected the idea of a staged process of social formation, working from the sole person up to the community. Instead, he analysed a dynamic process of growth or decline in the social ordering, reflecting the extent and depth of the human interrelationships that come into existence. There is a permanent dialogue between the person and the social structure they create, inhabit and modify, which is more significant when what happens is done in love. He stressed that relationships ‘immediately generate(s) a network for relations’.\textsuperscript{753} This suggests that Clarke would have welcomed a dialogue with the proponents of relational sociology.\textsuperscript{754}

If self-possession is the ‘introverted’ dimension to a human person, the relational is the ‘extraverted’ dimension. Therefore, given that these are complementary poles of being, the question is: how do they interact? Clarke wished to emphasise this interconnection. He described interactivity as an ‘unending dialectic of the within and the without, the in-itself and the toward-others’.\textsuperscript{755} Such an unending movement and intertwining of the two is fruitful for the relationships created, or, even if they are not created, the ongoing engagement with others in existing relationships. Thus, in relationships, there is ‘the inward facing act of existential presence in itself, and the outward facing active self-expression and self-manifestation to the others’.\textsuperscript{756}

\textsuperscript{750} Ratzinger was familiar with Martin Buber’s writings. See de Gaál, \textit{Theology of Pope Benedict XVI}, 27–8.
\textsuperscript{751} Clarke, \textit{Person and Being}, 76.
\textsuperscript{752} Ibid., 65–7. Further, it is helpful to recall how Ratzinger identified, among other sources, his reading of Buber and how its effects on dialogue were an important part of his thinking and practice.
\textsuperscript{753} Clarke, ‘Person, Being, and St. Thomas’, 607.
\textsuperscript{754} I suggest he would have enjoyed reading the recent volume of essays in Pierpaolo Donati, Antonio Malo and Giulio Maspero, eds. \textit{Social Science, Philosophy and Theology in Dialogue: A Relational Perspective}, (London: Routledge, 2019).
\textsuperscript{755} Clarke, \textit{Person and Being}, 64.
\textsuperscript{756} Ibid.
For this reason, Clarke argued that the combination of substantiality and relationality is a dynamic synthesis occurring within an ever-changing matrix of social relations.° For this reason, Clarke argued that the combination of substantiality and relationality is a dynamic synthesis occurring within an ever-changing matrix of social relations.° However, given the human person’s limitations, this dynamic does not guarantee a growth towards or decline from perfection, or a turning away from or an orientation towards transcendence.° Instead, Clarke argued that the more a person as a relational being directs themself towards transcendence, the greater the manifestation of their humanity because a ‘being-with-other does not cancel his being-with-himself but brings it fully to itself’ in the other.° For Ratzinger, this other was God, where ‘through Christ, this relativity which is towards the other and God’, the person can ‘truly come to himself’; moreover, in coming to oneself, the person enters into unity with someone they are related to.° In other words, being with the other is its form of being with itself where they find themselves as relational beings in their relationality and substantiality.° Ratzinger, at this point, referenced the Gospel: ‘only the one who loses himself can find himself (cf. Mt 10:36)’.°

Relationality is a pole of the structure of being of the human person; however, it is integral, although distinct, in its synthesis with substantiality. In the relational mode, a person, Clarke argues, is someone who can say can: I am present to the other—by self-communication and receptivity where I learn about “thou”—and at the same time I am present to myself and do “learn” about myself as an “I”.° This presentation makes it the outward facing act of ourselves, where relationality means the other is treated as a ‘thou’, which is where an ‘I–thou–we’ emerges.° In this, a person who exercises their relationality as a gift of the human person, the giving of which does not change anything in the poles of the ontological structure of the person who is the giver or the receiver, and although a different self does not emerge, a community of giving can form in this situation.

Thus Clarke insisted that ‘unless one has a distinct self to give and some awareness of it being yours as one’s own’, one cannot give self to another.° One only gives what one owns. If there is an acceptance of this, the person, through their

---

° Clarke, Person and Being, 64-66.
° Ibid.
° Ibid., 57.
relationality, creates social realities because there is always an effect on the other people involved in the giving and receiving. Clarke recalled how ‘every consciously chosen action … helps mould and construct our own very selves, who we are in the moral order, at a deeper level than the action taken by itself’. Moulding and constructing captures an understanding that the experience of an event or series of events, whether creative or destructive, ‘cannot help but leave some trace in us’ of what eventuated. The question remains regarding the nature of this gift.

Clarke addressed this question indirectly when he asked: what do we communicate when we are self-communicative? Although material goods are a form in which self-communication occurs, a gift only arises from a person’s spiritual roots. These roots are ‘wisdom, love [and] the joy of togetherness, both in shared action and simple loving co-presence or communion’. Any giving to the other derives from an expansive drive within beings, which transforms into creating bonds between persons. As a way of understanding gift, it offers an insight into the progression in CIV 5.7, from self-gift to the creation of NoCh. Because of the giving between people, the bonds merge and coalesce, leading to large and small social systems, where there is an interconnection to some degree. From these, social realities generate to form a community. Under the shape of God’s Love, these become communities of faith and love.

2.2.3. Relational Beings Constitute Social Realities

Clarke argued that creating social realities arises from the outward self-communication of human beings and is a consequence of relationality because when ‘being naturally flows over into self-communicating action to and on others, it immediately generates a network of relations with all its recipients’. However, Clarke was careful not to overlook the possibility of distortion by ineffective substitutes, such as power, possessions or other goods, whether material or spiritual, hindering, undermining or blocking relationships. People involved in such relation-blocking activities find it difficult to enter or remain in relationships (community) with others.

---
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770 Clarke, Person and Being, 109.
without a degree of confusion, suspicion or fear. A breach in the relationality between
human beings pushes people towards selfishness. For Clarke, such breaches can affect
the giving and the receiving of the operation of receptivity.\footnote{The deepest form of poverty occurs where sin is an alternative to ‘authentic self-transcendence, especially vertical, we can have radical uncaring self-centredness’; thus, we become ‘fearful self-enclosed secretiveness or a habit of going out to others to get as much as possible from them or dominate them for our own advancement’. Clarke, ‘Person, Being, and St. Thomas’, 607.}

In saying this, Clarke followed Ratzinger when he noted that these relationships include receptivity as a dimension of being. Here, he was referring to receptivity as complementarity to the self-communicative process. Self-communication works well when there is a receiving because, as Clarke indicated, there is ‘no giving without receiving’.\footnote{Clarke, \textit{Person and Being}, 83.} His analysis of the mutuality necessary for love, in its highest form, recognised receptivity as an ‘essential’ part of love’s highest form. With this, Clarke laid the basis for his explicitly creative development of what he considered was implicit in Aquinas.\footnote{Ibid., 84.} He went on to stress how:

‘it becomes clear that real being tends naturally to spin out a web of relationship with the beings around it—within its horizon of action, we might say—and that these relationships involve interactive relationships of communicating and receiving, it also follows that real beings tend naturally to form some kind of network, or order or systems of interaction—may we not say some kind of community in the wider sense.’\footnote{Ibid., 22.}

In emphasising this Clarke opened up a way of reading CIV 5, when he described a process of love where a person who also receives goes on to give.\footnote{‘Man is in God’s image and thereby he is a being whose innermost dynamic is likewise directed toward the receiving and giving of love’. Ratzinger, \textit{God and the World}, 189.} Such a reading illuminates what Benedict was trying to express in CIV 5. Nevertheless, how is a human person, with their sins, part of this process of love?

Clarke observed how, in a lower being, receptivity might be incomplete.\footnote{‘In the lower levels of being, indeed, receptivity is woven in with poverty, incompleteness…’. Clarke, ‘Person and Being’, 20.} This observation raises the question of whether, if one knows one is an object of love, there is a sense that God’s Love (which is received as such) overcomes the incompleteness in human beings? If this is correct, then knowing and becoming a ‘subject of charity’ opens a way to overcome this incompleteness. Is this to enter into conversion? NoCh, as the fruits of conversion, create a social reality different from what a person’s ordinary or natural drive of their relational nature for relationships creates with others, such as
entities for a practical, commercial or artistic purpose or some other activity. Nevertheless, how is what Benedict presented as NoCh in CIV 5, different from what Clarke argued for in his lecture?

A point of differentiation lies in whether such communities absorb the giver into the receiver, rather than the receiver becoming a giver, no matter how impeded or limited the person is in what they do in order to give to another.777 Thus, such a community is authentic, not absorbing the person, to the extent that it does ‘not submerge the free self but liberates it, nourishes it as its natural environment and ends up bringing us to know our own unique individuality more’.778 A second point emerged from Clarke’s concern regarding whether the person acting in their self-communicative mode is doing this not for ‘self-fulfilment but for communicating one’s own richness to others’.779 Such acts of communication indicate how this is a ‘moving towards a metaphysics of love’.780 Clarke wrote in personal terms when he insisted that ‘even my own self I now love … but only as known and loved by God … In a word I know and love myself as God knows and Loves me’.781 This leads one to open up their being to the ‘Great Center’ so that it can act out its life of creative love through me’.782 Further, from God’s creative Love, a Christian is not ‘on one’s own or in oneself but living completely open from and toward’.783 This oneness towards the other indicates Clarke’s development of being as orientating towards the divine. Here, Clarke signified a final dimension of being where being tends naturally towards self-transcendence, towards a form of togetherness in system and community where self-transcendence is part of a universal dynamism towards a good, which becomes an innate implicit longing for personal union with God as the ‘infinite Lover’.784 This is a union in which the person seeks to instantiate and imitate by becoming more like God in the outward going of God’s self-sharing as the infinite good.785
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777 This suggests Clarke sees the receiver as crippled spiritually in some manner that has led them to suffer from a doubt regarding whether they are loved. Personally, I have known many physically or mentally damaged people; however, all were givers in some degree or other because they knew or had some realisation, they were recipients of love.
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2.2.4. Conclusion

Ratzinger’s theological notion of the human person (or as Walsh described it – ‘theological personalism’) was of a relational being who moves from the person’s ‘I’ to another as a ‘you’, where both become a ‘we’. Ratzinger did not develop the nature of this ‘we’. However, Clarke carried forward the discussion regarding the ‘we’ with his analysis of the human person as a relational being. According to Clarke, this makes the person a relational being whose ‘inner life’ grounds their relationality (self-possessing, self-communicative and relational and transcending), and as such, is the author to some degree, of social realities, of new social structures. However, the social realities may have varying intensities, with different periods of existence and variable contributions to social ordering. Clarke made a significant contribution to this argument in his lectures. In these lectures, Ratzinger’s call for a ‘new trajectory of thinking’ was also answered to some degree by Clarke, not least by his development towards a metaphysics of love. However, it remains to be adopted by other theologians and metaphysicians who could contribute to understanding how human beings work together to generate cultural renewal and social change.\textsuperscript{786} Noting how Ratzinger referenced the social sciences as already addressing this task, Section 2.3 provides a sketch of the theory of relational sociology in the work of Archer and Donati on the person as a relational being who is a relational subject and how social realities arise from these as social subjects.

2.3. Person and Person

Section 2.3 discusses the human person as a relational being and author of social realities, such as NoCh, using relational sociology, which is the product of a cooperation between two sociologists. Archer was a sociology professor at Warwick University and a member of the PASS, serving as its president for several years.\textsuperscript{787} Archer described herself as a philosopher of the social sciences, with her perspective grounded in ‘critical

\textsuperscript{786} CIV 53.
\textsuperscript{787} Margaret Archer was a professor of sociology and the Director of the Centre for Social Ontology at University of Warwick, near Coventry and the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne. She was appointed as a founding member to the Council of PASS by Pope John Paul II in 1994. Pope Francis appointed her as president of PASS in 2014, and she held office until 2017. She has authored numerous texts: http://www.pass.va/content/scienzesociali/en/academicians/former/archer.html.
realism’. Archer argued that critical realism grasps how non-reified relations exist between the agency (the human person) and the structure (social entities or realities). Further, she stated that critical realism ‘made an effective case for distinguishing between structures and agents in terms of their distinctive and irreducible properties and powers (as it did for mind in relation to matter)’. Donati was a professor of Sociology at the University of Bologna and also served on the PASS. A significant result of their cooperation was The Relational Subject.

Their theory of Relational sociology advances a defence of the human person as a relational subject. Archer and Donati addressed how to capture the elusiveness in the human person who is both ‘someone who is partly formed by their sociality, but also has the capacity to transform their society in some part’. Archer and Donati answered this question differently from sociologists who have promoted either an:

‘undersocialised’ [sic] view of man, one whose human constitution owed nothing to society and was thus a self-sufficient ‘outsider’ who simply operated in a social environment … [or a] ‘oversocialised’ [sic] view of man, whose every feature, beyond his biology, is shaped and moulded by his social context.”
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788 Margaret S. Archer, ‘Thinking and Theorising about Educational Systems’, In Structure, Culture and Agency: Selected Papers of Margaret Archer, eds. Tom Brock, Mark Carrigan and Graham Scrambler, (London: Routledge, 2017), 36-49, 37. ‘The elements of critical realism include: (i) there is a stratified social ontology, that is, the social world is not flat but has layers that may depend on the ‘lower’ levels and be interrelated; (ii) there are different levels in the social order with their own emergent properties and powers (Archer follows epistemological relativity), and while we can make judgments about the nature of the real world, these may need to be revised subject to further questions or observations; (iii) we can make judgments of and about the world, which is real and observable, analysable and understandable (judgemental rationality)—such judgements may need to be revised in light of any further developments, observations or questions—however, it is not impossible to reach some judgments about the reality of the world.’


790 Pierpaolo Donati was a professor of sociology at the University of Bologna. He is a member of PASS, having been appointed as a member of the Council of PASS in 1997, and continues to serve on that body. He is an author of numerous texts, including Relational Sociology. Unlike Archer, Donati recalls he was a student activist in Italy in 1968 but says he was never a Marxist or an anarchist! He describes as his driving force a desire for ‘a better world’. Pierpaolo Donati, ‘Birth and Development of the Relational Theory of Society: A Journey Looking for a Deep “Relational Sociology”,’ 1–29, (unpublished manuscript, 2007). PDF held on file. http://www.relationalstudies.net/uploads/2/3/1/5/2315313/donati_birth_and_development_of_the_relational_theory_of_society.pdf, (accessed March 25, 2018).
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Further, Archer and Donati did not ignore the transcendent or the religious as a dimension of the human person when they developed their theory. The Relational Subject described how the emergence of and change in social structures is the outcome of human persons’ relationality. Section 2.3 explores the significance of these ideas for understanding NoCh.

2.3.1. The Human Person as a Relational Being: A Convergence

Archer and Donati understood the era of modernity as an era when the ideas from the Age of Enlightenment became dominant with a concomitant secularisation; they also recognised that this era was coming to an end if it was not already at its end.

Both grappled with trying to understand the speed and extent of the changes sweeping through the social orders coming from the effects of the rapid advance of globalisation. They agreed on the ‘centrality of “social relations” because all emergent properties are relational’. An emergent property is that which ‘comes into being through social combination’. Archer emphasised their commitment to articulating ‘the importance of emergent properties and powers in explanatory accounts of the social order’. They shared a desire to rescue the human person from the idea that the person is little more than a node ‘in networks of connectivity or represent its

---


795 There is a degree of commonality in their relational ontology, not least with Clarke’s grasp of the human person as a ‘generator’ of social realities, although I do not press there is cross-fertilisation between their ideas and Clarke’s. Lastly, Benedict was familiar with the work of both Archer and Donati through their involvement in PASS, which he addressed on a number of occasions, particularly in 2005. This Address can be read as preliminary engagement with their ideas on the human person. Benedict XVI, Address to the Members of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences’. In Conceptualisation of the Person in Social Sciences: The Proceedings of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, 18–22 November 2005, Acta 11, eds. Edmond Malinvaud and Mary Ann Glendon, XIX–XX, (Vatican City: Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences), 2006

796 ‘The number one problem of modern social science has from the beginning been modernity itself. I mean that historically unprecedented amalgam of new practices and institutional forms (science, technology, industrial production, urbanization); of new ways of living (individualism, secularization, instrumental rationality); and of new forms of malaise (alienation, meaninglessness, a sense of impending social dissolution)’. Charles Taylor, ‘Modern Social Imaginaries’, Public Culture 14, no. 1 (2002): 91–124.
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holes. Archer and Donati also shared an understanding that the human person is a challenge to sociological theories advancing the reductionist view of the human person.

Their shared perspective was so significant that *The Relational Subject* noted how ‘it is a very rare occurrence in sociology, unlike the natural sciences, to have the “simultaneous invention” of a remarkably similar approach from entirely independent sources.’ Emmanuel Morandi (Morandi) shared this insight when he stressed how astonishing the ‘confluence of Italian relational sociology and English critical realism’ was. Morandi argued that this convergence comes from two similar approaches:

‘Roy Bhaskar’s transcendental or critical realism, first formulated as a philosophy of science but then working ‘downwards’ by under labouring for the social sciences, with Pierpaolo Donati’s relational sociology, developing ‘upwards’ from social theorizing to formulate a realist meta-theory.’

In her Introduction to *The Relational Subject*, Archer dated her collaboration with Donati back over 20 years. She recorded how each had contributed their respective ideas, theoretical developments and intentions to the joint effort, although they came from various starting points. In other words, despite their initial differences, a synergy emerged ‘between Donati’s early ideas of relational sociology concerned with the social order and Archer’s concept of a morphogenetic framework of social realism.’ Therefore, a consensus was reached that sociology is about ‘the persistent relations between individuals (and groups),’ at the heart of which is a fuller picture of the human person that other theories promote.
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802 Ibid., 4. Archer had written earlier on this convergence observing that ‘in the natural sciences “simultaneous invention” is quite a common occurrence but one virtually unknown in social science’.
803 ‘Sooner or later all true realisms end up converging and acknowledging one another, no matter the differences in their research routes and cultural context they come from. The fact these perspectives, both realistic and free from any naivety, have gained credence in the heart of an exhausted postmodernity, tell us that reality, especially social reality, after having been a prop for forced scientific frameworks and fascinating constructions—frequently rooted in a dark dream-like atmosphere—wishes to take revenge’. Emmanuelle Morandi, Introductory Outlines to Pierpaolo Donati’s Relational Sociology, *Journal of Critical Realism*, 9.2 (2010), 208-226, 210.
804 Archer, ‘Critical Realism and Relational Sociology’, 199–200. Also see Archer, ‘Trajectory of the Morphogenetic Approach’, 35: ‘the philosophical under-labouring supplied by Critical Realism provides the backcloth for all my works’. ‘Under-labouring’ is the idea of preparing the intellectual ground at the philosophical level for a different way of approaching a discipline.
805 Donati and Archer, *Relational Subject*, xv. The book was published in 2015; two decades after their first collaboration in 1991, which may have been stimulated by their common membership of the Council of the PASS.
807 Donati and Archer, *Relational Subject*, 16.
Relational sociology promotes an understanding of the human person as a being who is neither an absurd caricature of an isolated being nor a shadow of structures.\textsuperscript{809} These opinions regarding the human person challenged an understanding of the human person as one that could ‘build up a social system that could do without the human’.\textsuperscript{810} Archer and Donati met this challenge by recognising and reclaiming the idea that there are ‘autonomous factors of change’.\textsuperscript{811} This idea led to the question about how it is possible to see the human person as both ‘partly formed by their sociality, but also having the capacity to transform their society even in some part’.\textsuperscript{812} The answer lies in the ‘need to establish sustainable and sustaining relations with’ the three orders of reality: the natural, practical and social.\textsuperscript{813} This relationship between the three orders posed the question of understanding the relationship between human beings and the social order.\textsuperscript{814}

Archer addressed this question by going beyond the theories where ‘the human agency had become pale and ghostly in mid-century functionalism’ or approaches such as ‘structuralist Marxism and normative functionalism … which virtually snuffed out agency, or in positions such as in … interpretative sociology [, which] banished the structural to the realm … where it became reduced to supine plasticity’.\textsuperscript{815} Archer argued

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{809} There is an alternative school of relational sociology loosely grouped around sociologists in North America who do not share the same views as Archer and Donati or recognise the emergent powers of social realities. See Francois Dépelteau, and Christopher Powell eds., \textit{Applying Relational Sociology}, (New York: Palgrave, 2013); Mustafa Emirbayer, ‘Manifesto for a Relational Sociology’, \textit{American Journal of Sociology} 103, no. 2 (1997): 281–317.; Nick Crossley, \textit{Towards Relational Sociology}, (London: Routledge, 2011).
\textsuperscript{811} Donati, \textit{Relational Sociology} 165.
\textsuperscript{812} See Archer, ‘Persons and Ultimate Concerns’, 283.
\textsuperscript{813} Archer, ‘Trajectory of the Morphogenetic Approach’, 39.
\textsuperscript{814} ‘Modernity can be defined in many ways: the rise of capitalist democracies in the eighteenth century, the scientific revolution, the divisions of Church and state, the primacy of subjective consciousness (Descartes), skepticism \textit{sic} about ultimate metaphysical explanations coupled with an ethics of autonomy that gives rise to liberal secular culture (Kant), the use of historical studies to relativize all absolute truth claims’. Thomas Joseph White, ‘Catholicism in the Modern World’, \textit{First Things}, 8 August 2017. For Taylor, pre-modernity is where the human person is ‘embedded’ in their social order (‘social embeddedness’) [along with limited] ‘ability to ‘imagine the self, outside of a particular context extended to membership of our society in its essential order’ \textit{A Secular Age}, 149.
\textsuperscript{815} In Margaret S. Archer, ‘Morphogenesis versus Structuration: On Combining Structure and Action’. \textit{British Journal of Sociology} 33, no. 4 (1982): 455–483, 455, she used some striking metaphors to describe the varying and competing theoretical positions:

‘The fundamental problem of linking human agency and social structure stalks through the history of sociological theory. Basically, it concerns how to develop an adequate theory account which deals simultaneously with men constituting society and the social formation of human agents … Initially … human agency had become pale and ghostly in mid-century functionalism … On the one hand structuralist Marxism and normative functionalism virtually snuffed out agency … on the other hand interpretative sociology banished the structural to the realm … where it became reduced to supine plasticity.’
\end{flushright}
that both these positions fail to recognise that the social order is a ‘real social world with real properties inhabited by real people who collectively made the past and whose causal powers are already shaping the future’. These are the social dimensions of the human person. Moreover, these positions are antagonistic to the human person and reveal the continuing challenge to the human person’s nature in postmodern society.

In the debates about the human person, Archer noted that much of sociological theory adopts either a reductive or exaggerated view. On the one hand, the person is characterised as ‘modernity’s man’, or homo economicus, where the person works in and on the world, but nothing in the world affects them. That is, the person is ‘under-socialised’. The other view of the human person is from the perspective of structure, which recognises only an upwards conflation of agency towards structure, in which the person predominates as the active element. Conversely, another view positions the person as (almost entirely) separated from their biology. Here, the human being is shaped and moulded from and through the social context. In this frame, the human person has a minimal capacity to transform their situation and is labelled ‘society’s being’ or homo sociologicus.

In this perspective, the person is no more than a being who is a gift of society, an ‘over-socialised’ subject with no real or objective capacities for flourishing or even a liability to suffer. In short, the social invades the person, reducing them to a ‘zombie’ status. In this perspective, the social structures, shaping and generating the person (i.e., holistically generative of the person), operate in a process understood as
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817 ‘In other words, “the social dimensions” of the human person in his/her inner and outer life do not represent a meaningful and central issue per se in pre-modern thought, from ancient Greece to the Middle Age. So much so that, if we try to understand the social dimensions of the human person by relying upon the classical philosophical categories, we come across “natural explanations” which cannot grasp the reality we are trying to explain’. Pierpaolo Donati, ‘Understanding the Human Person as a Relational Subject: An ‘After’-Modern Paradigm for the Social Sciences (Or: The ‘Economy’ of the Human Person Lies in Their Ultimate Concerns)’, in Conceptualization of the Person in Social Sciences: The Proceedings of the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, 18–22 November 2005, Acta 11, eds. Edmond Malinvaud and Mary Ann Glendon, (Vatican City: The Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, 2006), 286.
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‘downwards conflation’. Here, the person is over-socialised because their individuality has less significance to how society works. Although it does not follow the above perspectives, a third approach regards the person as an agent lost in social structures, where people's actions are lost in each other, such that each absorbs the other. This is understood as ‘central conflation’.

Archer argued that these three approaches are all defective ways of understanding the human person because they remove the person from the real world, cutting off the person from experiencing reality and the possibility of changing themselves and society fundamentally. Archer argued that while culture and structure are real forces that shape and mould the human subject, this does not occur to the extent that the human person ‘disappears’ into culture or structure. For Archer, these debates regarding the human person are about understanding the relationship between agency and structure.

Where Archer focused on the relationship between agency and structure and the human person, Donati understood it in terms of an antithesis between the two poles of freedom and social order, where social life unfolds between these poles. Here, freedom conceives the human person as someone who lives and acts without constraints or controls, even to the extent of denying any limitations, and in this understanding, social structures become little more than aggregations of people with no order. On the other hand, the ‘control’ perspective, which opposes the concept of freedom without limits, gives little recognition to the person because control means the social order is conditioning the ‘action from … outside’ the person. However, this debate is just another way of grasping the relations between agency and structure. Donati stated that the two competing positions reflect ‘either individualistic or holistic ways of viewing and examining society, along with their corresponding characterisation of the human
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825 Donati and Archer, *Relational Subject*, 268.
827 Ibid., 12.
828 ‘It is entirely possible to adopt a position which could be called “centrism” which indeed accepts that human agents shape culture but are themselves culturally moulded, without collapsing the two levels’. Margaret S. Archer, *Culture and Agency, The Place of Culture in Social Theory*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 80.
person’. Against these polarities of the analyses, Donati argued that society is not a space containing relations or a field in which relationships and relations occur. The answer for Donati is that society is relations.

Donati conceived of society as constituted in the fabric and tissue of relations. The ‘relation’ is the basic unit, the social fact, and the centre of the analysis and study in relational sociology. Donati indicated that the difference between him and other sociologists who call themselves relational sociologists is that ‘they do not see the sui generis reality of the relations’. For Donati, social reality is social relationality; society does not have relations but is relations. Society is not a construct but a fact of where human beings are in relations.

However, these are social relations that are not reducible to the level of interpersonal relations. Relations are ‘sui generis’ and not the outcome of such features as perceptions, sentiments and intersubjective mental states of empathy. Instead, Donati emphasised that relation is both a symbolic fact (‘a reference to’) and a structural fact (‘a link between’). Although the ‘relation’ comes into ‘life’ through subjects, the subject is not reducible to the relation, and vice versa, relations are not reducible to the subject. Relations however only ‘come alive’ through the interrelating of subjects.

Donati explored this idea of relations by considering the example of a friendship between two people. The friendship does not belong to either of them, although both share and value it, and it requires both to work at it if they value it and wish to maintain and deepen it and enjoy the development in their friendship. Friendship is a relation,
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832 Donati, ‘Birth and Development’, struggled with advancing countervailing arguments and currents of thought. He described the influences that lead him in the direction of his ideas.
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838 Donati stressed that relationality is neither reducible to individuals in the aggregate or to structures. Otherwise, the temptation is to understand relations as mechanical ways of connecting and forget they are a real and an emergent good.
which Donati calls an ‘emergent “relational good” ’.\footnote{Ibid., 203.} Here, there is a recognition of the friends as individual, and yet also relational subjects who generate and enjoy a social reality apart from each other, but together where the relation only derives from both. The relation is real because it is observable by others and it grows and deepens as something real, even though the relation is not tangible.\footnote{Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 56. Donati indicated that we do not see relations, rather, we see relations in a similar way as we see with light.} From this example, Archer and Donati identified the concept of the person as a relational subject, a concept that ‘no longer correspond to the ideal types of individualistic or collectivistic modernity’.\footnote{Ibid., 15–6.}

2.3.2. \textit{Person as a Relational Subject}

The basic thesis of the relational subject is that a subject is social because ‘he/she is relational’ and this relationality places the person as an integral part of a ‘we’, ‘where the “we” is not a super-ordinate entity but … a relation’.\footnote{Ibid., 32.} In their identity, the relational subject is formed by social relationality because they are a ‘subject-in-relation’.\footnote{‘Where social relations are partly constitutive of personhood, whilst allowing they are not exclusively so … such relations should be an expression of the self as relational subject’. Ibid., 56.} A relational subject is a critical factor in any social change, although this is always within the limits of any constraints or external conditions imposed on them. Although many may not accept that it is a driver to building relations with others, such a pivotal point confirms that a relational subject is a human person who is a relational being in their nature.\footnote{Ibid., 54. This resonates with the thinking of both Benedict and Clarke.}

A relational subject is a person who exists only in relations and is constituted by the relations that they care for, along with any other concerns.\footnote{Ibid., 55.} A relational subject still possesses, however, ‘a continuous sense of self and his/her own subjective reflexivity’.\footnote{Ibid., 52.} Further, this is in both time and space, which is where relations are constituted.\footnote{Ibid., 54.} However, their identity separates them from other human beings because their identity is what they know of themselves. From this, they grasp that other people outside themselves are also subjects who make relations.\footnote{Ibid., 54.} This is why when a person

\footnote{There is the external world of nature and the external practical ways of living that can be called culture. Archer defined culture: ‘culture as a whole is taken to refer to all intelligibilia, that is to any item which has the dispositional capacity of being understood by someone’. Archer, \textit{Culture and Agency}, xviii.}
sees ‘an individual “in relation” to others and otherness (people and things), they grasp a “relational I” that not only acts and is involved as Self in these relations, but is itself elaborated (as the Me, the We and the You) in/through/and with these relations’. However, the relational subjects have an identity that is an emergent property but is also at risk of being undermined and damaged to the extent that they cannot create relations, even where they may enter into them to some limited degree. In these instances, the person is not a relational subject. A relational subject requires people who are ‘robust singular selves … [, as] necessary precondition … to form relations’. Without being this sort of person, a ‘human subject’s real, objective capacities for flourishing and liabilities to suffering fade into insignificance’. That is, not all relational human beings in all situations will be or become relational subjects to become active agents of change.

Three ideas may help understand when a human person is a relational subject who is an active agent of change. Though not being a relational subject does not mean they are a lesser type of human person, because for whatever reason they are not an active agent of change. The three concepts explored here explain this. The first insight comes from the concept of ‘morphogenesis’, which Archer used to refer to the idea that social change is mediated through the human person. The second idea recognises that the nature of a person’s inward reflexivity is an indicator of whether they emerge as a relational subject or not. The third is that the person has an ultimate concern orienting them towards becoming a relational subject. The following Sections 2.3.3, 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 explore these issues.

2.3.3. Relational Being, Morphostasis and Morphogenesis

Archer understood morphogenesis as an explanatory term for how the transformation of social and cultural structures is an activity continuously mediated by
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830 Ibid., 54.
831 Note the reality of persons who suffer from physical, developmental, psychological, genetic, accidental or social limitations. L’Arche is creating communities for such persons, where these persons build up to become to a degree more open relational subjects. See Hans S. Reinders, ed., Paradox of Disability: Responses to Jean Vanier and L’Arche Communities from Theology and the Sciences. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2010).
832 ‘When social relations enter into the constitution of the personal identity of whoever is involved … and is one of their constellations of concern … The relational subject does not exist if this not the case’. Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 58.
833 Ibid., 13.
834 Ibid., 6.
835 Archer, ‘Thinking and Theorising about Educational Systems’.
human agency.\textsuperscript{856} The concept of morphogenesis is the key to understanding the activity by which relational subjects change the social order, where any change is visible when contrasted with no change.\textsuperscript{857} In this activity, the people are agents generating a social structure. They also transform themselves to some degree, which occurs within the social transformations they generate.\textsuperscript{858} Where morphogenesis conceptually captures the idea of a ‘society of permanent change, with little room for the stabilization of permanent social forms that can be transmitted from generation to generation’, there is a counterbalance in the idea of morphostasis.\textsuperscript{859}

Morphostasis encompasses that activity or, more logically, inactivity that tends to preserve or keep a system in its current state.\textsuperscript{860} However, both the concepts of morphogenesis and morphostasis require an effort from a human agency, whether it is to generate or sustain social structures. The effort to maintain morphostasis is less dramatic and noticeable, and more so, where the social pressures act to reinforce the effort of human persons to avoid rapid or noticeable social changes. With morphogenesis, the various relationships between parts of the social system only exert causal powers resulting from the efforts of the social agents.\textsuperscript{861} More effort is required to reach morphogenesis, which only occurs through a process that begins with relations because ‘it is through relations that new social forms are generated’.\textsuperscript{862} Thus, morphogenesis appears when the ‘relation involves the reflexivity of subjects, in either the autonomous or meta-reflexive mode, and entails positive feedback, particularly relational feedbacks’.\textsuperscript{863} Morphogenesis has ‘transformatory consequences—however small—for the relational structure of the participant’s network’.\textsuperscript{864} In this sense, change is a constant for the relational subject as an agent and the social structures they generate.

\textsuperscript{856} Archer offers a brief outline of why morphogenesis arose and how it can explain the changes occurring in contemporary society is more important today than it was a century ago or even before the rise of modernity: ‘Modernity starts to be morphogenetic, but leaves enough room for social roles to stabilize, but requires much higher levels of reflexivity. Finally, today, with rapid and incessant change, deep and continuous reflexivity is a sine qua non for survival’. Archer, \textit{Culture and Agency}, xviii.
\textsuperscript{857} Donati observed: ‘I believe that Margaret Archer made a unique and original contribution to sociological knowledge when she proposed the morphogenetic argument as an explanatory conceptual framework for critical realist sociology’. Donati, ‘Relational Sociology’, 103.
\textsuperscript{858} Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 17.
\textsuperscript{859} Ibid., xviii.
\textsuperscript{860} ‘Premodernity is almost exclusively morphostatic, giving the vast majority the time to socialize in stable groups, requiring low reflexivity on life choices which are mostly determined by social role and habit’. Archer, \textit{Culture and Agency}, xviii.
\textsuperscript{861} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{862} Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 30.
\textsuperscript{863} Ibid, 28.
\textsuperscript{864} Ibid., 30–1.
In this way, morphogenesis becomes an unceasing cycle of change through the effects of a person’s social agency, even where the current social structures may condition the agent in the course of their agential actions. Such conditioning has an effect to a degree, although it is still more or less dependent on the nature of the social situations and structures (e.g., family, school, sporting clubs and religious community) in which the person is present as an agent. When interacting with other people who are in that context, there is a ‘development of new structural, cultural and agential forms’ across and through society.\footnote{Donati, ‘Relational Sociology’, 99.} However, morphogenesis occurs only through an individual, relational subject or a collective subject that is ‘relationally constituted’.\footnote{Examples of collective subjects are the couple, the family, a voluntary association, a cooperative, a labour union, a political party, a foundation, a local community and a social movement, each with different relational qualities and causal properties. Donati, ‘“Relational Subject” According to a Critical Realist’, 354.} In its ‘we-ness’, a relational collective subject is a social entity with ‘qualities and powers through their internal and external social relations’.\footnote{Pierpaolo Donati, ‘The “Relational Subject” According to a Critical Realist Relational Sociology’, \textit{Journal of Critical Realism} 15, no. 4 (2016): 352–75, 355.} The emergence of ‘we-ness’ comes from the person who is a relational subject and, thus, an agent of change. This summary indicates that NoCh are the product of human agents’ morphogenesis in their transformation to create a new social subject. Consequently, NoCh are a collective social subject and source of future changes. The remaining two concepts are questions about how an agent of social change moves to act and what moves them to act.

\textbf{2.3.4. Reflexivity of Persons}

The concept of morphogenesis introduces a discussion about what the human person is doing when they are generating or maintaining social relations. This concept requires an examination of the concept of the reflexivity of the person. Associated with this idea is understanding what a person is driving towards in their reflexivity, and this is located in the discussion on the nature of ‘ultimate concerns’ in Section 2.3.5.

Archer argued that the idea of reflexivity only emerged, in sociological terms, during the early nineteenth century.\footnote{‘Although the historical recognition of reflexivity came “early”, its incorporation into sociological thinking was delayed until the late 19th century’. Archer, ‘Reflexivity’, \textit{Sociopedia.isa}, 2013, 1. https://www.isaportal.org/resources/resource/reflexivity/.} Thus, for Archer, Plato and medieval confessional practices are evidence that introspection is a human phenomenon that had
a history before it entered sociology. Archer developed the concept of internal 
reflexivity through field research and theoretical reflection. For Archer, reflexivity 
expresses a way of looking at a person’s activity when the person, in ‘the regular 
exercise of the mental ability, shared by all normal people … [considers] themselves in 
relation to their (social) context and vice versa’. Reflexivity is, for Archer, an internal 
conversation evaluating various proposals, promoting some and subordinating others, 
such that the combination of concerns that a person affirms are also those with which 
they feel they can live with. The conversation is ongoing because the process is 
corrigible (a person may get it wrong, or circumstances may change). The process 
involved in reflexivity makes the singular subjects what they are because, in each 
person, there is ‘an interior dialogue through which a personal identity is forged by 
coming to identify one’s self as the being-with-this-constellation-of-concerns’. 
Through the reflexivity of human persons (i.e., through their conscious and deliberate 
internal conversations), the person comes to mediate the mutual interactions they, as a 
person, experience and engage in with others. Such mutual engagements extend to 
responding to social groups. The reflexivity, however, does not occur within the 
interior of an ‘isolate’, free of the world or ‘outside’ the person because a person always 
encounters constraints.

There are many constraints on personal reflexivity. These may arise from a 
person’s history and status in society, or limits in a person’s natural and other capacities. 
Further, reflexivity is not a single process of an internal conversation but an activity of 
discernment, deliberation and dedication, all of which lead, although not necessarily, to 
a decision for action. In the case of the person holding an internal conversation, it is
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869 Archer references the classical writer Plato arguing “reflexivity is specifically described as a process of personal opinion formation that, since about ‘anything’, could well be about the social”. Ibid., 2.
870 Archer, ‘Reflexivity’.
871 Archer, Making Our Way Through the World, 4.
872 Archer, ‘Reflexivity’, 71.
873 Ibid.
874 Archer, Making Our Way Through the World, 3.
875 ‘Internal conversation’ as the process of mediation “through” which agents respond to social forms—fallibly and corrigibly, but, above all, intentionally and differently—is to attribute three properties to their reflexive deliberations. The “internal conversation” is held to be (a) genuinely interior, (b) ontologically subjective, and (c) causally efficacious”. Archer, Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation, (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 16.
open and outward facing. Nevertheless, this is not always the case when the nature of the various modes of reflexivity is understood.

The formulation of differentiation in modes of reflexivity came from research Archer carried out at Warwick University. She identified four dominant or key modes of reflexivity experienced by a human person: fractured, communicative, autonomous and meta-reflexive. However, she emphasised that there is no single model of reflexivity that is operative or dominant all the time, or active in every situation or context that a person finds themselves in, or even when the person draws on their capacity for some degree of interior reflexivity to meet a problem or difficulty in a new or current situation. Furthermore, two of the four modes of reflexivity do not appear to lead to action, such as when a person’s dominant mode of reflexivity is either fractured or communicative. In these instances, there is less of a possibility for the generation of social structures. However, when the other two are present there is a possibility for action, leading to the generation of social structures.

When operating with ‘fractured’ reflexivity, Archer argued that a person is a person whose ‘internal conversation cannot lead to purposeful course of action but only intensify personal distress and disorientation’. In a sense, there is no sustained reflexivity in operation because the process and thoughts are considered too scattered to hold a meaningful level of reflexivity. This is often the same in external conversations or unfamiliar social situations. Conversely, communicative reflexivity occurs when some coherent internal thought generates conversations and ideas that ‘need to be confirmed and completed by others before leading to action’.
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877 Ibid., chapters 6–9.
878 This research involved students at Warwick University and others from the Coventry, England. See also the trilogy published by Archer: Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation; Making Our Way Through the World; Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity.
879 ‘People’s modes of inner dialogue can be very different and empirical work confirmed the practice of four distinctive modalities … Reflexivity is not homogeneous, and the dominant mode varies with the subject’s “context” (with especial importance attaching to its “continuity”, “discontinuity”, or “incongruity”) in conjunction with the subject’s ultimate “concerns” (with particular importance attaching to their compatibility or incompatibility with natal social backgrounds). Each mode has very different external (aggregate) consequences for the individual subject (e.g., distinctive patterns of social mobility …) and for quite different parts of civil society. “Communicatives” principally invest themselves in the family, thus making a huge contribution to social cohesion; “Autonomous” subjects devote themselves strenuously to the market and contribute most to economic development; and “Meta-reflexives” promote social transformation by gravitating towards employment in the non-profit sector’. Archer, ‘Reflexivity’, 2.
880 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 143, footnote 43.
881 Ibid
882 Ibid.
requiring action, they give the other these ideas and then experience a tentative wait to see if the other agrees with the ideas or rejects them.\textsuperscript{883} People engaging in communicative reflexivity often generate little more than an exchange of ideas with others who often share the same view or are in the same framework of thinking. Therefore, there is little or no reflection among the people regarding matters outside them as a circle of significant others. There is nothing different occurring from that which usually occurs within the person’s cultural or social group. For example, a group may include a family situation where communicative reflexivity is adequate for sustaining the family’s relationships. The possibility of generating actions that challenge the situation or taking actions apart from the others is unlikely.\textsuperscript{884} However, social actions can occur when the dominant mode of a person (or person) is either autonomous or meta-reflexive.

The act of moving from internal reflection to social actions is more likely to come from those people who exercise autonomous reflexivity or meta-reflexivity. Autonomous reflexivity arises when a person’s internal conversations are self-contained and lead directly to actions, even though such actions do not extend beyond the person’s social group. Autonomous reflexivity is robust for stimulating the person to meet their own interests with activity that usually does not lead to anything transformative in social terms.\textsuperscript{885} For example, the reflexivity might mean the person achieves acts to meet their desires. However, when the person considers how to achieve a goal, even when they operate with an active and openly outwards reflexivity, the person with autonomous reflexivity only relies on their own actions to reach what they desire. In part, this either arises due to a lack of self-awareness of their own relationality or attempting to ignore or even suppress their relationality where it is likely to hinder their actions. Knowing the degree and type of reflexivity a person adopts when engaging with others indicates an answer to what extent and how a person is a relational subject.\textsuperscript{886}

However, a person in the meta-reflexivity mode is a person whose internal reflexivity places them apart from others. The person as a meta-reflexive works out their possible course of conduct by engaging in an ‘internal conversation’. Archer noted how

\textsuperscript{883} Ibid., 143-146
\textsuperscript{884} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{885} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{886} ‘Everyone is a reflexive being. This means we deliberate about our circumstances in relation to ourselves and, in the light of these deliberations, we determine our own personal course of action in society’. Archer, \textit{Structure, Agency, and the Internal Conversation}, 167. However, not everyone is necessarily in a meta-reflexive mode.
people with this characteristic in the research group included those ‘who cite as the source for their values, “my church” or “my faith”’, which demonstrates how this mode differs from the other modes.\textsuperscript{887} Meta-reflexivity describes those internal conversations that ‘critically evaluate previous inner dialogues and are critical about effective action in society’.\textsuperscript{888} The marked difference is that the person is reflecting on the why, wherefore and any course of action they might contemplate and their relationships with others who might become drawn into any action.\textsuperscript{889} Contemplating how to engage with others is an important aspect of this conversation because it is a reflection on those people, the relationships that exist and others around them and how they may shape or support a proposed course of action.\textsuperscript{890}

A meta-reflexive person lives in a context that shapes but does not determine them while they engage to reshape that context.\textsuperscript{891} Even when the person and their history does not enable them to engage in meta-reflexive thinking, for the most part, their history or context does not prevent meta-reflexivity. A person may experience some social event(s), arrangements, or ordering that lead them to consider what, if anything, is to be done to change what is occurring. Because of this drive to seek change, meta-reflexivity is particularly significant as a form of relational reflexivity for the person. The meta-reflexive person cherishes ideals that are vital and central to their lives. Their reaction to the outcome of their internal conversation about an ideal occurs to try and ‘live up to it, even though they feel they fall short of what is required of them’. In this way, they strive for self-transcendence and social transcendence.\textsuperscript{892} The discussion about meta-reflexivity illustrates the change that the steps in CIV 5 capture. The concept further strengthens the importance of understanding how people who grasp

\textsuperscript{887} Margaret S. Archer, \textit{Making Our Way Through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility}, (Cambridge; CUP 2007), 230.

\textsuperscript{888} Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 143.

\textsuperscript{889} Donati offered an example of a musician reflecting on her personal performance and trying to evaluate her performance within the performance of the orchestras; if she only thinks about herself, then: she will seek her personal model of perfection and nothing more (autonomous reflexivity). If she thinks about her contribution as a function of the orchestra, she will seek her best “adaptation” to the orchestra’s performance (communicative reflexivity). If, instead, she reflects on/in/with the orchestra’s performance and on how this performance can be improved in the event that the musicians relate to each other in a different way, she will seek to alter the performance of the orchestra as a whole, that is, she will seek to produce a different emergent effect which is to say, a more satisfying performance of the orchestra. In this latter case, we can speak of meta-reflexivity. Donati, ‘ “Relational Subject” According to a Critical Realist, 354.

\textsuperscript{890} Donati, Relational Sociology, 199.

\textsuperscript{891} Archer, \textit{Making our Way Through the World}, 230-1. This paragraph draws heavily on Archer’s research and theoretical development of the concept of differing ‘reflexives’.

\textsuperscript{892} Archer, \textit{Making our Way Through the World}, 231.
the logic of the Love of God respond to it through social actions. However, the how are the respective modes dominant in different social settings?

The answer lies in how each mode of reflexivity (except fractured reflexivity because it generally encompasses people who are in a crisis or under some form of a disability) operates in the varied social settings. Communicative reflexivity allows the person to operate in a social context that is continuous or ongoing due to its stability and lack of significant disruptions. For example, a family where each member is close to the others, and there is stability in the routine of their personal and collective forms of living. On the other hand, the autonomous reflexive person handles discontinuity in their social and personal context. They have a single-mindedness in their internal conversations, which are often about work and the future. The key here is self-reliance. In broad terms, Archer concluded that a person who is autonomous reflexive seizes the gift of an opportunity and goes with its logic to find ways to achieve the goals they have for themselves. This is the case in those who act, without others, to take up the chances that contemporary society offers them. Archer argued that the category of meta-reflexivity is the key to the generation of social goods that are relational goods; for example, NoCh.

Archer’s research on meta-reflexivity concluded that this category captures those human agents who conceive of an idea or project that needs advancing and then act, with others, to try to achieve it and create a change in society. The people who operate in the mode of meta-reflexivity are distinctive. A distinction comes from the ‘importance they attach to living up to an ideal’. Although these people live in a context full of incongruities that they work on and direct their actions to address, they are a group for whom ‘it is not possible to have a genuine concern and to do nothing about it’. Thus, it is necessary to do something if one is to become a relational subject and an agent of social change. People who live in their dominant mode either autonomous or meta-reflexive or even both, offer a key to understanding how the human being is an agent in generating the morphogenetic cycle of social change and drivers of engaging with the world. In this mode, the human person is the active agent in modifying the social order, although only to the extent that any constraints allow. Donati took this

893 Ibid., 194.
894 Archer, Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity, chapter 5. See also Archer, Making Our Way Through the World, 192–228.
895 Ibid., 231–32.
896 Ibid., 230.
897 Ibid., 231.
discussion further when he noted that the people who generate such relations are the ones with the ideas about what they are doing and why and how the activity ‘would make them happier’. They are people who care about the outcome, no matter how small or limited it is. Thus, what they care about is a concern, even if there are many concerns.

Nevertheless, Donati insisted that there is always an ultimate concern. What does it mean to have an ultimate concern? How does a person come to know their ultimate concern? How do they clarify, maintain and renew any concerns as ultimate concerns? How do people balance their concerns arising from each order of reality (natural, practical and social)? This question is explored in Section 2.3.5.

2.3.5. **Ultimate Concerns**

Though many limitations (cultural, social, and economic) surround a person, whether from their upbringing, family or native capacities and powers, ultimate concerns are what a human person grasps as true for themselves arising from the internal conversation held within themselves. While ultimate concerns only arise from within the person, the stimulus comes from the person’s engagement with the instructions, advice, suggestions, visions and ways of thinking they receive when undergoing their education, experiences of mentoring and general formation. Different influences come from factors such as the degree of engagement with others in a person’s immediate or broader cultural and social milieu or where a person decides on a *modus vivendi* for what is vital to them and their lives.

Archer observed that this is because ultimate concerns ‘are commitments which are constitutive of who we are and the basis of our personal identities. It is only in light of our “ultimate concerns” that our actions are intelligible’. An ultimate concern is
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An ultimate concern is something a person must consider when working through a series of practical and concrete steps for a chosen project of action. The ultimate concern of a person shapes a person’s identity. A broader understanding at the social level of what an ultimate concern means for a person comes from considering its origins as a concept.

Archer referenced two thinkers in her thinking on this concept: Harry G. Frankfurt (Frankfurt) and Alasdair Macintyre (Macintyre). However, she did not discuss these thinkers beyond quoting them as definitions. She observed that Frankfurt defined that an ultimate concern occurs when a person ‘not only … [cares] about following a particular course of action which he is constrained to follow. He also cares about caring about it’. Therefore, an ultimate concern presses itself on the person almost to the point of self-recklessness. Note that an ultimate concern is not the same as desiring or wishing for something, no matter how pressing these may appear to be at a particular moment. Often, it is only upon further reflection that these desires and wishes are put into perspective. Usually, competing concerns require integration and prioritisation if life is not a prolonged sense of failing to achieve anything. Archer referenced Macintyre’s discussion about the internal good as that which a person most cares about. In After Virtue, Macintyre related internal goods to ‘practices’, which link to virtues. Douglas Porpora (Porpora), a relational sociologist in the school of Archer and Donati, located a different source for the idea of an ultimate concern.

904 ‘It forms the organising principle around which all else should be integrated’. Archer, Making Our Way Through the World, 155. However, Archer noted there will always be tension for those with an understanding of their concern and the context in which it is lived out in the world.

905 Archer, Making our Way through the World, 7.

906 ‘Our ultimate concerns are definitive of us in that what our commitments “keep us from violating are not our duties or our obligation but ourselves”—this is precisely what I am calling our personal identities’. Archer, Reflexive Imperative in Late Modernity, 103.


908 Frankfurt, Importance of What We Care About, 87.

909 Macintyre, After Virtue, 189. ‘The internal goods are those which result from an extended attempt to show how Wittgenstein’s dictum the human body is the best picture of the human soul’. Macintyre, After Virtue, 178e.

910 ‘By a “practice” I am going to mean any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realised in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended’. Macintyre, After Virtue, 187.

Porpora located the concept in Tillich’s *Dynamics of Faith*, where Tillich defined ‘religion as an ultimate concern’. Moreover, Tillich understood that faith encompasses non-religious faith, which is no less of an ultimate concern because an ultimate concern is ‘an act of the total personality. It is the most centered act of the human mind … [because] it participates in the dynamics of personal life.’ Further, ‘the dynamics of faith are the dynamics of man’s ultimate concern’. According to this definition, all people are religious, with the only difference being the object of their worship. Porpora developed the concept further and proposed that an ultimate concern is close to a moral purpose with an emotional or spiritual call to which we respond. He defined an ultimate concern as ‘what we care about, what we love’. He offered a note of caution because the reality is that while many may have something they care about that they love, such as a family, this may be a concern that does not reach the point of becoming an overarching point for a person’s life; one which is insufficient to unify their lives. These reflections provoke the question: what is the nature of an ultimate concern?

Archer observed that an ultimate concern is where ‘there is a cognitive judgement about its inherent worth, which is always fallible … [and] there is a deep emotional attachment to it’. Further, ultimate concerns emerge through a person’s reflexivity and internal dialogue, including what impinges them from outside that shape
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912 Clarke, *Person and Being*, 55, referenced Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*.(Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989) where he stated that to ask the question ‘who are you?’ is also to ask, ‘what do you stand for?'; that is, to ask ‘what is your ultimate concern?’

913 Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*, 5. ‘Faith as ultimate concern is an act of the total personality. It is the most centered act of the human mind … it participates in the dynamics of personal life’. Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*, 5. See also Paul Tillich, *Christianity and the Encounter of World Religions*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), 6, where he defined religion as ‘the state of being grasped by an ultimate concern which qualifies all other concerns’. An interesting aspect of Tillich’s definition is the development in the USA’s jurisprudence of the concept of ultimate concern: see Kent Greenwalt, Religion and the Constitution, Vol. 1 of Free Exercise and Fairness, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).132–33.


918 Ibid.

their concerns. Such reflexivity and dialogue determine the ultimate concerns and orientate the person in developing a hierarchy of concerns because not all concerns are equal. The ultimate concern becomes what is most encompassing or fundamental to a person and how they perceive their way of going forward in the world.

Thus, the next step for a person is to determine what they want to put their effort into, including how they envisage what they need to do as essential. There is nothing in this to say that an ultimate concern is necessarily of a high order. A person’s reflexivity is limited to the three orders of reality, and a person's highest ‘ultimate concern’ may not reach very high. Ultimately, a person’s ultimate concern is a matter of what that person knows and cares about and how much they care about it. A person who knows their ultimate concern can be overwhelmed by many other things, such as a desire for companionship. Porpora questioned whether a person could have an ultimate concern for ‘the plight of the oppressed’. This question can be reframed: can a person have an ultimate concern for the love of the other to the point of self-gift?

Archer reflected that an ultimate concern emerges from a person’s relations with transcendent reality. She proposed that transcendent reality is no less objective than the other orders of reality. Moreover, love is one of those transcendent concerns, which, when ignored, is damaging for all people because one of the concerns closely tied to a person’s flourishing as a human person is love. She argued that love is

920 ‘Conversely, a more robust concept of the self would allow that a person has become something of what she is through her (unmediated) experiences of reality: through interacting with nature (as in teaching oneself to swim), through developing practical skills (a solo mountaineer learning hand and footholds) and through experiencing transcendence (as in solitary contemplative prayer). She will also have become something of a different person in the process, in ways that have not depended upon a detour through society’s conversation. Moreover, if any of the above experiences come to feature among her “ultimate concerns”, they will have served to shape her personal identity. In turn, how she reflexively reacts to face-to-face encounters and the “positionings” others attempt to assign her will also be different. All of her actions and attitudes, including the reasons she gives for her acceptances, rejections or variations upon the “positionings” proffered to her, will not be explicable within the confines of the small group itself—or even within “society” at all’. Archer, ‘Concept of the Person as the Gift of Society’, 322.
921 Porpora, ‘Human Project’, 163.
924 CIV 53
925 Ibid.
926 ‘What difference is made if our relations with transcendent reality are introduced? Those who hold that they have justifiable beliefs in the existence of God also consider that they have good reasons for holding relations between humanity and divinity to be as ineluctable as those pertaining between humankind and the other orders of reality’. Archer, ‘Persons and Ultimate Concerns’, 272.
indispensable based on her belief that God is Love.  

928 Love is an ultimate concern because the transcendence of God as Love shapes a person in that ‘relations formed in transcendental space react back upon the world, to which they are not conformed, by sanctifying it. From these relations ripple out concentric circles of unconditional love’.  

929 God’s Love is unconditional and formative. What a person cares about most, when recognised and accepted, is love.

Archer observed that ‘how we respond by loving back (with all our heart, soul, strength and mind) … determines its effect upon our identities’.  

930 A person who prioritises their concerns in this way is, drawing on Augustine’s idea of loving ‘in due order’.  

931 Therefore, a person’s ultimate concern shapes their identity and directs their way of addressing it and the manner of living it; however, Archer noted that this is not easy.  

932 She reflected that:

‘the struggle of those who have put their transcendental commitment first is that they thereby seek to subordinate all three of their naturalistic concerns to it: their physical well-being, performative achievement and social self-worth. Those who try to respond more and more freely to God’s unconditional love feel drawn to live in conformity with this supreme good, which explicitly means not being conformed to the world. Their struggle is always understood in the Christian tradition as the battle between the two Kingdoms of heaven and earth or, by extension of the military metaphor, as the battle lines between the ‘two standards’ in St Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises. In our own terms, it is the antinomy between transfiguring theosis and both the anthropocentricism of ‘Modernity’s Man’ and the socio-centricism of ‘Society’s Being’’.  

933
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928 ‘My argument is based on the belief that God is love—the quintessence of unconditional love. That is what He offers us by His nature. To defend my case, I thus have to adduce some indispensable human concern that hinges upon our relations with transcendent reality, namely one which it is universally damaging for us to ignore and one which is intimately related to our flourishing. There seems to be every reason to advance love itself as this concern. As an emotional commentary, love also signals the most profound human concern in that our fulfilment depends upon our need to love and to be loved. It has been debated since antiquity what makes this particular emotion different from others. The answer seems to lie neither in its intentionality nor in its cognitive or evaluative characteristics, but quite simply in its indispensability’, Archer, ‘Persons and Ultimate Concerns’, 273.

929 Archer, ‘Models of Man’, 80.


931 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 132.

932 ‘Though the idea that all human beings do so is not asserted. Not least because there is a proportion of the wider population which experiences “fractured” reflexivity, as there is a proportion of the community that tend only to engage at the level of “communicative reflexivity”. Archer, ‘Persons and Ultimate Concerns’, 278. Archer’s research has suggested this is a roughly equal proportion for all types of reflexivity. Further, note that not all ‘autonomous’ and ‘meta-reflexives’ achieve their ‘vision’ of meeting their ultimate concerns. See also Archer, Making Our Way in the World, chapters 4–7.

933 Archer, ‘Persons and Ultimate Concerns’, 278.
When faced with this tension, Archer concluded that the human person is capable of a ‘transformative creativity, derived from the response of human persons to unconditional love that forever holds open the door to the two Kingdoms becoming one’.\footnote{Ibid., 283.} This argument enables one to consider how transformative creativity is one of the fruits of those who accept the call in CIV 5, to create NoCh.

Further, the option Benedict formulates in CIV 5, was expressed well by Archer when she observed that ‘if seeking to be conformed to unconditional love is the ultimate concern, it will be more formative of our way of being-in-the-world than any other naturalistic commitment’.\footnote{ Ibid.} Benedict noted that being conformed to love is a need if the person is ‘to love God and his neighbour as Christ himself Loves’.\footnote{Benedict XVI, ‘General Audience’. The Holy See. 24 November 2010. http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2010/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20101124.html.} The dissertation reads CIV 5, as identifying how people who know God’s Love can enter into a transcendental reality leading to a transformation. This transformation does not override their will or personhood but transforms them in giving a response to God’s Love so that it becomes a person’s ultimate concern, which is to receive and give love. The person or people can thus reach their ultimate concern by cooperating with the creation of NoCh as instruments of love. This ultimate concern answers Benedict’s call because a person’s answer to the call in CIV 5 is to return such love as a response to God’s Love. Thus, they demonstrate how they love others and to know their love shapes them as much as it shapes others.

2.3.6. Conclusion

Part 2 moved from the theological to the metaphysical to the sociological to understand the human person as a relational being. It can be argued as the material in the preceding Sections demonstrate that a relational being is the creative ‘force’ for transforming and renewing the culture that CIV calls for. There is common ground between the three disciplines in understanding the human person as a relational being. Ratzinger’s identification of the ‘we-ness’ that builds the earthly and heavenly city remains abstract. Although still at an abstract level, Clarke understood the human person as a ‘being-in-communion’ with the capacity to form human bonds that can coalesce into viable and authentic communities, creating social realities rooted in the communion
of love. In Archer and Donati’s relational sociology, the relational subject emerges as a human subject, a person as a relational being, with the power to initiate and instantiate changes in social structures and create new social realities—NoCh. Given that relational subjects are agents of social change, the related question is: what are the fruits of the activity in shaping social change when relational subjects act on their ultimate concerns? Section 2.4 discusses this topic and considers relational goods as the ‘fruits’ of the actions of relational subjects.

2.4. Relational Goods and Networks of Charity

In Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 the argument is that the human person is a relational being and the author of social realities. Section 2.4 aims to demonstrate that it is central to the call in CIV 5, to understand that the human person is more than a monad or automaton; instead, they are a relational being capable of entering into a relationship with God and others. Moreover, this new relationship enables them to respond to the call made by Benedict to form communities that give signs of God’s love and so become a source of social and cultural renewal. In Section 2.4, the argument is that the relationship between people formed with their knowledge of God’s Love produces a social reality: an instrument of grace and NoCh.

This dissertation argues that CIV 5 is more fully understood when NoCh are seen as the fruits of a relationship with God and a commitment by people in that relationship to give themselves as instruments of God’s Love for others. Understanding NoCh as communities in this way raises questions about whether they are more than a bundle of intimate interpersonal relationships. Such relationships occur between friends on social occasions, when there is a shared common interest in exercising skills, such as in an orchestra or sporting club, or when there is a religious ideal with a social character of no great depth. If NoCh are to be a way of life in faith Ratzinger called for before becoming Pope and which call Benedict continued to make, it is necessary to examine their social identity for NoCh to have a social meaning. This examination in Section 2.4 explores the concept of relational goods in Donati and Archer’s relational sociology.

937 Clarke, *Person and Being*, 78–9.
938 ‘We must offer ways for a socialization of faith so that faith will form communities, offer vital spaces and convince people through a way of thought, affection and lively friendship’. Benedict, ‘Meeting with Diocesan Clergy of Aosta’.
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The exploration considers relational goods, how the concept arose, what the idea means and how it can help understand NoCh as addressing a renewal of the social order.

2.4.1. Relational Goods

The concept of relational goods as goods of relationships emerged towards the end of the twentieth century during the discussion about the nature of economic goods of a non-tangible nature. Relational sociology argued that relations and relationships are central to generating social entities that are more than relationships, such as between friends. Benedetto Gui (Gui) quoted Martha Nussbaum (Nussbaum) as defining relational goods as ‘friendship, reciprocal love and civil engagement’ where the relationship constitutes these goods until the relationship ends. Gui identified these as ‘non-material goods’ that cannot be enjoyed individually but are ‘tied to interpersonal relations’.

An economist, Carol Uhlaner (Uhlaner) suggested that relational goods require mutual agreements and only ‘exist after a person and non-arbitrary others have taken appropriate joint actions’. Archer developed the concept further and argued that relational goods are the social reality of ‘relationships linking those involved and are wholly reliant on the endurance of their bonding’. Donati insisted that the concept encompasses ‘those immaterial entities that consist of social relations that emerge from [the] subjects’ reflexivity that is oriented toward producing and enjoying together in a shared manner, a good they could not obtain otherwise’. He referenced de Tocqueville’s concept of the ‘art of association’, in Democracy in America, which, he
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940 Bruni, ‘Relational Goods’, 175. Bruni writes that ‘Nussbaum used the expression “relational good” differently from Gui, defined friendship, reciprocal love and civil engagement … where the relationship constitutes the good: they are born and die with the relationship itself’.
943 Archer, ‘Critical Realism and Relational Sociology’, 203. Donati developed the concept of relational good on the basis of his relational sociology paradigm proposed in his Introduzione alla sociologia relazionale. See also Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 203–9.
944 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 213.
argued, is a civic version of relational goods.\textsuperscript{945} However, Donati held that the current idea of relational goods is more extensive and refined than de Tocqueville’s concept of associations.\textsuperscript{946} Not least because relational goods is a wider concept in capturing not only association with a possible visible expression (for example a corporation et al) but includes relationships such as friendship and marriage which are not visible in the same way.

These definitions recognise that relational goods are neither visible nor tangible. That is, even when those in the relationship have a visibility, the relationship is not.\textsuperscript{947} For example, Donati highlighted the observable difference between harmony and happiness in one family and conflict and violence in another family, as instances of where relations are visible.\textsuperscript{948} The same holds for a married couple, where no external markers or badges identify the marriage, but there are signs they are a couple who have ‘relations, which themselves remain unseen’.\textsuperscript{949} Using such external signs makes it possible to identify a relation between people, note how it develops, understand its history, and observe how the people alter the relationship and undergo a transformation.\textsuperscript{950} Another example of a visible relation is when listening to a performance of musicians who, in their harmony, skill and unity, generate beauty, which poor or fragmentary performances cannot generate.\textsuperscript{951} Thus, the fruit of the individual players’ efforts to learn and keep this skill when performing with others creates a relational good. However, this has no substance beyond the performance, unlike a marriage. A marriage is a relational good across time, with a history and, hopefully, a future, although it does not exist after a separation.

\textsuperscript{945} Ibid., 200. An early understanding of the significance and importance of the art of association is in Alexis de Tocqueville, \textit{Democracy in America}, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000), who summarised his understanding of the nature of the local association during early USA history. He recognised their democratic structure and how they drew on a high degree of participation of those involved and had a ‘bottom-up’ orientation towards problems and challenges.

\textsuperscript{946} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{948} Ibid., 62–5.

\textsuperscript{949} Ibid., 56.

\textsuperscript{950} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{951} Ibid., 60–1. Joseph Ratzinger, ‘Message to the Communion and Liberation (CL) Meeting at Rimini (24–30 August 2002)’. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20020824_ratzi nger-cl-rimini_en.html, (accessed April 15, 2018). In this Message he wrote about an unforgettable experience he had at a Bach concert in Munich:

I was sitting next to the Lutheran Bishop Hanselmann. When the last note of one of the great Thomas-Kantor-Cantatas triumphantly faded away, we looked at each other spontaneously and right then we said: ‘Anyone who has heard this, knows that the faith is true’.
These examples reveal that there are conditions relating to the emergence of relational goods. First, they only emerge over time. Second, other conditions are needed. One such condition is that the relations between the associates need to be symmetrical because there is no hierarchy in the relationship. Further, the parties involved need to be free and responsible, with motivations that are non-instrumental and do not have a mercantile rationale. Finally, relational goods do not emerge in conditions of anonymity because a person’s identity needs to be open to the other as the mutual interactions refer to the other.

Further, the parties must commit to and work within the reciprocity rule in the relationship, giving the other what they need when they need it, leading to total sharing. A passive acceptance of the other’s wishes does not meet the requirement for a positive engagement within their relationship. Relational goods do not emerge by accident, and it is impossible to drift into a relational good. Last, the emergence of relational goods is not spontaneous because the persons’ relational reflexivity needs to be in the meta-reflexive mode if anything like a relational good is to emerge. Even when there is an expectation that an interaction between people may lead to a relational good, not every interaction may result in a relational good. Thus, a prayer group does not necessarily lead to a relational good; however, if the prayer group develops some form of communal sharing that leads to a more systemic religious life, then a relational good may emerge. Only a closer examination of the interactions between people clarifies whether relational goods are likely to emerge.

Examining the relationships between relational subjects and their generation of relational goods helps understand the nature of these goods, although this may not be clear in all instances of relationships. For example, what is clear about a couple who are in a marriage of many years is not so clear when examining collaborative teamwork in a research project or the commonality among those working in an academic discipline across a network of institutions. The complexities of what is happening in such a set of relations do not exclude such groups from becoming social subjects that generate relational goods. However, such a relational good will have a more complex character because there are differences in how relational goods arise within such examples.

Donati argued that the nature of the relational good is neither an expression of ‘certain qualities and causal properties’ belonging to a person nor the product of

952 Donati and Archer, *Relational Subject*, 198.
953 Ibid., 211–21.
‘collective factors’, such as ‘civic culture’.\textsuperscript{954} Instead, Donati claimed that the nature of a relational good arises from ‘an emergent effect generated by the qualities and causal properties of reciprocal actions among subjects’.\textsuperscript{955} That is, it is the outcome of a process of social morphogenesis.\textsuperscript{956} Further, the nature of such an effect is that it is neither replaced nor exchanged but only withers away. Relational goods, if they are to emerge, need reflexive subjects within their concrete context, which is also a favourable context to the generation of relational goods in the social world. The ‘good’ that emerges meets the fundamental needs of each person’s sociability and the group's needs.\textsuperscript{957} However, this occurs in a social world inhabited by non-relational bodies, such as strictly public goods and purely private goods.\textsuperscript{958}

Relational goods are social in their presence in society and more so where the community is shaping their social and geographical space. This shaping contributes to reordering the social, economic and political spheres for better or worse. The higher the level of relational goods of varying types in contemporary society is an outcome of a world with a higher degree of social mobility than in previous times and greater personal freedom to enter relationships than was possible in pre-modern societies.\textsuperscript{959}

Further, some feedback will still affect the subjects themselves, whether the outcome of an interaction between relational subjects is a relational good or a relational evil. One necessary consequence is that the subjects creating the relational good are also subject to feedback from the emergence of the relational good. That is, there is an effect on the people and the social environments in which they live.\textsuperscript{960} Such an effect gives relational goods a democratic character because they generate feedback to the people who are the authors of this new good. A democratic character which accompanies the emergence of a relational good for emergence requires the participants’ involvement to some degree. A failure of a significant number to be involved means there is no basis for the entity being a relational subject. The term ‘non-democratic’ describes where the process of interaction between people within a social entity is driven from the top

\textsuperscript{954} Donati, ‘Discovering the Relational Goods, 239.
\textsuperscript{955} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{956} Donati, ‘Manifesto for a Critical Realist Relational Sociology’.
\textsuperscript{957} Bruni, ‘Relational Goods’, 176; Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 211–13.
\textsuperscript{958} Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 209–11. A ‘strictly public good’ incudes nationalised services or goods such as water or electricity. A ‘strictly private good’ describes the same goods when in private hands. In both instances, the services and functions do not change, only the ownership.
\textsuperscript{959} Ibid., 174. Bruni, ‘Relational Goods’, 174, noted these could not have existed before modernity.
\textsuperscript{960} Donati and Archer, \textit{Relational Subject}, 31.
(bureaucratic) or from below (anarchistic). In both these instances, the outcome will not be a relational good constituted through relations that all enjoy but none own.

Thus, it is non-democratic to deny, hinder or undermine the relational nature of the association. With their democratic character, relational goods are distinguishable from bureaucratic organisations operating through commands. Donati distinguished these from bureaucratic organisations to emphasise that relational goods are neither closed nor particularistic, unlike closed bodies, such as the mafia and political lobbyists. Donati used the idea of the art of association to demonstrate the need for openness in relational goods. This idea indicates that relational goods are born in ‘lifeworlds’ with an organic character derived from their origin and development bearing the mark of fraternity.

Even where relational goods operate within a hierarchy of responsibilities and service, they still retain a democratic or participative character. Their structures do not have a basis in either caste or privilege because each reflects a distribution of power. Where relational goods are not the property of anyone, the relational good requires everyone to sustain it and maintain its democratic character. Conversely, the bureaucratic desire is to control the relations as if they are a machine. Macintyre stated that there are ‘only two alternative modes of social life open to us, one in which the free and arbitrary choices of individuals are sovereign and one in which the bureaucracy is sovereign, precisely so that it may limit the free and arbitrary choices of individuals’. The choice is between the state’s bureaucratic rationality or the corporation’s desire for profit, where both hide the individualism of self-interest. The promotion of the good and achievements of its mission occurs through the ongoing reflexivity of those involved collectively to the degree that it is possible. The good is a benefit to the broader society. A benefit that is due, in part, to it having neither an instrumental nature nor a limitation of the purpose of what it offers. Any limitation on any benefit for the
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961 Ibid., 200.
962 Ibid. See De Tocqueville, Democracy in America.
965 Ibid., 26–36.
community is no more than a restriction that may arise from the relational subjects’ activities operating in a meta-reflexive mode. Relational goods are not a social reality that sits between the public and private worlds. They are rather goods of human sociability found in private and public spaces, although they are neither private nor public goods.

Conversely, if the social entity under consideration is limited to a particular purpose, it is not a relational good as in the case of the private world of a corporation. However, a relational good is not going to emerge if the social entity is ‘closed’. Donati offered the example of the mafia as a ‘closed’ entity. These entities, while present in contemporary society, are not relational goods.

2.4.2. Relational Goods as Networks of Charity

Section 2.4.2 explains that NoCh are relational goods in a postmodern society and then reflects on what this means for understanding NoCh. Benedict indirectly addressed this question in DCE when he highlighted the need for people working in Catholic charitable organisations to have love. Rowland rephrased this when identifying that what Catholic organisations need is holiness, not better management.

Although holiness is not a definitional quality of a relational good, holiness can arise when the relations between the participants are open and democratic in the common interest of serving the other without reward through self-gift. The logic of the movement in CIV 5, and 5.6, in particular, produces a vision of the procession of relational subjects, aiming to generate new relational subjects in NoCh. These become communities where the gift of self leads to people living and serving others in love. This does not mean that the practices of a relational good when undertaking services to the poor in simple charity terms differs from pre-modern times—the poor still need to be fed and clothed, and the dead need to be buried.
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968 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 203.
969 Donati, Transcending Modernity, 91, offered the example of the mafia. I add two other examples: the North American Man/Boy Love Association in the USA and the Paedophile Information Exchange in the United Kingdom (UK).
970 Where they arise NoCh have the character of primary and secondary relational goods. Primary, because friendships will form, and secondary, because their size and distribution will prevent having a significant intersubjective character, except for a few people who work closely together in coordinating or ‘leadership’.
971 See Benedict, DCE, Part II, 19-39. Note the title is: ‘Caritas, The Practice of Love by the Church as a ‘Community of Love’
972 Rowland, ‘Catholic Education’. See also DCE, part II.
Does the human person exemplify a person who is the object of God’s Love, which is where Benedict placed the origin of the gift of Love from Christ? Benedict stressed that God’s Love is creative and redemptive. Love leads the subject to fulfil the task from hearing the call. Moreover, hearing this, the person does not sit waiting for the gift to continue to flow; instead, they accept the invitation (and it is an invitation, not a command) to change into a self-gift, where the change or transformation is only possible through responding to the love given. The response to love changes the human person who is a subject of charity, and from this change, NoCh emerge to become the source of actions that change and renew the world. The capacity and power for renewal come from knowing the experience of love, which generates the ability and strength to act in that love. Thus, NoCh are the fruits of the Trinitarian cycle of Love operating in the human person who enters into the meta-reflexivity mode and seeks to reach and fulfil or realise the ultimate concern of loving the other. This is where, as Benedict stated in his 2013 Lenten message (his last), ‘the Christian life consists in continuously scaling the mountain to meet God and then coming back down, bearing the love and strength drawn from him, so as to serve our brothers and sisters with God’s own Love.’ However, this work is only fruitful because the person knows that ‘everything begins from the humble acceptance of faith (“knowing that one is loved by God”) but has to arrive at the truth of charity (“knowing how to love God and neighbour”)’. Thus, the minimum necessary act for a person to become a relational subject is that the person, as a subject, is ‘capable of relationality and love’ to accept responsibility for acting. Moreover, with this, a person becomes an instrument of grace that, at its most superficial level, opens God’s Love to move through one human person (myself) to the other within NoCh.

NoCh are not accidental social entities; they are genuine, have their own properties and powers beyond their originators and arise from people who experience
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974 ‘Its source is the wellspring of the Father’s love for the Son, in the Holy Spirit. Love comes down to us from the Son’. CIV 5.
975 Ibid.
976 Ibid.
977 Ibid., 7.
978 Ibid., 21. ‘Without trust and love for what is true there is no social conscience and responsibility’.
979 See Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 26. ‘…introduces us into the dynamic circle of trinitarian love that not only unites subject and object but even brings individual subjects together without depriving them of their individuality’.
980 Benedict, ‘Lent 2013’.
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983 See Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 128–29, footnote 11, 129.
an overwhelming desire to act. They are real, shape and create new realities and always affect society, although NoCh cannot be understood in social, political or economic terms. Instead, people in NoCh generate a more profound sense of themselves and the other as loved. People grasp how they can transform their situation as a reflexive human person through love. NoCh are relational goods that emerge when people exercise their meta-reflexivity in response to the Trinity’s creative Love. People in the image of God are free to exercise their relationality with others for a common concern. Social entities that are for loving the other, giving witness to the world of this love and rescuing the human subject from obliteration renew the cultural, social and economic order. CIV 5.7, is confirmed as a call for Christians to take up this fundamental call for creating NoCh as social communities of faith. Further, any such effort starts with the self-gift of people to create such communities.
Part 3. Gift of Self

This dissertation argues that at the heart of CIV 5 is God’s Love as the source of the transformation of people into being acts of self-gift. CIV 5 embodies a call, or rather a commandment, to live out the vocation that falls on those who know of God’s Love for them and have experienced the call to gift themselves as instruments of love in the form of NoCh. Part 2 showed that this self-gift is realisable only when the person is acting wholly in the relationality of their being. This is a person whose actions, as an instrument of grace, can create NoCh as a social reality, although these are different from those in contemporary civil society. However, giving a gift of self is not something a person does alone. All actions of self-giving require what CIV 5 designates as NoCh because they provide a pattern of love in communal form. These are communities with a continuity in sharing the multiplicity of gifts because no one believes or loves alone and all serve the other, especially those beyond the community.

Part 3 examines this principle through selected ecclesial realities as exemplars of NoCh. The structure of Part 3 is in two sections. Section 3.1 discusses friendship and analyses charity, drawing on some of Ratzinger/Benedict’s formulations. The notes on friendship and charity contribute to understanding NoCh and provide several pointers about what NoCh are. The second section starts in Section 3.2 with a broad analysis of ecclesial realities by developing a draft of a structure or taxonomy as a framework for approaching Section 3.3, which analyses the four ecclesial realities as exemplars of NoCh.

3.1. Friendship, Charity and Transcendence in Networks of Charity

In Section 3.1 the dissertation moves to build on the conclusion that NoCh are social entities constituted by people inspired by the Love of God who generate a meta-reflexivity in their transformation towards becoming an instrument of love. The focus is on deepening what it may mean for NoCh to be instruments of love through three themes: Benedict’s recognition of the importance of friendship with Christ, Benedict’s understanding of charity as a force for social change, and the charity of trust in God and transcendence. These themes are the key to understanding how NoCh flourish and how they differ from other entities in civil society.
3.1.1. Friendship in Christ

Friendship in and with Christ has been a significant theme for Ratzinger/Benedict. Friendship is a theme for social living in CIV that is like a canopy stretched across his papacy from start to finish. Later in Section 3.3 in the discussion on exemplars friendship is understood as a feature of the lives of these communities. Certainly, the importance of friendship in Ratzinger’s work, certainly inspired by the thought of St. Augustine, cannot be underestimated. For this reason, I will now briefly turn to the subject of friendship. Hans Reinders (Reinders) writing in praise of Jean Vanier (Vanier) and his work with L’Arche, focuses on the contrast between the Aristotelian idea of friendship as that between equals with the befriending of intellectually disabled people by those such as Vanier. At the heart of this is that friendship is a central part of any community which takes it beyond the relationality of sharing in a common project. To understand NoCh as the outcome of transformed persons constituting it through their relationality does not fully comprehend the dynamic of persons coming with an ‘ultimate concern’, better grasped as desire to enter into being an ‘instrument of grace’, to proclaim the love of God through charity. Thus, while relationality is a key to the constituting of the social entity, the NoCh requires more for the ongoing work of giving charity to others, it needs friendship amongst those within the community and with those who are receivers of this charity. For this reason, the turn is to consider friendship, firstly in a review of Benedict’s calls for Christians to deepen their friendship with Christ, and then to consider friendship more broadly, though not with an intention of carrying through a fuller study of friendship, but only to generate pointers, which contribute to the meaning of the fullness of NoCh.

Friendship in the Love of Christ deepens the relationality inherent in building a community. Such a community is where a person lives in relationships with others but recognises ‘the ultimate goodness of his life depends on the rightness of his essential relationships’. Ratzinger recognised that the embodiment of love in friendship is
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987 Hans S. Reinders (2015) Transforming Friendship: An Essay in Honor of Jean Vanier, Journal of Disability & Religion, 19:4, 340-364. In Vanier starting: “… L’Arche as a life of friendship, he goes against the grain of widely shared intuitions about friendship in our culture, particularly as they have been handed down by the Aristotelian tradition. …To the extent that their views on the matter are shaped by the same intuition, not many people in our culture would recognize a relationship with someone who is intellectually disabled as friendship… Vanier’s view of his friendships with persons with intellectual disabilities as a calling is deeply embedded in his religious understanding of L’Arche…”, 341.

988 Ratzinger, Salt of the Earth, 22.
decisive for building a community aiming to serve the other in self-gift and poverty. Friendship is charity in a more intense and relational form, contributing to cultural and social renewal. In 2000, Ratzinger addressed the Jubilee of Catechists and Teachers of Religion and insisted that the essence of Christ’s message is ‘the gift of a new friendship, the gift of communion with Jesus and thereby with God’.  

The gift of communion with God calls people to conversion, where, in company with others, they enter onto a path to God. Therefore, there is a requirement for a community of life, a shared space for this ‘new style of life’. Evangelisation does not come with words alone; it is ‘the Gospel [that] creates life, creates communities of progress; a merely personal conversion has no consistency’. In this community, a person finds friendship with Christ.

On the eve of the 2005 conclave, Ratzinger discussed the need for a friendship with Christ, when he called for people (Christians) to have ‘a holy restlessness’, which shakes up humans to want to give this friendship to others; a friendship which comes from a friendship with God. In his homily at the Eucharist before the conclave of 2005, Ratzinger reminded the cardinals that friendship with Christ in a mature adult’s faith allows the Christian ‘to distinguish the true from the false, and deceit from truth’. Ratzinger identified differences between the nature of the friendship between God and persons and that of the friendships between people. For Ratzinger, it is no secret that the existence of a communion of wills arises from a desire for the Father’s will to be done on earth as this is what makes friends of Christ become friends of God. A friendship with Christ opens people ‘to all that is good and gives us a criterion by which to distinguish the true from the false, and deceit from truth’ in what a person does and how they live. Shortly after his election to the papacy, in his homily at the imposition of the Pallium, Benedict again touched on friendship, considering it the experience of ‘beauty and liberation, as true life’. In 2008 in his homily at the Chrism Mass he wants to emphasise how in a friendship with Christ there is friendship with those with whom we have communion, and this is where new find life. Benedict does not limit
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friendship, even if it is only at the human level, to those within the Church or within Christianity. In his Address to Representatives of Other Religions he recognises friendship is necessary for genuine dialogue. For “…through dialogue and countless small acts of love, understanding and compassion…”, 1002 there develops, as D L Schindler puts it “..the courage to speak to each other openly…” 1003 Two months before Civ is published, Benedict, in his Address to the 2009 Convention of the diocese of Rome, shows it is ‘living charity’, as the word proclaimed and demonstrated in solidarity and sharing, which reveals Christ as the true friend of man. 1004

In 2009 the Introduction to CIV Benedict put charity at the heart of the relationship between God and humans as well as the intimacy of friendship and family. 1005 He reinforced this message with the need to recognise charity as ‘an element of fundamental importance in human relations’. 1006 Some paragraphs later, he interwove friendship with solidarity and reciprocity as the basis for what needs to be accepted as part of economic activity. 1007 He insisted on the goodness of human relations that are realised when people live with others. These relations, when lived authentically, are essential for our humanness. 1008 He argued that people must develop a friendship with others as in the family, which is the basis for experiencing friendship with others. And it is only in the family where the relationality of persons is nurtured and matures 1009

This experience is crucial for people if they are to become open to a friendship with Christ. When someone gives love to the other, they are giving them both charity and justice. Justice comes from the love of the other, but charity goes beyond justice. Justice must always be given to the stranger who needs justice, yet it goes along with charity

1003 D L Schindler, Ordering Love, 32.
1004 Benedict XVI, Address, Opening of the Pastoral Convention of the Diocese of Rome, 26 May 2009. “… Living charity is the primary form of missionary outreach. The word proclaimed and lived becomes credible if it is incarnate in behaviour that demonstrates solidarity and sharing, in deeds that show the Face of Christ as man's true Friend...”.
1005 CIV 2.
1006 Ibid., 3.
1007 Ibid., 36.
1008 Ibid., 53.
because charity is greater than justice.\textsuperscript{1011} Moreover, it is a charity that comes through friendship with Christ.

The final reference was given in the 2013 Lenten message when Benedict noted that faith and charity are united in friendship with Christ.\textsuperscript{1017} Here he wrote how friendship is integral to living a Christian life.\textsuperscript{1018} That is, friendship comes through faith and charity, so that there is a need for a life that seeks to cultivate this friendship and live it in charity. Through faith, ‘we enter into friendship with the Lord [and] through charity this friendship is lived and cultivated (cf. Jn 15:14ff)’.\textsuperscript{1019} However, Benedict clarified that no one comes to this friendship through their own will. Instead, this friendship is a gift because ‘Christ, through his death and resurrection, brings about this transformation through our redemption’.\textsuperscript{1020}

Even with these brief references I suggest friendship is central for grasping what Benedict has in mind when he formulated paragraph 5 in Civ. Friendship is required to deepen the relationality, otherwise there is a thinness to a social reality drawing only on the relationality of it originators. At heart friendship is an expression of charity. Friendship amongst and between human persons though crucial for any human institution to operate is insufficient where the social entity wishes to be a source of gift in proclaiming God’s love to the world. Christ needs to be at the centre of the community and the witness in the proclamation. For this there needs to be a friendship with Him. This is not a suggestion that other human institutions can do without Christ. The forward movement and development of such institutions, which are without Christ, is either in direction of decline and decay, or to undergo a morphing away from its founding inspiration due to adapting to the pressures and power of the social worlds around it. Rather all need Christ, and more so where we are called to find and reveal his Love in all the situations of our lives. To proclaim God’s love is impossible without Christ. The broader question of friendship, if it is to be carried through fully is beyond this dissertation. Augustine is however central to any such discussion, not least because he was important for Benedict’s thinking on this question.\textsuperscript{1021}

\textsuperscript{1011} DCE, 6.
\textsuperscript{1017} ‘Through faith we enter into friendship with the Lord, through charity this friendship is lived and cultivated (cf. Jn 15:14ff)’. Benedict, ‘Lent 2013’.
\textsuperscript{1018} ‘And the “yes” of faith marks the beginning of a radiant story of friendship with the Lord, which fills and gives full meaning to our whole life’. Benedict, ‘Lent 2013, 2.
\textsuperscript{1019} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1020} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1021} A study of friendship and Augustine will need to draw on a range of scholars and two central works of Augustine: Donald X. Burt, \textit{Friendship and Society}: \textit{An Introduction to Augustinian’s Practical
In conclusion, an open and a full relationality with others expresses how Christ is at the centre of NoCh. It is argued that Benedict understands friendship with Christ as the basis for communities, including the family, communities of faith and the social order, and therefore, NoCh. That is, the meta-reflexivity of a person is insufficient to sustain what the person creates. The life of the created instrument of love, NoCh, are fruitful only through an ongoing friendship with Christ.

3.1.2. Friendship and Community

If NoCh are to be as fruitful as Benedict hopes, mere relationality is insufficient to serve the other in love. Efforts to serve others through charity as more than a ‘simple’ response to an immediate need requires a self-giving that is open to entering into a friendship with those being served.1022 No one believes alone; therefore, no one gives themselves alone. A community sharing a common belief has meaning, and friendship with Christ sustains the sense of this meaning. However, friendship does not always mean kind words and close affection. Instead, friendship in a community is for a closeness to the mission in an encounter with Christ. Friendship is an aspect of constituting communities because it is relational and good, and because such goodness builds communities. The vocation embodied in CIV 5.7 is not because God is showering His Love on all people, but because the human person gives themselves as the reality of God as Love in a social world where the other exists. Further, to make oneself into a gift is to be in the gift as totally as is possible for a person to be. This process is active, not passive, in a person’s history. It is where there is a recognition of those events or moments that are ‘proof’ of God’s Love for them. Friendships in the everyday living of the logic of the transformation leading to the creation of NoCh continuously shape people as relational subjects; therefore, they continually contribute to constituting the community in charity.

---

1022 L’Arche demonstrates this in its care for severely intellectually disabled people in a friendship setting. See also footnote 138, 671, 672, 851, and 1218.
3.1.3.  Charity

As a prelude to the presentation in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 on ecclesial realities, Section 3.1.3 discusses Benedict’s placement of charity at the heart of Christian life and the teaching and life of the Church and his identification of charity as integral to human society and its development. Benedict argued that charity, being the truth of the Love of Christ, is required for liberation in history and human development and social wellbeing; however, he has insisted that more is needed. For liberation and human development, charity must involve a demonstration of love. Benedict demonstrated that charity and truth mirror faith in God. Truth is essential if charity is to give more to this world than contribute to social cohesion. This is because in the praxis of charity in truth, Christianity becomes ‘essential for building a good society and for true’ IHD. In CIV Benedict moved beyond understanding charity as assistance for those in need of support and assistance, to the idea of charity as a ‘gift, acceptance, and communion’.

Further, charity expresses ‘relationships of gratuitousness, mercy and communion’ which ‘build the earthly city’. For this to occur, there must be a change in how the human being thinks, so that ‘the quest for truth, beauty, goodness and communion … are the factors which determine consumer choices, savings and investments’. Further, this means that a different form of charity, in truth, is required. However, even this activity is insufficient to create and shape ‘forms of social and civic life—structures, institutions, culture and ethos’. It is only through a ‘reliance upon God’s providence and mercy, love and forgiveness, self-denial, acceptance of others, justice and peace’ that the activities of human charity can succeed. The Trinity is at the heart of charity. Moreover, to witness charity is to witness the Trinity—not just witnessing charity but understanding that an act of charity is an act of the Trinity.

1023 CIV 3.
1024 See also DCE, 1.
1025 CIV 5.
1026 ‘Charity is at the heart of the Church’s social doctrine. Every responsibility and every commitment spelt out by that doctrine is derived from charity which, according to the teaching of Jesus, is the synthesis of the entire Law (cf. Mt 22:36–40)’. CIV 2.
1027 CIV 3.
1028 CIV 6. See also Francis, ‘Lumen Fidei’, 51: ‘where even as they go about building in charity a city based on relationships in which the love of God is laid as a foundation’.
1030 CIV 78.
1031 Ibid., 79.
1032 ‘“If you see charity, you see the Trinity”, wrote Saint Augustine’. DCE, 19.
Benedict declared that love is central to life as God’s greatest gift. There is only one love—the Love of God because God is Love. Charity determines who we are and is embedded in who we are because we are ‘created in God’s image, hence reflecting the Trinity’s relational Love in our inherent nature, in our very being. Love itself gives rise to our Being as humanity and to our Being as particular beings’. Therefore, God’s Love creates and sustains the human person and the communities where they live. Therefore, charity is central to how to live, in truth and charity, the plan that God gives to people, placing charity at the heart of CIV.

Charity requires the freedom to act, which comes from the human person’s relational and social dimension and the spaces people create. In giving his Love, God pours it out for and in the activity of renewal of the world. As the Beloved Son, Christ is in the history of all persons, communicating God’s Love to all people for this renewal to emerge. This is because Christ is the ‘principle of the charity that “never ends”’. This promise of a charity that never ends is the foundation for living the Christian life so that it becomes the centre of all social life because the promise is the ‘real core of the believer’s identity’. God’s gift of Love receives the person’s response only in the Shema because the truth of loving God is only in loving the neighbour. For this to occur, one needs to know the promise of God’s eternal Love.

---

1033 ‘Love is God’s greatest gift to humanity; it is his promise and our hope’. CIV 1.
1034 1 Jn 4:16, quoted in DCE, 1: ‘God is Love, and he who abides in love, abides in God, and God abides in him’.
1037 CIV 1. See also CIV 52: there is ‘a plan that is prior to us and constitutes for all of us a duty to be freely accepted. That which is prior to us and constitutes us—subsistent Love and Truth—shows us what goodness is, and in what our true happiness consists’.
1038 CIV 3.
1039 Ibid., 5.
1041 CIV 12.
1042 Ratzinger, Behold the Pierced One:, 51, quoted in Rowland, Ratzinger’s Faith, 103.
1043 DCE, 19.
1044 McGregor, ‘Reading Deus Caritas Est Missiologically’, 182. ‘The argument is that it is in the actions of loving our neighbour where we love God. However, this not to argue the liturgical actions of praise are not a way of loving God.’
Christ is the source of Love through the actions of the Holy Spirit. It is a Love that gives everyone the capacity to go out of themselves and give themselves to the other and God. Therefore, we come to love God through our actions of loving our neighbour. However, the term ‘charity’ is used in many different ways, often reflecting the different types of ‘charity in action’. Therefore, sketching out a meaning of charity as the expression of Christ’s Love requires examining charity in action.

It is argued that Benedict suggested three models or types of charity in action. First, charity as a ‘simple response’, most notably where goods or resources directly meet an immediate need.\(^{1045}\) Benedict considered this form of charity a ‘service of charity’ carrying out essential works of mercy.\(^{1046}\) Second, Benedict linked charity to the idea of the gift of self, where there is a giving to serve others through a community.\(^{1047}\) As a gift, charity connects to the relational and social human dimensions. Third, charity acts as an active principle constituting the social order. The common basis for each type of charity is God’s Love, from which the human person receives the capacity and ‘drive’ to act in love for and with the other, although each type has different depths and effects.\(^{1048}\) The differences in the meaning of charity echo the path in CIV 5.7, where there is a movement from the Love of God to the love of the other. Through the self-gift in transformation, the person serves the other in relationality to build communion. God still pours out his Love through people and communities acting as intermediaries for God in whatever type of charity.\(^{1049}\) This pouring out of love through people resonates through their relationality’s innermost dynamic, which is a dynamic of giving what they receive.\(^{1050}\)

\(^{1045}\) DCE, 31(a).

\(^{1046}\) DCE, 22.

\(^{1047}\) There is another register I call ‘nuptial charity’. In 2006, Benedict stated ‘the communion of life and love which is marriage thus emerges as an authentic good for society’. Benedict Address 11 May 2006. In 2009, in CIV 15, Benedict insisted that Paul Vi’s, ‘Humane Vitae’. Encyclical Letter. Holy See 25 July 1968 https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae.html, and Paul VI’s ‘Evangelii Nuntiandi’, are important for achieving full IHD. Benedict repeated this later in CIV 28 when he called for a respect for life because ‘openness to life is at the centre of true developments.’ Lastly in 2012 gave greater depth to this form of charity when he observed how in ‘the union of a man and a woman, their becoming “one flesh” in charity, in fruitful and indissoluble love, is a sign that speaks of God with a force and an eloquence’. Benedict, Homily, October 7, 2012.

\(^{1048}\) ‘It is precisely the communication of the personal dimension of God that makes the creature a human person’. Marko Ivan Rupnik, In the Fire of the Burning Bush: An Initiation to the Spiritual Life. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2004), 37.

\(^{1049}\) ‘Charity always manifests God’s love in human relationships’. CIV 6.

\(^{1050}\) Ratzinger, God and the World, 189.
3.1.3.1. Charity as a Simple or Direct Response\textsuperscript{1051}

In DCE, Benedict observed that charity is first a simple response to those in need, which includes ‘immediate needs and specific situations: [such as] feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, caring for and healing the sick, visiting those in prison’.\textsuperscript{1052} Simple charity is the first and necessary act of love by one person to the other.\textsuperscript{1053} Simple does not imply that there is no need to organise or coordinate the effort it involves. The term ‘simple’ identifies the level of intention. Although addressing complex needs requires complex organisation and effort, simple charity does not necessarily require the heart of the person assisting; however, in DCE, Benedict warned that such charity degenerates without a heart. Some charitable bodies are little more than channels for bureaucratically managed state funds, sometimes directed with a political and diplomatic purpose. Often, these bodies lack a serious and careful concern for the people in their care. Abuse, whether sexual abuse of those in need, or in thrusting abortion onto people in distress, is a denial of simple charity.\textsuperscript{1054}

Despite the minimum level of engagement between people, simple charity has a direct and immediate effect on the receiver and is relational. Simple charity encompasses actions from giving money to a street beggar without judgement to assisting, with respect and patience, disabled and older people in their daily lives.\textsuperscript{1055} Simple charity, where the person is a giver, is often the most common form of action, whether making donations or helping and giving signs of concern and care towards unfortunate, disabled and mentally ill people. Simple charity is often a non-reflexive action for recognising the other’s human dignity without mediation. However, an inchoate recognition of the ‘divine image in the other’ makes such an act a privileged service of God.

\textsuperscript{1051} Costanzo offered a profound study of the significance of almsgiving in the early Church and the writings of the Fathers, in particular, Chrysostom: ‘Almsgiving was demonstrated by the giving and sharing of resources, provision of surplus goods, offering emotional and spiritual care to those in need, and the application of spiritual disciplines that were of benefit to others’. Eric Costanzo, \textit{Harbor for the Poor: A Missiological Analysis of Almsgiving in the View and Practice of John Chrysostom}, (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 137.

\textsuperscript{1052} DCE, 31 (a).

\textsuperscript{1053} See Ratzinger’s concern for the danger of the Church’s institutions becoming ‘an end in themselves’. Ratzinger, \textit{New Outpourings of the Spirit}, 69.

\textsuperscript{1054} See Section 2.4, where Macintyre is cited regarding the bureaucratic nature of organisations.

\textsuperscript{1055} I would include charitable donations at the parish level to national bodies, such as CAFOD in the UK or Caritas in Australia, in this type of charity, although the gift is given often at a great distance from the person in need.
Moreover, such service includes ‘learning to know the Word of God and to make it known’ to others.1056 This is so even if it is hidden from the person who is acting in charity, and in this the act of charity is privileged.1057 However, many philanthropic responses often stop at a certain level of giving of self. Nevertheless, these still lead to discovering how ‘to mature in a love that “becomes concern and care for the other”’.1058

In many countries in the wider Euro/Anglosphere, the modern welfare state is the source of most relief for those seeking assistance.1059 Nevertheless, Benedict noted that ‘there will always be suffering which cries out for consolation and help. There will always be loneliness. There will always be situations of material need’.1060 Many charitable bodies have shown the need for simple charity by assisting the poor.1061 Simple charity extends to the worldwide efforts to address hunger by directly giving aid or channelling funds for support and development.1062

Simple charity though is the basis for all other charity. If someone disdains from giving simple charity or refuses a claim for charity, any other activity they claim as charitable or an action for the good of all is mere politics and ego.1063 A lack of engagement in simple charity is proof that there is no love to give and that, therefore, there is no acceptance of God’s Love.1064 Simple charity is not necessarily a closed act because it can open a pathway to enter ‘a journey, an ongoing exodus out of the closed inward-looking self towards its liberation through self-giving, and towards authentic

---

1057 ‘Overcoming hardness of heart which blinds us to the suffering of others … charitable service becomes a privileged form of evangelisation’. Benedict, Audience of St Peter’s Circle.
1058 CIV 11.
1059 However, it is often inadequate, as evidenced by the demand for food banks.
1060 DCE, 28(b).
1061 There are continuing demands for bodies such as the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul (SVdP) and The Salvation Army, which indicates gaps in the modern welfare state. SVdP provided an illuminating case of what might be called an ecclesial reality that emerged to meet the widespread needs of the poor in Paris during the early 1840s. This initiative happened outside the ‘institutional structures’, such as the parish or diocese, of the Church; however, later, it became established as an integral part of the parish as an early example of a community of faith.
1062 These funds mostly come from governments that do not hand them over without attaching their own political requirements. The existence of many charitable bodies performing the task through a range of agencies, including Caritas Internationalis, indicates an ongoing need to provide simple charity. See also Kevin Ahern, Structures of Grace: Catholic Organizations Serving the Global Common Good, (Mahwah, NJ: Orbis, 2015), for a detailed study of the network of non-government organisations and international charities, including those with ‘Catholic’ in their name. If Catholic aid organisations, with their bureaucracy and government funds, are structures of grace, then more so are NoCh.
1063 DCE, 34.
1064 ‘Charity is in the action of a person who knows they are loved. In this they become filled with the Holy Spirit and become pointers to God’. Rupnik, In the Fire of the Burning Bush, 32.
self-discovery and indeed the discovery of God.\textsuperscript{1065} Section 3.1.3.2 explores charity as the outcome of self-gift.

\textbf{3.1.3.2. Charity as Self-Gift}

In CIV Benedict introduced God’s Love as the opening of ‘our lives to gift’.\textsuperscript{1066} Such a gift is not a mere event; rather, it arises when ‘charity in truth places man before the astonishing experience of gift’.\textsuperscript{1067} An experience of the gift is what leads to a radical change because when one has received God’s gift of Love, ‘hope bursts into our lives … as something … beyond merit’.\textsuperscript{1068} Moreover, this hope brings the human person to become ‘a sign of God’s presence in us’; to be a sign of his love.\textsuperscript{1069} God expects this gift to reach out and become a performative response in a human person, to be a sign of what is to come about.\textsuperscript{1070} It is a sign that gives a person the courage to act.\textsuperscript{1071} However, this truth is lost in ‘a purely consumerist and utilitarian view of life’.\textsuperscript{1072} All gifts of love is integral to being a human person who is made to receive and give the gift of love. Further, this ‘expresses and makes present [one’s ] transcendent dimension’.\textsuperscript{1073} By making themselves present, a person can insert the centrality of gift into people’s lives and the social order. Therefore, how does action of giving make a transcendent dimension present?

First, the human person is the one who has a gift and is a gift in their being. Benedict claimed that the person is given their self as the basis for building their own ‘I’.\textsuperscript{1074} To know this truth comes from experiencing Love from God as a gift. By knowing the person’s love as a self, the person realises they are a gift in receiving themselves.\textsuperscript{1075} Love is the primary source of the gift of self and relationality; ‘truth, and the love which it reveals, cannot be produced: they can only be received as a gift’.\textsuperscript{1076}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{1065} CIV 6.
\item\textsuperscript{1066} Ibid., 8.
\item\textsuperscript{1067} Ibid., 34.
\item\textsuperscript{1068} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{1069} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{1070} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{1071} ‘Only the great certitude of hope that my own life and history in general, despite all failures, are held firm by the indestructible power of Love, and that this gives them their meaning and importance, only this kind of hope can then give the courage to act and to persevere’. SpS, 35.
\item\textsuperscript{1072} CIV 34.
\item\textsuperscript{1073} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{1074} Ibid., 68.
\item\textsuperscript{1075} Ibid., 77.
\item\textsuperscript{1076} Ibid., 52.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
and their situation to love others. The source of this gift is ‘God, who is himself truth and love’. Section 3.1.3.2.1 explores self-gift and the human person.

3.1.3.2.1. Self-Gift

Self-gift is the key to opening oneself to the other within the transcendent framework that God creates when his Love comes. Without entering into the transcendence of the gift of love, the call to love the neighbour lacks meaning, purpose and content. Practical activity is always insufficient unless it visibly shows a love for the other, even where this activity leads to sacrificing one’s own life. However, an encounter with Christ nourishes that love and enables that sacrifice. A deep personal sharing in others’ needs and sufferings requires sharing a person’s very self with them. If the gift is not to prove a source of humiliation to the recipient, the giver must give others something they own and their very self through sharing the transcendent Love of Christ. A person is only personally present in their gift when it is truly a gift of self.

However, a gift of self needs an appropriate sense of self-love. When a person recognises and accepts that God creates and constitutes their being, they give the gift of their acceptance in response; from this, interior self-love grows. Self-love is the knowledge of the truth of God’s Love, the experience of God’s love and the practice of the truth of this love in self-love. The possibility to give oneself to the other comes from this love of self. In the same way that love comes to a person as a gift, it is now available to be given as a gift. What a person has in themselves to give is only what they can give. That is why self-love is a necessary element if the gift is to be of value for the recipient. Self-love is the knowledge, experience and practice of love. In this, there is an ‘I’ through which the knowledge of love establishes a communion with the other. Ratzinger observed that ‘if we fail to love ourselves, we cannot love our neighbour. We are unable to love our neighbour as we love ourselves because we do not love ourselves and are

---

1077 Ibid.
1078 Milbank, *Beyond Secular Order*.
1079 ‘Love now becomes concern and care for the other … it seeks the good of the beloved … [which] is ready, and even willing, for sacrifice’. DCE, 6.
1080 DCE, 34.
1081 Ibid.
therefore antagonistic.\textsuperscript{1082} Benedict understood that to give oneself is to believe that a
gift of self is worthwhile, even if it is only to recognise oneself as a gift from God.

Further, it is only possible to give oneself when one knows something of their
worth and what they are giving. The key to this form of self-love is comparable to that
which arises under the sacramental canopy of married love. Familial love arises from
the nuptiality of the relationship. This is a love which is a mutual giving of self in the
complete nuptial sense and extends to the giving of self to children, who are the product
of this nuptiality. For a child to become an adult who loves their neighbour, they need
to know and experience a creative love to constitute them in self-love. Self-love comes
from experiencing love and knowing of this love. Self-love is the basis of a relationality
that is open to the other. Through self-gift, relationality is more than merely constituting
the other; it brings love into that new way of being with the other.

The gift in every act of giving requires the self to go beyond its limits. Such
giving invites the question: what does this mean for human beings? The questions often
include how much money, time or effort one can afford to give. These questions are
directed towards people who seek to measure out their lives because they think they
own them and who give from the surplus of their life without touching what is essential.
In the gift of self, the giving is on a different level altogether. To give of oneself is to
place material, personal and spiritual goods at the feet of the receiver. These personal
goods encompass many forms of activities, decisions and practices. Activities may
include making time for the other, which may involve days and months rather than
minutes. Self-gift is hospitality, which includes simply listening to another.\textsuperscript{1083} These
activities shape people's decisions about how to live in the future, such as deciding not
to follow a career. Alternatively, a person who is on a career path and abandon it,
willingly accepting the loss of a preconceived, but no longer followed, direction and
expectation for their life. Further, all of this encompasses practices in which everyone
lives with the same level of comfort (or discomfort) in sharing with the other, which
only comes from sharing spiritual goods.

Spiritual goods include the courage to be with the other as they are, serve the
other in humility, accept the other, forgive when one receives an injury, seek peace

\textsuperscript{1082} Ratzinger, Co-Workers of Truth, Meditations for Every Day of the Year. San Francisco: Ignatius Press,
1992, 82.

\textsuperscript{1083} ‘Hospitality is first and foremost, the hospitality we give each other, exchanging words and silences,
rather than conflict and answer injustice with love. When meeting with the ecclesial realities in June 2006, Benedict discussed the nature and fruits of the gift as self-love. He argued that it:

‘is only in giving life that it is found; life is not found by seeking to possess it. This is to learn from Christ, for the Holy Spirit teaches it is a pure gift, that it is God’s gift of himself. The more one gives one’s life for others, for goodness itself, the more abundantly the river of life flows.’

Benedict held that the key to charity is the self-gift of the person. He argued that self-gift is a key to the development of charity as a living and constitutive force in renewing the social order. Social charity is the outcome of this level of self-gift.

3.1.3.3. Social Charity as Cultural and Social Renewal

In Section 3.1.3.3, the subject is Benedict’s observations and reflections about ‘social charity’ as the source of renewal. CIV provided many reflections on the nature and purpose of (social) charity. Not least, it began with charity in truth in the social order. CIV expressed social charity as the ‘principal driving force behind the authentic development’ of people and humanity in the social order. Social charity is the ‘institutional path of charity’. For where there is no truth, charity is excluded from ‘promoting human development of universal range, in dialogue between knowledge and praxis’. Where it is accepted that loving the neighbour is to love God who then becomes the source of Love for loving others more fully. This informs the praxis of making oneself into an instrument of grace and creating NoCh. Loving the neighbour is the prerequisite for giving glory to God for what He has done in each person’s life. In a particular and universal way, when people love their neighbour, they love God in his glory. Therefore, charity is a social act.

1084 Ratzinger, Co-Workers of Truth, 82.
1085 Benedict, ‘Solemnity of Pentecost’.
1086 DCE, 29.
1087 CIV 1.
1088 Ibid.
1089 Ibid., 7.
1090 Ibid., 4.
1091 DCE.
1092 ‘To love one’s neighbour as God’s own beloved meant forgiving one another in the face of wrongs, recognising that we too have wronged others, constraining war as the interruption of a more fundamental peace, granting sanctuary to one’s enemy, extending alms to those in need, exercising mercy to temper judgment, and offering ourselves as gifts to one another in manifold contexts for forming a communion of people’. Joel Harrison, Post-Liberal Religious Liberty: Forming Communities of Charity, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 168.
Benedict discussed the importance of social charity in CIV. He stated that charity is central to the Church’s social doctrine; it is at the ‘heart of the Church’s social doctrine’.\textsuperscript{1093} Why? Because love gives real ‘substance to the personal relationship with God and with neighbour’.\textsuperscript{1094} Thus, he identified the human being as the agent for bringing love into the world through creating and living in relationships in the social world. Truth goes through charity, although an ‘emotionalism … deprives it of relational and social content’ and therefore, undermines charity.\textsuperscript{1095} Benedict reflected that ‘interiority is emptied of its meaning and gradually our awareness of the human soul’s ontological depths, as probed by the saints, is lost’ when problems and difficulties are understood only in a psychological framework.\textsuperscript{1096} God’s Love in the human person is social charity’s praxis as the praxis of God’s Love in the social world. Charity is in this way the Trinitarian formula of love, gift and relationality in communion.\textsuperscript{1097} Benedict asked everyone to practice this charity in a way that corresponds to their ‘vocation’ and ‘degree of influence in the world’.\textsuperscript{1098} Moreover, this is a practice which explains how political activity becomes a form of ‘social charity’.\textsuperscript{1099}

Earlier in section 1.1.2 Benedict reflected on how the Church’s crisis highlighted the need for ‘people who make God credible’.\textsuperscript{1100} There is also a need for those who believe in God to find God at the heart of charity. In DCE, Benedict identified certain saints as lasting models of social charity who are active in the service of charity in various areas of social life and who make God credible.\textsuperscript{1101} Benedict placed a significant task before all Christians to practise social charity because adhering to the ‘values of Christianity is essential for building a good society and true’ IHD.\textsuperscript{1102} This task places charity at the centre of building a social order and is for those experiencing God’s Love who, through self-giving, create such a social order.\textsuperscript{1103} This form of charity is an earthly

\textsuperscript{1093} CIV 2.
\textsuperscript{1094} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1095} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{1096} Ibid., 76.
\textsuperscript{1097} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{1098} Ibid., 7.
\textsuperscript{1099} DCE, 29.
\textsuperscript{1101} ‘The figures of saints such as Francis of Assisi, Ignatius of Loyola, John of God, Camillus of Lellis, Vincent de Paul, Louise de Marillac, Giuseppe B. Cottolengo, John Bosco, Luigi Orione, Teresa of Calcutta to name but a few—stand out as lasting models of social charity’. Ibid., 40. See the quotation above, at footnote 1092: Harrison, \textit{Post-Liberal Religious Liberty}, 168.
\textsuperscript{1102} CIV 4.
\textsuperscript{1103} ‘Promotion and building of forms of social and civic life—structures, institutions, culture and ethos’. Ibid., 78.
activity contributing to building the ‘city of God’. Although these are the objectives, a question remains about how to understand social charity. The approach to understanding Benedict’s thinking on social charity develops through the adoption of three subcategories: (1) evangelisation, which needs a link with charity; (2) the call for gratuitousness to enter into the economic order; and (3) charity as the humanism that builds fraternity, the key to the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity.

3.1.3.3.1. Evangelisation

CIV as a social encyclical, is an encyclical of evangelisation. Benedict argued that proclaiming Christ’s Love for everyone ‘through works of justice, peace and development’ is to give charity in evangelisation. Further, this is because ‘evangelisation has always developed alongside the promotion of the human person and authentic Christian liberation’. In saying this, Benedict recognised that evangelisation is charity as much as the work to transform unjust social structures is charity. Evangelisation is the continuous act of understanding that from a ‘fellowship in the body of Christ and in receiving the body of Christ means fellowship with one another. Of its very nature, charity includes mutual acceptance, giving and receiving on both sides, and readiness to share one’s goods’. However, he cautions a radical sharing of goods to the point of self-denial is only possible through faith. With this call to share goods within and through a community, Benedict placed a marker for change.

Without evangelisation, there is no possibility of a fundamental difference emerging in social structures to achieve justice. Moreover, this is more the case when violence initiates some form of change. Instead, CIV repeatedly called for ways of acting and living that witness God’s Love where evangelisation is a work of charity; it...
is the ‘greatest work of charity’. Evangelisation is the greatest form of charity because it ‘introduces a person to a relationship with God’. Further, a relationship with God is ‘the highest and the most integral promotion of the human person’. In short, charity is beyond, though not displacing, direct aid to the poor and transforming oneself into a gift. In social charity, works, such as those for peace, justice and development, are a ‘testimony to Christ’s charity … [which are] part and parcel of evangelisation, because Jesus Christ, who Loves us, is concerned with the whole person’.

Moreover, there are different forms of work giving signs of evangelisation (see Section 3.3). Evangelisation is witnessing to Christ, who enables a person to have a pure and generous love for the other because Christ loves that person equally. Thus, evangelisation becomes integral to creating a social order where humans flourish. The temptation in any social body seeking to give signs of the Love of Christ is to develop a program of action, which often leads to a demand that others need to change, and usually, that the other changes first. Benedict warned against this temptation because ‘practical activity will always be insufficient unless it visibly expresses a love for man, a love nourished by an encounter with Christ’. Instead, evangelisation teaches people the ‘art of living’, which is a form of living, listening and giving voice to the Father. The interior mission is that Christ becomes known to all and that this knowledge of Christ living in a person’s life attracts others to Him rather than attempts at proselytising.

Proselytising is not a part of charity or of evangelisation. The Church’s task is to make all its members disciples of Christ so that all people ‘may have life in

---

1111 Benedict, ‘Lent 2013’, 3
1112 Ibid.
1113 Ibid.
1114 CIV 15.
1115 DCE, 31(b).
1116 ‘Integral evangelisation, as “an unceasing interplay of the Gospel and of man’s concrete life both personal and social”’. CIV 15.
1117 DCE, 34.
1119 ‘The Church does not engage in proselytism. Instead, she grows by “attraction”: just as Christ “draws all to himself” by the power of his love, culminating in the sacrifice of the Cross, so the Church fulfils her mission to the extent that, in union with Christ, she accomplishes every one of her works in spiritual and practical imitation of the love of her Lord’. Benedict, Fifth CELAM.
1120 ‘Charity … cannot be used as a means of engaging in what is nowadays considered proselytism … Those who practise charity in the Church’s name will never seek to impose the Church’s faith upon others. They realise that a pure and generous love is the best witness to the God in whom we believe and by whom we are driven to love’. DCE 30(c).
Evangelisation for life in Him is the mission of the Church and those beyond its frontiers. The truth of any evangelisation is in a living charity demonstrating solidarity and sharing, revealing the face of Christ. In saying this, Benedict placed evangelisation at the heart of charity, where there also needs to be gratuitousness.

3.1.3.3.2. Gratuitousness

One aspect of CIV that attracted much attention, both supportive and discouraging, was Benedict’s promotion of gratuitousness. The discussion in CIV mainly centred on its possible role in the economy, referencing, though not naming, bodies of gratuitousness, such as the EoC. From the perspective of charity, gratuitousness is love directing relationality. This is not a giving away of goods for free; instead, it gives something that has no price in the market and cannot come under the state’s scrutiny. When a person enters into the love they receive (from God), their relationality acquires the character of gratuitousness coming from the presence of God. Their relationality opens through gratuitousness into becoming a ‘more fully dimensioned relationality’. Benedict made this link when he argued that a ‘man establishes his worth … by placing himself in relation with others and God’. A person places themself in relation with others through self-gift.

---

1121 Benedict, Fifth CELAM, 3.
1122 ‘Living charity is the primary form of missionary outreach. The word proclaimed and lived becomes credible if it is incarnate in behaviour that demonstrates solidarity and sharing, in deeds that show the Face of Christ as man’s true Friend’. Benedict, ‘Opening of the Pastoral Convention’.
1123 CIV 46. The EoC started in Brazil (see Section 3.3). Although there is no direct evidence, it is possible that Benedict’s presence in Brazil during the Fifth CELAM in 2007 saw him informed about the practices and theory of EoC. Another hypothesis is that Bruni, who was a joint presenter of CIV and was at the conference, is close to Focolare and an adviser on CIV, and would be a source of information on EoC.
1125 ‘Human gratuitousness can only tend to being … an act of freedom aimed at pursuing what is beautiful, just true, admirable; what is worthwhile in itself no matter what (i.e., whether or not this act will be visible, appreciated, reciprocated) … there is no such thing as “my” gratuitousness. Because what is truly beautiful and perfect precedes me and transcends and draws me into more deeply desiring it. A truly gratuitous gift is always exceeding the expression of “our own” gratuitousness, as the presence of God’s Love is there’. Simona Beretta, ‘Development Driven by Hope and Gratuitousness: The Innovative Economics of Benedict XVI’. In Explorations in the Theology of Benedict XVI, ed. John C. Cavadini.,(Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 2013), 187–211, 198–99.
1127 CIV 53.
The giving of self is a feature of charity; however, it moves beyond the level of one-to-one personal interactions into the social order as a separate (though not separated) level of reality. Self-giving enters into the creation of social entities, such as businesses operating in the spirit of the EoC. The line between the personal and the social is not always clear. However, without self-gift, there is no relationality to underpin the gratuitousness for intervening in the social and economic order as Benedict conceived of it. In ordinary circumstances of living, outside spousal self-giving, there are varying depths of relationality. Many people’s relational lives deepen when gratuitousness is present in social living. Bruni noted that gratuitousness lies in understanding ‘gift-as-reciprocity’. After all, gratuitousness is needed for a fully human encounter to occur. Bruni further argued that without ongoing receiving and giving, the social order would decline and disintegrate. Thus, the charity of gratuitousness is the decision to act with love towards the other.

Moreover, to act in this manner opens the door to a more profound and open relationality than that which occurs in most social intercourse. The gift is both a path it travels and the goal it reaches. An important part of the discussion in CIV concerned ordering the economy, which requires understanding the importance of gratuitousness as charity in its social register.

Benedict gave a central place to gratuitousness in CIV. He understood that there is no selling and buying of gratuitousness because such a market cannot exist. He pressed for gratuitousness to be present in people’s lives, even if there are different patterns in giving and some are hidden. Humans require the spirit of gift, which is gratuitousness because a person is ‘made for gift, which expresses and makes present his transcendent dimension’. Schlag argued that without gratuitousness, ‘living together in a human way is impossible’ because lack of gratuitousness means ‘there is

1129 See Section 2.3 for Archer and Donati’s arguments about the separate reality of the social entity.
1130 Bruni, Civil Economy, 181.
1131 Bruni, Wound and the Blessing, 45.
1132 ‘We can a live a long time without markets or income. But much less without receiving and giving gratuitousness’. Ibid., 46.
1133 Bruni, Wound and the Blessing, 46, footnote 1.
1134 CIV 39.
1136 CIV 34.
no truly human encounter with one’s neighbour’. Gratuitousness can be measured by how it shapes the development of a society. Benedict developed this further and observed that the earthly society needs ‘relationships of gratuitousness, mercy and communion’ in order to see real human development. Benedict explained that this is because ‘gratuitousness … fosters and disseminates solidarity and responsibility for justice and the common good’, leading to solidarity and fraternity.

3.1.3.3. Fraternity

Fraternity is an essential dimension of CIV although its discussion is often lost when the idea of fraternity is grounded only in the human ability to generate what is needed for ‘fraternity’ to emerge. Benedict claimed that fraternity is integral to human development and the good ordering of society if brothers are to become neighbours. However, Benedict was careful to emphasise that to call another a brother does not mean including the whole world under the term ‘fraternity’. It is more to be at one with others in communion where both are in communion with Christ. Benedict insisted that fraternity is rooted ‘in a transcendent vocation from God the Father … through the Son’ and that it is the Son who enfleshes the truth of fraternity. Christ ‘does not regard his divine Sonship as something reserved only for himself: the meaning of the Incarnation is rather to make what is his available to all’. Christian brotherhood makes human fraternity possible and grounds it in Christ’s identity as the eternal Son of God the Father. For Benedict, this meant that ‘the human community that we build by ourselves is never, purely by its own strength, a fully fraternal community, nor does it overcome every division and become a truly universal community’.

1138 Ibid.
1139 ‘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’. CIV 6.
1140 Ibid., 34.
1141 Joseph Ratzinger, Meaning of Christian Brotherhood, 2nd ed, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 36. Here Ratzinger addressed this idea in a substantive and innovative way. He noted how fraternity was the one slogan that disappeared and fell out of use of all the slogans of the French Revolution of the 1790s—liberté, égalité, fraternité.
1142 Ibid. To call one a brother is not to include the whole world but to be at one with those where there is communion. Though the ideal is to call into communion with Christ. See also Matthew Shadle, ‘Fraternity and Solidarity in Pope Benedict XVI’s Caritas in Veritate’, Catholic Moral Theology. 6 June 2017. Here he discussed what Benedict means by ‘fraternity’ and ‘charity’ and the distinction between the two.
1143 CIV 19.
1144 Ratzinger, Meaning of Christian Brotherhood, 49.
1145 CIV 34.
Gift is the step towards building fraternity; the gift to the other is also the step towards making the social world sustain such fraternity. In this sense, brotherhood is not the criterion for building ties across the globe, which lacks a central form, but rather brotherhood describes those connections within those communities which exercise signs of relationality, love and gift. Communities of mercy, service and love are NoCh and, simultaneously, communities of social charity.

A further idea about social charity comes from the notion of how gratuitousness involves building fraternity. Christ’s charity urges people to establish ‘authentic fraternity’. NoCh become sources of fraternity for those within the community and, more importantly, for those outside it. Unless the actions of NoCh seek to create and maintain fraternity, its activities are redundant. The purpose of NoCh are to enhance the possibility of civil society as ‘the most natural setting for an economy of gratuitousness and fraternity’. ‘The challenge … is to demonstrate, in thinking and behaviour … that in commercial relationships the principle of gratuitousness and the logic of gift … [lead] to fraternity [and] find their place within normal economic activity’. Fraternity does not arise from a human person’s will or desire or emerge from the market, planning or state’s laws. Instead, fraternity is the reality of charity between people in their social living.

Charity as a fraternity is a way of being in communion with God and with others. In that way, NoCh are the promise of a way of being in charity that ‘shapes all our relations and current endeavours’. Fraternity, originating in a ‘vocation from God the Father, who Loved us first, teaching us through the Son what fraternal charity’ becomes, is an important feature or aspect of economic and social life. Charity is at the heart of the STCC. Further, the STCC, with its four basic principles, is the working out of charity’s actions as social love. From the fraternity of gift of self in love come the
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1146 Ratzinger, Meaning of Christian Brotherhood, 74.
1147 CIV 20.
1148 Ibid., 38.
1149 Ibid., 36.
1150 ‘What is charity? We are perhaps more accustomed in the modern period to understanding charity as an act of benevolence or sympathy, something we direct to the poor, for example. This is an impoverished usage. St Paul identifies charity as the greatest of virtues. Traditionally it has been understood as divinely infused habit, a form of grace by which the person is inclined to cherish God and cherish other persons for the sake of God. In Benedict’s words, “charity entails making ourselves instruments of grace who, being loved by God, pour forth God’s charity. In this way, charity is better understood as a way of being that is to shape all our relations and shape our current endeavours”. It is this above all’. Harrison, Post-Liberal Religious Liberty, 167.
1151 ‘Today we can say that economic life must be understood as a multi-layered phenomenon: in every one of these layers, to varying degrees and in ways specifically suited to each, the aspect of fraternal reciprocity must be present’. CIV 38.
new structures of social life that sustain subsidiarity and help build solidarity in a renewed social order.

These three forms of social charity, drawn primarily from Benedict’s writings, are not exhaustive and do not exclude other observations or analyses that contribute to deepening a social charity. However, they are central to understanding how charity functions in our world, shaping the social world in its various manifestations: economic, cultural and social. The desire is not for individual people to act but for social entities which driven by charity, seek to develop and maintain what Benedict called ‘relationships of gratuitousness, mercy and communion’. Building these relationships generates the renewal of a culture that recognises God. These relationships are integral to grasping what Benedict called for when he discussed the need to create NoCh. NoCh are the new social realities coming from the lay movements, echoing the previous millennia’s religious orders.1152 Creating these new realities reveals the need to trust the other to work collaboratively on a project.

3.1.4. Trust in God and Transcendence

When people aim to work with others in accepting the truth of being no more than a channel for grace that can create a new social reality, questions arise about whom to trust. Many people in contemporary society focus on themselves first and others later. However, Benedict started not from the human person but God as the source of trust. Reading CIV is reading an encyclical on trust in God’s Love as the grounds for IHD, in which there is a need to create NoCh as a centre for the development of trust in God.1153 In this, Christ is at the heart of the movement reaching for IHD by opening the person to trust God.1154 IHD cannot arise from the state’s power or the market’s resources. IHD ‘is a response to a vocation from God the Creator … [and this] demands self-fulfilment in a transcendent humanism which gives [to man] his greatest possible perfection’.1155 CIV and DCE explained that when there is trust in the Love of God, there is a real

1152 As in earlier instances, many lay movements developed into different religious orders. This is the history of many established and famous religious orders. Sisters of Life is a contemporary example of a religious order that was founded in New York in 1991 initially as a lay association before becoming a religious institute in 2004. It focuses on promoting pro-life causes, including ending abortion and euthanasia, and providing support for pregnant and post-abortion women seeking emotional and spiritual consolation. It is a contemplative community active in the seeking justice for the unborn child. See ‘Homepage’, Sisters of Life, https://sistersoflife.org/, (accessed August 20, 2020).
1153 CIV 79.
1154 ‘The idea of a world without development indicates a lack of trust in man and in God. And it is not only trust in God but “mutual trust” in each other that is required’. Ibid., 14. Cf. CIV 35.
1155 Ibid., 18.
dynamic for the development of all people through Christian humanism. As Benedict put it, Christian humanism is ‘a humanism open to the absolute’ to promote and build a social and civic life with renewed structures, institutions, culture and ethos.1156 Benedict’s humanism was built on understanding the person as a relational being with a transcendent dignity which arises and is underpinned from the human person as ‘imago Dei’.1157 Through and from their transcendent dignity, human beings become the foundation for communities that protect weak, vulnerable and marginalised people.1158

Transcendent dignity finds the person who, through their acts of self-gift, is making ‘present [their own] … transcendent dimension’.1159 Through this giving, the human person reveals the transcendent meaning underpinning the human being as creators of their sociality.1160 When there is a proper understanding of the human person’s dignity, there is a recognition of the person as a relational being, created to be in relationships with others.1161 The human person as a ‘spiritual being … [who is] defined through interpersonal relations’ is the originator of social entities within a transcendent orientation.1162 These entities are structures of grace providing a guarantee that the ‘person-based and community-oriented cultural process of worldwide integration … [is] open to transcendance’.1163 Against a development which is little more than building a mechanical and, ultimately, fruitless society, the Christian is called to keep hold of a ‘transcendent vision of the person’.

Moreover, truly human development only occurs through structures where the vertical dimension expresses the transcendent in the dimension of God. These structures that create and sustain in the horizontal dimension of the world, especially the social world, practice the truth of God.1164 NoCh exist for the transmission of love, charity and grace, for the ongoing generation of fruits for and of transcendence and for creating what is necessary for human social living in fraternity and solidarity.

1156 Ibid., 78.
1157 Ibid., 29.
1158 Ibid., 45. ‘The Church’s social doctrine can make a specific contribution because it is based on man’s creation ‘in the image of God’ (Gen 1:27), a concept that gives rise to the inviolable dignity of the human person and the transcendent value of natural moral norms.’
1159 CIV., 34.
1160 Ibid., 48.
1161 Ibid., 53
1162 Ibid.
1163 Ibid., 42.
1164 ‘What we receive comes before what we do … [to be] in communion the horizontal dimension depends on the vertical and can only be understood on that basis’. Ratzinger, Behold the Pierced One, 83. Without this, NoCh would be no different to any other social entity in civil society and would deteriorate and decline exactly the same way. That is, without the vertical, there is no communion, and ultimately, the horizontal disappears unless it is lifted up.
### 3.1.5. Networks of Charity as the Fruits of Following Christ

Although Benedict never specified what he meant by the phrase NoCh, he often spoke and wrote about what it means to follow Christ and what this meant for developing culture.\(^{1165}\) In an Address given by Ratzinger in 1998 he set out how the emergence of various apostolic movements throughout Christianity’s history brought about a transformative development in the broader cultural, social and economic world.\(^{1166}\) He argued that these developments came from people accepting the gift of God’s Love through the Holy Spirit to follow Christ. The apostolic movements became a record of this gift of love as performative in history. As he expressed in SpS, the core of Benedict’s argument was that Christianity is performative.\(^{1167}\) Christianity is not just the text of the Gospel or the arguments of preachers and prophets. Christianity is no less than actions and deeds, whether generated from the inspiration of those speaking of God’s Love or the examples of the lives lived in the spirit and truth of these words of Christ. Thus, Christianity’s effect is creative because it generates a new and life-changing history in each era.

The core of this making of history is the word of love and love’s action. In the Church, Christianity is the phenomenon of love. Such an expression is not political or social. Instead, as DCE stated, it starts with the evangelisation of people ‘through Word and Sacrament’.\(^{1168}\) However, achieving this evangelisation, which leads to a transformation in history, is not a product or gift of people’s efforts or initiatives. A community forms that produces fruits when there is the inspiration of the Love of Christ. Further, as Benedict stated, such fruits only come from a community where love is a power greater than that of the sum of a community’s efforts. Such love is the primary driver for fruits to come from Christian life.\(^{1169}\) Benedict argued that, without receiving this love through the Church, any community would become ‘empty, a romantic gesture,

---

\(^{1165}\) A striking example of this is the idea of slitting the sycamore so that it becomes flavourful, to see Christ as the Logos slitting ‘our cultures and their fruit’ and to transform and purify it. See Ratzinger, *On the Way to Jesus Christ*, 47.

\(^{1166}\) Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’.

\(^{1167}\) ‘The Christian message was not only “informative” but “performative”. That means: The Gospel is not merely a communication of things that can be known—it is one that makes things happen and is life-changing’. SpS, 2.

\(^{1168}\) ‘An undertaking that is often heroic in the way it is acted out in history; and it seeks to promote man in the various arenas of life and human activity. Love is therefore the service that the Church carries out in order to attend constantly to man’s sufferings and his needs, including material needs’. DCE, 19.

\(^{1169}\) Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith*, 89. This part is bolded in the text.
a demand for security within a small group that nonetheless lacks any real content’. Outside the great network that is ‘the institution of the apostolic succession’, Ratzinger argued that a community that is not founded on the Lord and in the Eucharist and all Eucharists is where there will be no real and lasting fruits. To help grasp the idea of NoCh, requires understanding what Benedict considers such communities might be like and what their fruits might be?

The first step is to explore how Benedict envisaged a community, such as NoCh. Benedict’s fundamental position was that Christ is necessary to sustain the basis of a community that seeks transformative action in the world. The charity of self-gift is the core of the work and life of NoCh as a new form of living that generates a brotherhood of people. A community can become a community of the praxis of the Shema through the self-gift of charity. Such a community is where there is a way of loving, where one loves because they receive the call to love. Therefore, NoCh go beyond the nature of communities that the secular meta-reflexives aim to generate (including those where political and social change is the community’s objective). NoCh are, like ecclesial realities which are ‘schools of communion … journeying on in which one learns to live in the truth and love that Christ revealed’. Section 3.3 gives several accounts of ecclesial realities and how their fruits reveal that God’s Love lives in society.

Further, NoCh in the social world are where, to the degree that each is true to its origins in the action of God’s Love, love shines forth to build a civilisation of love and withstand the barbarity in their local concrete world. NoCh are centres of...

---

1170 Ibid. Benedict’s reflections are directed at the parish; however, they apply no less equally to communities such as NoCh.
1171 Ratzinger, Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith, 89.
1172 ‘Christ is necessary in order that the human race may come into its future which it is not able to do unaided’. Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 187–88.
1173 ‘The Eucharist must again be visibly the sacrament of brotherhood in order to be able to achieve its full, community-creating power’. Ratzinger, Meaning of Christian Brotherhood.
1174 ‘Only if I serve my neighbour can my eyes be opened to what God does for me and how much he loves me’. DCE, 18.
‘by loving the neighbour in God … neighbours are loved not as objects manipulated for satisfying the self’s desires but in themselves and as fellow pilgrims … that way there is a relational journey modelled on the incarnate Christ, who inhabits the temporal realm in order to form relations of love that bridge earth and heaven.’
1176 Benedict, ‘Second World Congress’.
transcendence for illuminating the nature of human beings as both creatures of God and creators in God’s grace of a human social world. They become spaces for a charity where God’s Love makes possible the integral development of humanity and of every man’.\footnote{1177} Benedict discussed these as schools generating spaces where charity creates roots for a life living the ‘extraordinary fusion between Love of God and love of neighbour’.\footnote{1178} Living in this way requires communities to ‘be a concrete place and a communal, indeed eucharistic, people whose very lives are transparent to God’.\footnote{1179} In other words, communities are where people live with an awareness of the need to have a transcendent orientation if they are to serve other human beings. They are places where one ‘retreats from the world’ to refresh ‘until the mind, emotions and will are clarified and focused, ready to bound with joy and perseverance out of the desert into the world’.\footnote{1180}

For Benedict, NoCh possess the purpose or rationale to be mediators of love and ensure that Trinitarian Love suffuses throughout the social order.\footnote{1181} This suffusion of love may take the form of acts of mercy, evangelisation, work for cultural or social renewal or even a simple presence in the world. Benedict was, however, not prescriptive about NoCh. Turkson discussed these entities as places where people receive God’s Love as a gift and there is a transformation of people by the Word of God into a ‘resocialisation’ in his Love to become agents of a new freedom and way of thinking.\footnote{1182} Benedict described such social entities as expressing a ‘social sacramental’ of love, in which grace is poured out in a visible social form ordering the new people in communities of faith.\footnote{1183} Communities are sacramental in the form of a social entity, where there are ‘experiences of trust in God [and] spiritual fellowship in Christ’.\footnote{1184} They are sacramental to the degree that friendship in a community of service of love is sacramental.

Thus, NoCh are agencies for the renewal of the world in Christ where, with others, through a praxis imbued with love from Christ, people are open to transcendence. In NoCh, there is a reshaping of people’s ultimate concerns to become a concern to love as one loves oneself in the Love of God. With this, there is a pouring out of grace in the

\footnote{1177} Benedict, ‘Lent 2013’.
\footnote{1178} Benedict, ‘Second World Congress’.
\footnote{1179} Brumfield, Benedict Proposal, 112.
\footnote{1180} Ibid., 183.
\footnote{1181} Ratzinger and Pera, Without Roots, 127.
\footnote{1182} Turkson, ‘Gospel and Social Teaching’.
\footnote{1183} Benedict, First Vespers.
\footnote{1184} CIV 79.
continuing search for truth, beauty, goodness and communion with others for the sake of common growth.\textsuperscript{1185} Reinders explained that L’Arche communities are communities of the Cross, that grow from accepting one’s brokenness.\textsuperscript{1186} As NoCh, these become social sacramentals for the transmission of love, charity and grace, the ongoing generation of fruits and an opening to transcendence that is necessary for human social living.

The fruits of NoCh are of an order beyond their boundaries because, as DCE put it, ‘the human race through love of neighbour’ receives healing from these communities.\textsuperscript{1187} Benedict emphasised that when NoCh introduce their neighbour into a relationship with God, this ‘evangelisation is the highest and the most integral promotion of the human person’ because there is no action more charitable.\textsuperscript{1188} As communities of love, gift and relationality, NoCh mediate signs of hope and freedom as a freedom they receive as God’s children.\textsuperscript{1189} In this freedom, they become a new people and, in the communal expression in NoCh, also become a minority living a ‘convincing model of life … offer[ing] a different way of seeing things’.\textsuperscript{1190} Further, in this living, they exhibit and proclaim Christ in the grace poured out and, as Benedict argued, this pouring out is quasi-Eucharistic in its giving.\textsuperscript{1191} Witnessing that this is charity at its highest, goodness, beauty, and truth leads to signs of holiness, and therefore, it becomes desirable for the witnesses.

3.1.6. Networks of Charity and the Dynamic of Orientating to the Trinity

Benedict discussed what constitutes the Christian faith and observed that the act of faith introduces the Christian to a God who is the ‘dynamic circle of Trinitarian love’.\textsuperscript{1192} Brumfield noted that this phrase expresses a Trinitarian communion; a pale imitation of this is the idea of communities as dynamic circles of love arising from the force of God’s Love.\textsuperscript{1193} With this love, the shaping and grounding of NoCh open into bringing others to the truth of God’s Love. The truth of a person’s response to this love

\textsuperscript{1185} John Paul II, ‘Centesimus Annus’, 36, quoted in CIV 51.
\textsuperscript{1186} Reinders, Receiving the Gift of Friendship, 337.
\textsuperscript{1187} DCE, 7.
\textsuperscript{1188} Benedict, ‘Lent 2013’.
\textsuperscript{1189} These are ‘“signs of hope” for the good of the Church and humanity’. Benedict, ‘Second World Congress’.
\textsuperscript{1190} Ratzinger and Pera, Without Roots, 121.
\textsuperscript{1191} Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 444.
\textsuperscript{1192} Ibid., 26.
\textsuperscript{1193} ‘Trinitarian communion is the cypher through which authentic communion can be perceived’. Brumfield, Benedict Proposal, 63.
is through a liturgy of worship and a Eucharist of thanks, accompanying and extending the gift of self in love for the neighbour.\footnote{DCE, 7.} With this comes a formation of a community building up the human race through the love of neighbour. For Benedict, this was because people are built from within to receive and give love in the image of God.\footnote{Ratzinger, \textit{God and the World}, 189.} In NoCh, the building up of people is an action in love, leading to the holiness that fulfils the Shema. This fulfilment is in a dimension beyond simple diaconal charity, which creates the social and ecological world anew from the power of love in a community that is greater when a community grows in the Shema framework, expressing the vertical and horizontal dimension of life.

NoCh occur when the vertical dimension orientating to God creates and sustains the world’s horizontal dimension, especially the social world. There is no true communion without the vertical orientation to God because it only comes from the vertical.\footnote{Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’.} Further, the horizontal does not disappear in the vertical; instead, it is lifted up to bear fruit. The horizontal is where the dynamic of charity is at the service of proclaiming God’s Love, which gives rise to the STCC as CIV \textit{in re sociali}.\footnote{CIV 5.} The totality of what NoCh are and what they are for is a proclamation of love, which is illustrated by Sections 3.2 and 3.3 on ecclesial realities as exemplars of NoCh.

\section*{3.1.7. Conclusion}

In Section 3.1, the discussion has focused on several strands contributing to the development of a meaning for NoCh. First, recognising friendship in and with Christ constitutes and sustains NoCh, which leads to identifying the three forms of charity as evangelisation, gratuitousness and social charity. These are the key components of NoCh for the renewal of cultural, social and economic life through evangelisation and living and working in gratuitousness. Second, each form of charity contributes to deepening the understanding of what Benedict was calling for with NoCh. Finally, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 draw a fuller picture of NoCh and explore Benedict’s call for communities of faith and his welcome of ecclesial realities.
3.2. Introduction to Ecclesial Realities

Reading Benedict’s mind about NoCh through using a three-point approach also assumes there are no definitive answers. The complexity of the history, activity, development and spirituality of the four exemplars to be discussed in Section 3.3 will illustrate this. Nevertheless, reading what emerges from the actions from the three points in CIV 5.7 invites an understanding of how NoCh come from unique situations and places (exhibiting diverse forms, engaging in various activities and developed differently) while sharing a commonality in the way each arises.

The first part of the approach comes from examining some commentators whose work has contributed to the discussion on taxonomy in this dissertation. ‘Taxonomy’ is a shorthand to framing an understanding of ecclesial realities as a precursor to working through selected ecclesial realities as exemplars of NoCh. A taxonomy can be a guide in how it offers a framework with which to consider the many facets of ecclesial realities as fruits of the Holy Spirit. However, this is not limited to the entities close to the structure of the apostolic succession. After reviewing the literature on this question, the discussion proposes to understand the ecclesial realities through the structure of CIV 5.7, which defines the steps towards creating NoCh and offers an intelligible framework for Section 3.3. The second part of the approach draws on Benedict’s reflections and observations regarding what Christians are called to bring about as a result of following Christ, in his vision of a Christian life and what it does for the world. The third approach explores, briefly, a perspective which sees NoCh as the dynamic of love that grounds the STCC.

3.2.1. An Approach Through a Taxonomy

For understanding the ecclesial realities selected as exemplars of NoCh, this section develops a draft of what may be characterised as a form of typological analysis or taxonomy. The purpose is not to identify realities by situating them into compartments, such as liberal or illiberal theologies, conservative or progressive, orthodox or heterodox, left or right, small or large numbers, political or non-political, focused on social justice or not, whether the nature of the communal life is new monastic
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1198 Heim, Joseph Ratzinger, 445.
1199 ‘We must always remember … taxonomies are temporary, provisional, intellectual structures whose relevance will not always be what it is, or seems to be, today’. Alan Jacobs, How to Think: A Guide for the Perplexed, (London. Profile Books, 2018), 119.
or a loose form of gathering. Instead, the objective is to gain a broader understanding beyond immediate experiences, whether this is a history, including mistakes and exaggerations, of the growth towards maturity, or decline. The approach seeks to capture the relationships between the realities and place their origins, development and activities in a context, including trying to encompass their internal and external features in a perspective from which to understand what is occurring when these entities operate in the world. There is a need to avoid oversimplification and prejudices regarding ecclesial realities. Further, before proceeding, Ratzinger’s caution about not looking for too strict a definition of the ecclesial movements remains relevant: he noted that ‘the Holy Spirit always has surprises in store, and only in retrospect do we recognise that, despite their great diversity, the movements do have a common essence’.  

The literature on ecclesial realities revealed a range of reactions, from outright hostility or fear and suspicion to tepid support or enthusiasm. A common and significant yet unfortunate feature through the literature is the lack of concrete evidence supporting the various positions. This could be because the authors were writing at a higher level of abstraction to encompass a broader range of realities, even if the result is a summary that is either overly critical or hagiographical. Those commentaries expressing support generally offer some experience or direct knowledge of the ecclesial realities; however, these can err in being uncritical. The literature has sometimes used various forms of criticism, often they are traditionalists seeking a return to the time before Vatican II. Others use words such as ‘fundamentalist’, ‘sect’ or ‘cult’ and often do so with little attention to the meanings or evidence. There is a group of what might be called ecclesiological critics, which includes those who highlight the complaints of bishops about the movements and those like Massimo Faggioli, who advocate for ecclesial realities to be more controlled by the bishops as against some type of papal control. Some criticise the realities as illiberal and conservative, contrasting them with those realities that focus on social justice, while some are concerned about the lack of inculturation. Finally, some critics focus their attention on the claims of the abuse of power or other types of abuse inside the movements, often, coming from former ‘members’ or participants. See Richard Rymarz, ‘Is “Fundamentalism” a Useful Descriptor’ of Some Trends in Contemporary Catholicism?’ Australasian Catholic Record 84, no. 1 (2007), 56–66; Gerald A. Arbuckle, Fundamentalism at Home and Abroad: Analysis and Pastoral Responses, (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2017), 97–124; see also Judith Tydings, ‘Shipwrecked in the Spirit’, Cultic Studies Journal 16, no. 2 (1999): 83–179.

1200 Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’, III. Later, Ratzinger suggested that ‘this attempt to find some kind of definition of what constitutes an ecclesial movement is no doubt very unsatisfactory’. Ibid.

1201 Some critics draw on the fundamentalist/heretical mode of criticism—often they are traditionalists seeking a return to the time before Vatican II. Others use words such as ‘fundamentalist’, ‘sect’ or ‘cult’ and often do so with little attention to the meanings or evidence. There is a group of what might be called ecclesiological critics, which includes those who highlight the complaints of bishops about the movements and those like Massimo Faggioli, who advocate for ecclesial realities to be more controlled by the bishops as against some type of papal control. Some criticise the realities as illiberal and conservative, contrasting them with those realities that focus on social justice, while some are concerned about the lack of inculturation. Finally, some critics focus their attention on the claims of the abuse of power or other types of abuse inside the movements, often, coming from former ‘members’ or participants. See Richard Rymarz, ‘Is “Fundamentalism” a Useful Descriptor’ of Some Trends in Contemporary Catholicism?’ Australasian Catholic Record 84, no. 1 (2007), 56–66; Gerald A. Arbuckle, Fundamentalism at Home and Abroad: Analysis and Pastoral Responses, (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 2017), 97–124; see also Judith Tydings, ‘Shipwrecked in the Spirit’, Cultic Studies Journal 16, no. 2 (1999): 83–179.

1202 Alberto Melloni, ‘Movements, On the Significance of Words’, in Movements in the Church, ed. Alberto Melloni, Concilium 3 (London: SCM Press, 2003), 7, observed how the debate about the movements is either expressed in the ‘antiquated vocabulary of heresiology’ or using descriptions of their reality in ‘apophatic terms’.
disciplines, including history, theology, ecclesiology, Canon Law, sociology, anthropology, spirituality and even geography.1203

One feature that is missing is any discussion of the history and context in which a charism emerges.1204 Consequently, the literature has not presented a picture of how the diversity among ecclesial realities comes, in part, from the different forces and ideas of the era in which they emerged. Without including such an understanding, this leads to gaps in the literature. The following paragraphs explore various writers' interpretations of ecclesial realities, and the different models proposed to understand them.

Various commentators adopted different models for understanding ecclesial realities. For example, Enzo Pace (Pace) proposed a model centring on two poles. The first pole is a spirituality ‘centred on conversion and the refounding of the community of the faithful’.1205 At the other pole is a spirituality ‘of a new identity which expresses itself in defence of Catholic identity threatened by modern individualism and ethical relativisms’.1206 Pace argued that between these two poles—one radical and the other conservative—is a range of realities or associations. Pace provided four criteria for interpreting the realities depending on where they lie along this spectrum. Each criterion used a smaller polar framework. First, Pace examined the nature of the ‘spiritual life’, which, when reframed, explores whether a reality is loose or tight in its spiritual formation, prayer life and liturgical celebrations. In his next step he studied the leadership structure and the division of powers and knowledge within the association. Pace identified the sociological structure and lines of authority, whether monastic, democratic or anarchic, in a community. The third polarity explores the nature of the relationship between religious choice and active commitment in society and the polis (directly or indirectly in political life). This criterion seeks to measure the political nature of an ecclesial reality as either radical or quiescent. The final criterion considers the stance of the ecclesial reality on the question of obedience regarding the authority of the Church’s magisterium. This polarity assesses the theological and canonical nature

1204 While this is a useful history, Faggioli advances his differences. See Massimo Faggioli, Sorting Out Catholicism: A Brief History of the New Ecclesial Movements, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008).
1206 Ibid.
of the reality and the degree of closeness it has to the magisterium, and by implication, the institutional character of the Church. However, Pace did not address the historical character or lines of development of an ecclesial reality, both of which might assist in identifying the work of the Holy Spirit. Another author who adopted a binary approach was David Ranson (Ranson). He positioned the ‘politics of mysticism’ at one pole and the ‘mysticism of politics’ at the other pole. For Ranson, the ecclesial realities at the first pole seek power, whether in society or the Church; that is, they focus on the use of mysticism for power. At the other pole are those entities that seek to serve the poor and seek justice. These latter entities he categorised as close to the ideas and praxis of liberation theology. Such a model does not seem to permit gradations between the poles, and ultimately, becomes a bifurcated and insensitive, and even a rigid form of classification. Other writers have used more complex models.

Michael Hayes (Hayes) adopted a three-dimensional approach. He argued that ecclesial realities are expressions of different ways in which the concepts of the kerygma, koinonia and diakonia may connect. For Hayes these three elements nourish each other, where each receives enrichment from the other. He argued that this is reflected in the different emphases occurring when a community lives the threefold life of communion, service and evangelisation. This model is closer to understanding how the Holy Spirit shapes and continues to shape a community. Thus, it acknowledges the diversity that is the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit. However, Hayes did not offer examples illustrating how his model works. Luis Navarro (Navarro) concurred to some degree with Hayes when he observed that any classification or analysis struggles
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1207 Ibid., 72.
1208 Ibid. Pace placed Catholic Action, Focolare and Caritas Internationalis in this category.
1210 ‘Ranson continues by first examining those movements that for him express “the politics of mysticism”, mentioning Opus Dei, the Neocatechumenal Way, Communion and Liberation, and Regnum Christi’. See also Purcell, Review of *Between*, 83.
1211 Ranson, *Between the ‘Mysticism of Politics’*, 269–85, described Sant’Egidio, Base Ecclesial Communities (BEC) and the groups with the spirituality of liberation theology as agents of the ‘mysticisms of politics’. See also David Ranson, ‘The New Age of Holiness: Vatican II: Today and Tomorrow’, *Compass* 40, 2006, 24–8, 28, where he favourably contrasted the Community of Sant’Egidio for having ‘inculturated in much more diverse ways’ than the NCW, which is still ‘enclothed within their originating cultural context’.
1213 Ibid.
to comprehend the variety of realities when viewed from a perspective of ‘their spirituality, apostolic methods, activities [and] membership’.1214

A brief examination of two entirely different ecclesial realities illustrates some challenges of developing a straightforward understanding of the variety of differences between ecclesial realities. The first example is the Catholic Integrated Community (CIC).1215 When Ratzinger was the Archbishop of Munich, he came to know this radical Christian community.1216 CIC arose in 1945 in reaction to the horrors of the Second World War (WW2) and, most notably, to address how the Holocaust could have happened in a, nominally at least, Christian Germany.1217 In response to this question, CIC explored the Christian relationship with Israel and the Judaic tradition. The question remained their focus, even while establishing a community and school in Tanzania.

In contrast to CIC’s intellectual and political focus, another ecclesial reality arose during the Council’s time looking to build communities where there could be friendships with severely intellectually disabled people. Vanier founded the first L’Arche community in France to care for and create companionship with severely disabled people living in institutions.1218 His first effort was not a success; however, L’Arche began creating communities where more able people were assistants living in communities and supporting and befriending people with disabilities. There are now many such communities across the globe. One of the significant achievements of L’Arche was how it reshaped the experience and understanding of people with severe

1215 CIC translates into German as Katholische Integrierte Gemeinde.
1217 The CIC’s history is rooted in the three young people who were active in a Catholic youth movement after WW2 ended. The key figure was Traudl Weiss (later Gertraud Wallbrecher). Michael Tyldesley undertook an extended study of the CIC in Chapter Four of his No Heavenly Delusion? A Comparative Study of Three Communal Movements, (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003). See Chapter 4 titled ‘Exodus-Integrierte Gemeinde, 86-115. CIC sought recognition in 1968, supported by the Archbishop of Paderborn and later, in 1976, by the Archbishop of Munich, one Joseph Ratzinger. Key features of the CIC include living communally in suburban houses, seeking to make the Gospel present to a world separated from the Church, meeting with others in ‘table communion’, celebrating a liturgy of the ‘Word of God’ while incorporating aspects of ancient Hebrew liturgies, and an outreach extending to Tanzania, where a CIC community is now established, and works in areas of education and health. See de Gaál, The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI, 225–27.
1218 The literature on Vanier and L’Arche is large and growing. Some key texts are from his own writings: Jean Vanier, Becoming Human (New York: Paulist Press, 2008); Broken Body, (Homebush, NSW: St. Pauls, 1988); and Community and Growth, (New York: Paulist Press 1989).
disabilities. Vanier opened the debate about recognising such people as human beings in the fullest sense. The L’Arche communities also witness the spiritual transformation that occurs in their members and assistants. This brief survey of CIC and L’Arche illustrates how a taxonomy requires more than adopting categories from Canon Law, ecclesiology, sociology or politics when looking to address the various realities through these categories.

This brief survey of the literature demonstrates that work is still required to develop a more comprehensive approach. Any future development needs to address the different eras, encompassing the social and cultural ideas and the economic, intellectual and political spheres in which an ecclesial reality emerged; however, as Ratzinger demonstrated in his address in 1998. Each era marks the ecclesial realities in their spirituality, formation, social structure and methods in the chosen field of mission. The religious/theological currents that were predominant or emerging during the time when a reality was emerging are also relevant. Examining when the charism arose and understanding the initiator or founder’s personal history is necessary. A personal history is a history of their sufferings and crises, including their experiences of beauty. Thus, studies must capture the charism’s spiritual, theological, ecclesiological, cultural and sociological dimensions through the founder/initiator’s life. Therefore, a study must also address a possible structure for investigating the ecclesial realities in their myriad forms, aims, activities and spiritualities. The following section, 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.5 focuses on developing an understanding as a provisional contribution to the ongoing discernment of ecclesial realities in preparation for Section 3.3, adopting as a framework the structure in CIV 5.7.
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1219 Reinders wrote about the ethical and theological issues relating to people with profound disabilities and L’Arche. See Reinders, Receiving the Gift of Friendship, 337, in which he described L’Arche communities as ‘of the Cross: they are places where people learn to accept their brokenness’. See also Hans S. Reinders, The Second Calling: A Novel Inspired by the Life and Work of Jean Vanier, (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2015), which offers fictionalised account of a L’Arche community.


1222 Such commentaries are a worthwhile contribution; even more so when they are grounded in a good knowledge of, and even a generosity in language and imagery towards the objects of their study. Little is gained from presumptions or relying on misunderstandings, mistakes or language taken out of context, whether by ‘leaders’ or ‘followers’. Using terms such as ‘sect’ is imprecise.
The structure of the three steps in CIV 5.7 provides the basis for a set of dimensions to draft a taxonomy. This draft includes two further dimensions: the relationship of the ecclesial reality with the Universal/local Church and the fruits from pouring out God’s Love in self-gift in charity. The first part of CIV 5.7, asked how each ecclesial reality learns of God’s Love at a concrete point in history. The answer involves exploring the social, intellectual, political and religious context in which the person (or people) learned of and experienced God’s Love for them. How does this open the Holy Spirit’s way to inspire a new charism in that person or people? How do the differences between exemplars reflect the circumstances when a person realises, or a group share, their realisation of the truth of this love? Charisms do not come from thin air or from an invention or outcome of manipulating people; instead, they come from a transformation of a person who may receive it alone, but more often with others.

The second point examines how and where people come to know of this charism as the truth of God’s Love for everyone. This investigates the history of the truth that drove them to live out the love received. Such recognition is more than intellectual. There is an awareness, which happens at the level of a person’s existence, of the Love of God. Often, there is no single founder but an initiator with friends or companions (as Benedict and the young men at Norcia showed). The change in a person or people comes from their realisation of the truth of this love. It is a truth of what it means for their lives and how it becomes the driver of the ecclesial reality. Within this transformation, various forms of the spirituality of a charism emerge. As spirituality shapes the communal form of the ecclesial reality, it shapes the different community structures, each with a sociological nature and character. The third element seeks to capture what ‘pouring out’ means as a praxis, where praxis is understood as the ecclesiological character of the actions and understanding of the community, the social charity of gift of self, the evangelisation and the mission.

However, within these dimensions, there is the need to identify the era in which the charism emerged, its orientation and self-declared purpose, the inner life and constitution of the communities, the forms of governance and the degree with which the original impulse or charism is followed and developed in real life. Part of this will be to understand the governance structures and how power is exercised both according to the charism and how it arises in practice. What is important is not to ignore situations or

1223 For the spiritualities of de Foucauld, Therese of Lisieux, Teresa of Ávila, Ignatian, the Benedictines, the Franciscans, the Bible and the Sermon on the Mount see Section 3.3.
patterns of behaviour in the exercise of authority that will without some form of counter control lead to structural oppression of those within the reality or distortion of the charism. No field of human activity is excluded from the field of engagement, whether it addresses people’s ecology or the ecology of nature. Schematically, this approach, with the variables within each category, can capture the character of different ecclesial realities.

The draft criteria developed in this section for a taxonomy of ecclesial realities are developed in response to shortcomings in standard typologies. The draft criteria are not detailed enough to carry through a deeper study of ecclesial realities. Some of the questions that will need to be addressed in any further development of the criteria must include how power is exercised at all levels including spiritual power, and the nature of the authority in ecclesial realities recognising there are different governance structures. Noting the different governance structures opens a discussion on how an ecclesial reality can become an example of where structural sin occurs. Part of this will be to understand the governance structures and how power is exercised both according to the charism and how it operates in practice. What is important is not to ignore situations or patterns of behaviour in the exercise of authority that will without some form of counter control lead to structural oppression of those within the reality or distortion of the charism. The idea of structural sin, however, which itself is a loosely defined term, needs to be read with an understanding of ‘dis-relationality’ [see section 2.1.4] and within the framework Ratzinger presents in his writings on liberation theology on structural evil (See section 2.1.4).

3.2.1.1. Knowing of God’s Love

An examination of the history of a person’s life considers when and how they came to know of God’s Love. This criterion examines the experience of the founder of the charism in their encounter with Christ as a ‘new expression of the following in the footsteps of Christ’. The account should include those who gather around the initiator

---

1225 Kevin Doherty, ‘The Paschal Dimension of the 40 Days as an Interpretive Key to a Reading of the New and Serious Challenges to Faith in the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland 1990-2010’ (PhD diss., Dublin City University, 2011), 47.
or founder.\textsuperscript{1226} It probably needs to extend to the founder’s personal history, formation in life, their sufferings and experiences of truth, goodness, and beauty. Examining the ecclesial reality in its contexts will need to include those theological issues and developments in the Church which help shaped the specific spiritual influences or inspirations for the founder(s) or initiator(s).\textsuperscript{1227} Further such an accounting needs to draw on the cultural, social, economic and political context of the period when an ecclesial reality emerged.\textsuperscript{1228}

3.2.1.2. Entering into a Transformation.

This part of the suggestion for a model taxonomy is structured around seeking answers to a variety of questions from which to develop some categories within this broader category. The focus is on the nature of a charism’s spirituality is the source of a movement’s spiritual strength and development and its innovative character.\textsuperscript{1229} The inspiration for this comes from Ratzinger’s quick survey of the history of the church and the different ecclesial movements.\textsuperscript{1230} Such a list of questions is not exhaustive, and in any work on the ecclesial movements, other questions will necessarily arise. Thus, a classification will begin looking for answers to these questions. How does such a reality seek to live the whole Gospel anew and recognise the Church without hesitation as the basis of their life? How do the community and the people in it live and proclaim this love?\textsuperscript{1231} What are the signs of taking the Gospel seriously?\textsuperscript{1232} Are the signs of the essential elements of the apostolic life present?\textsuperscript{1233} What are the spiritual

\textsuperscript{1226} There is rarely a single person involved in the foundation of an ecclesial reality. Often there a group of close friends assemble and begin a spiritual life if not a social life together. For example, the small group with St Benedict, starting out at Norcia; the seven founders of the Servite Order; St Ignatius and his company, who established the Society of Jesus; Focolare; Day and Maurin with the CWM; and Argüello and Hernández, who co-founded the NCW.

\textsuperscript{1227} The history captures whether the realities were founded by clerics, priests, religious or lay people.

\textsuperscript{1228} Julian Porteous, \textit{A New Wine and Fresh Skins: Ecclesial Movements in the Church}, (Leominster: Gracewing, 2010) proposed using historical criteria focusing on the Second Vatican Council and the status of the founder—lay, religious or cleric.


\textsuperscript{1230} Ratzinger, Ecclesial Movements, III. ‘...obedience in the sequela Christi, have been regarded throughout the ages as the essential ingredients of the apostolic life.’

\textsuperscript{1231} ‘Only when the person is struck and penetrated by Christ to the depths of his or her being, can others too be touched in their innermost being: Within this basic christological-pneumatological and existential structure, a great variety of accentuations and emphases can exist.’. Ratzinger, Ecclesial Movements, III.

\textsuperscript{1232} ‘Gospel is taken seriously and as something to be lived to the full: … “are not afraid of making radical demands on their members”’. Doherty, ‘Paschal Dimension’, 77.

\textsuperscript{1233} ‘Obedience in the following of Christ, have at all times been considered the essential elements of the apostolic life’. Ratzinger, Ecclesial Movements.
practices and patterns for holiness in which there is ‘a deep personal encounter with Christ’. Is there participation in prayer and involvement in both the Eucharist and other liturgies, and what is its character? Is holiness understood as ‘charity lived to the full[est]’? In their variable expressions, how do the realities reflect the need for a more profound spirituality, a countercultural presence in the world? Is there a structured life and what is its nature? How does it meet the call of service and simplicity in the name of the Gospel? How does this community’s vision in a fragmented society value life for the kingdom’s sake?

3.2.1.3. Formation, Growth and Continuation of Networks of Charity

There will be questions about the nature of the formation of people in a community. For example, how well does the formation relate to a Christian’s baptismal vocation? Does the formation or participation engender a robust Christian identity, and are those involved conscious of their particular vocation and mission on behalf of the Church? Are there people in the community with a mature Christian personality who possess a strong sense of belonging to the Church?

These questions raise the need to consider how a community governs itself. The governance of communities is an important variable. Some have a close supervision and management, while others have infrequent visits or gatherings and communications with only some form of overriding direction. The governance within communities can range from a low degree of direction to a greater level of organisational coordination,

1235 ‘Transformation is not instantaneous. Both time and the opportune moment; communal and personal direction; and acceptance of oneself in love and as loved; are all needed. Though there is no space to develop the idea of transformation or conversion further, the Cistercian Tradition sees conversion as the Path to Charity’. Cristiana Picardo, *Living Wisdom: The Mission and Transmission of Monasticism*, Monastic Wisdom Series 33, trans. Eric Varden. (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2014), 76.
1236 ‘Christian holiness is nothing other than charity lived to the full … by which we love God above all things and our neighbour through love of him … following, in decisions, the “signposts” that God has communicated to us, which are but forms of charity … “Hence the true disciple of Christ is marked by love both of God and of neighbour” (*Lumen Gentium*, n. 42). This is the true simplicity, greatness and depth of Christian life, of being holy’ Benedict, ‘General Audience’, 13 April 2011.
1241 Ibid.
1242 Ibid.
leadership or direction, with varying degrees of participation and the nature of those in the community.\textsuperscript{1244}

The nature of the participants varies. Some realities enjoy a broader range of people, such as lay, religious, families, single, old and young, all in a communal form. Others organise based on a single category, such as males or females, religious or laity, virgins or celibate and only married or single and young people.\textsuperscript{1245} All these factors give each community a different character as a social reality, not least because the vocation of the people who are participating and how they participate in the community shapes a community’s relationality.

Participation shapes the degree to which the community is a social reality as far as it has a degree of permanence in its social structures. However, some communities have a loose manner of participation.\textsuperscript{1246} Others are initially looser in their social ties, but with the passage of time and people’s experiences in the communal life, there is a generation of closer spiritual, social and personal ties as the community progresses.\textsuperscript{1247} Others have a closer and structured form of participation.\textsuperscript{1248} The sizes of each community range from small to large groups, although few communities may not work successfully beyond a certain level, varying from one reality to the next.\textsuperscript{1249} The spread of an ecclesial reality may be worldwide and measuring millions, with multiple communities in a locality, or its numbers are only in the tens or hundreds, where there only a few communities, or there may only be a small community in a locality.

\textsuperscript{1244} Faggioli, \textit{Rising Laity}, 3–5, provided examples of what he designates as ‘open’ realities, including the Pentecostal communities, CCR, Cursillo and Focolare.
\textsuperscript{1245} Some communities have separate fraternities for priest, seminarians, virgins and people not in communities. The pattern may be a lay community, with no common living and with married couples, families and people of all ages (e.g., NCW, CCR and BEC); a predominately lay and residential community where there is a core of celibate and single people (e.g., Focolare); or communities that involve participants who are residential or non-residential (e.g., the Emmanuel Community and Communion and Liberation). There are formal communities with fraternities (e.g., the Emmanuel Community, Focolare, Communion and Liberation, CCL and third order). There also informal fraternities, such as in the Community of the Beatitudes, with its larger outer association of friends. There are mixed residential communities, with lay people, single people, families and priests such as the Communauté des Béatitudes is present in many parts of the world. Examples of new monastic type communities include the Monastero di Bose in Tuscany, Taizé in France, the Monastic Family of Bethlehem, the Focolare houses, the Community of St. John, the Jerusalem community, the Community of the Beatitudes and the Sisters of Life.
\textsuperscript{1247} Ibid. For example, the NCW, where the community progresses along the path of the catechumenate, renewing in the ‘repeating’ of the baptismal rite—a journey where people get to know and support each other.
\textsuperscript{1248} Rausch, \textit{Radical Christian Communities}, 190.
\textsuperscript{1249} Charismatic communities can be large.
Conversely, others may only grow to a few scattered small communities across a country or the globe. Finally, the criteria examine how the ecclesial reality is a place for living the Christian vocation fully and coherently in an experience of fraternity, which comes on the journey that the ‘believers on the way’ take together. However, none of these criteria addresses the relationship between an ecclesial reality and the Church.

3.2.1.4. Relationships with the Universal and Local Church

Analysing the relationship between different ecclesial realities and the Catholic Church touches on questions of the canonical character, if there is any, of an ecclesial reality and how reality engages with the Church in its institutional forms. The question also touches on Ratzinger’s concern when he gave a retreat to the priests associated with Comunione e Liberazione in the 1990s. Ratzinger explained that for communities to remain healthy, they need to bear in themselves ‘the life and faith of the Universal Church’ and be ‘an actual community as a living thing’ if they are to ‘become themselves the Church, the place where faith is found and the place of rebirth into truth’.

Any analysis is not easy because of the tension between the universal and local dimensions of the Church at an institutional, theological and ecclesiological level. The other aspect of this relationship is that some ecclesial realities are entirely in communion with the Church and enjoy a ‘canonical’ relationship; while other realities may have a tangential or no such relationship. Moreover, a proportion of those participating in such a reality may be neither Catholic nor even Christian.

Why consider this relationship through the institutional aspect of the Church? Only the relationship of an ecclesial reality with the Church has an ecclesiological character to it to the extent that the realities, in how they are formed, their understanding
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1250 Faggioli, Rising Laity, 4, summarised the criteria of Augusto Favale as ‘Christian animation in the temporal world, Christian inspiration in the here and now, ecclesial micro communities, charismatic communities, neomonastic communities, communities related to movements, missionary communities and communities characterized by their openness’. Though ‘openness’ here is not understood in the way Ratzinger understood it.


1252 Benedict, Yes of Jesus Christ, 37–8.

1253 The debate between Ratzinger and Kaspar regarding this question is ongoing. See de Gaál, The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI, 199–208.

1254 L’Arche is one example.
of their mission or task and how they live as a community, reflect their understanding of the Church, which informs their institutional relationship. Thus, some realities consider themselves close to the Universal Church, referencing the Pope. Others may consider themselves only connected to the local Church without having the Pope as their point of reference. Further, they may understand their experience as being in communion through a new understanding of the Church’s pastoral, apostolic and evangelising mission.

Moreover, others, such as L’Arche, which does not seek to be exclusively Catholic, have a different relationship. Thus, a taxonomy must address the dimension of the relationship with the institutional forms of the Church. The arrangement is not a definitive criterion, but it is relevant given the centrality of some lay ecclesial realities in the Catholic Church’s life. The question is: is there a way of understanding this relationship beyond using canonical classifications?

Gianni Ambrosio (Ambrosio) proposed a model for capturing some of the different relationships between ecclesial realities and the institutional forms of the Church using three reference points: institutional, spiritual/emotional and ascetic/segregative. Ambrosio’s model is helpful for two reasons. First, it provides a basis for distinguishing different ecclesial realities in what they seek to achieve and provides the balanced grounds for assessing the many realities in or near the Church. Second, there is no prescription for NoCh to be only for Catholics because CIV 5.7, invites all Christians. To this extent, the three relationships are logical and assist with clarification while not judging ecclesial realities and their worth or value in living out social charity.

Ambrosio’s institutional type described those ecclesial realities ‘close’ to the institutions of apostolic succession in the Church. These movements seek to adapt missionary aspects of the Church to new societal patterns through a ‘spiritual-catechetical renewal of Church’. Generally, these are universal in their orientation to papal authority and understand themselves as being for the whole of the

---

1255 This is a criticism directed at both Focolare and NCW.
1256 Some ecclesial realities are international in scope. Of these, some are internationally organised and directed (e.g., SVdP), while others may only be managed within one country.
1258 Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’.
Church. In the spiritual/emotional mobilisation category, the reality is on the periphery of, even where there is an attachment to, the Church’s structures. The reality is to call the Church to recover identity through faithfulness to the Church’s radical commitment. Finally, the category of ascetic/segregative seeks to capture a reality that is further from the borders of the structures and authorities of the Church, whether by choice or the logic of their activities in caring for the other. The orientation is to a broader sense of Christianity and may express a commitment to the poor and radical social change. Such an orientation often involves moving from prayer and service to the poor to challenge the social order. The dissertation argued that these three dimensions have significant value to the Church when contemplating the ecclesial realities that have emerged over the last century. Ambrosio’s dimensions allow for recognising the fruits of an ecclesial reality as fruits for the Church and its mission.

3.2.1.5. Pouring out God’s Love in Self-Gift in Charity

In this Section, the approach to analysing NoCh is less prescriptive because there is no limit regarding what fields of endeavour NoCh may or may not undertake. For Benedict, evangelisation is a central feature of NoCh; he considered it the ‘best service for men and women and especially for the poor, so that the person’s life, a fairer order in society and peaceful coexistence among the nations may find in Christ the cornerstone on which to build the genuine Civilization, the Civilization of love’. In addition,

---

1260 Leahy, *Ecclesial Movements and Communities*, 19–20. ‘New Ecclesial Movements are universal … live in tension to the world’. Hegge, *Rezeption und Charisma*, 226–30. Examples of universal movements include NCW, Focolare, Sant’Egidio, Communion and Liberation and CCR. The quasi-monastic communities are often only present in centres or houses, such as the Cenacolo Community, L’Arche and the Focolare houses. New monastic communities are a component of Opus Dei and Communion and Liberation.

1261 Two realities focus on the parish: NCW (where it is permitted) and the SVdP (where it is supported).

1262 The early movement of St Francis had this character.

1263 Rausch, *Radical Christian Communities*, 189–90. Covenant communities include Lion de Juda and Pain de Vie.

1264 ‘Who are the poor? … slum children, … elderly, the new poor of the western city … immigrants, the homeless, the disabled, the prisoners, the mentally ill, the HIV-infected, the children with learning disabilities and the gypsies—anyone who lives at the neglected margin of the city and who are seen as in the eyes of the world to have nothing to offer’. Mario Marazzati and Austen Ivereigh, ‘A Church That Is and Works to be a Church for Everyone, but Particularly the Poor’, in *New Religious Movements in the Catholic Church*, ed. Michael A. Hayes, (London: Burns & Oates, 2005), 35.

1265 Rausch gave examples of the radical communities (the CWM, the Iona Community, the Sojourners Community and BEC) and established Catholic Charities as non-government organisations under the authority of a bishop or bishops’ conference.

1266 Benedict, ‘Solemnity of Pentecost’. 
evangelisation encompasses charity for social renewal, which characterises being a ‘Christian within the world of today’. With this, the idea of possible taxonomy helps understand how these are a gift for the Church and why different realities encounter different challenges within and outside the Church. Hopefully, a taxonomy, such as the one sketched out in Section 3.2.1, can help to move the debate about the ecclesial realities away from the various bipolar perspectives that confuse much of the discussion about this topic. The proof it is suggested lies in the answers to the following questions: Are these communities living in Christ and producing fruits for the world? Are these fruits assisting those who seek to tread the road to holiness? Such questions mean any suggested taxonomy needs to be open.

In conclusion any taxonomy can only provide a limited approach to understanding ecclesial realities. The three elements proposed above must always be under consideration when attempting to place realities within the framework of taxonomy. These three elements are dynamic, and thus, the taxonomy of ecclesial realities can never be permanent, unlike, for example, a taxonomy of flora and fauna, where the taxonomy, except for a discovery of a new species, is generally static. The three elements require a degree of openness to the other elements, to the facts on the ground; the fruitfulness (not necessarily measurable by the number of people in an ecclesial reality) of those entering and living in such a reality, include the degree of self-sacrifice that emerges to sustain the mission of the community; and the humility and holiness of their presence in the Church and the world. With this discussion in the background Section 3.3 explores ecclesial realities and their way of following Christ to understand how they exemplify NoCh.1268

3.3. Some Ecclesial Realities as Exemplars of Networks of Charity

After working through the background to the exemplars, Section 3.3 examines each exemplar with a method drawing on the three segments of CIV 5.7. The approach adopted for analysing ecclesial realities of all types is described in Section 3.2. The first segment, frames an examination of the origins of each exemplar through the

---


1269 For a detailed discussion about the three segments in CIV 5.6, see Section 1.3 of this dissertation.
history and charism of the founder/initiator, which requires a biography of how they realised God’s Love for them.\textsuperscript{1270} For the phrase ‘to make ourselves instruments of grace’, the text discusses the key moments in the initiators’ ‘conversion’.\textsuperscript{1271} Further, using the third segment, ‘to pour forth God’s charity and create’ NoCh, this dissertation seeks to capture the different ways each exemplar has developed and their various patterns of living out their charisms.\textsuperscript{1272} Finally, the discussion examines the fruits from each exemplar, treating each exemplar as an instance of NoCh. This approach offers a key to reading the exemplars, which provides the advantage of a more open-ended and less prescriptive process.

All the exemplars under discussion in this section use the word ‘community’ in their lexicon. This requires a brief note about the use of the word ‘community’ to helpfully avoid confusion. The range in the definitions of ‘community’ extends from describing a self-selecting cohort or group closed to those that organise in broader forms of loose gatherings. The word can include those who live with a close sharing of their goods and lives and those who regularly gather around some common point (e.g., liturgical, social or cultural) to walk the same journey and who might or might not live in a geographical area but may not share a form of communal living. The range is reflected in the four exemplars chosen for discussion in Section 3.3. The four exemplars belong to different eras of history, which recognises Ratzinger’s historical approach in the 1998 address.\textsuperscript{1273} Although Ratzinger reflected on a broader and longer historical scale, the principle remains the same: ecclesial realities arise from an eruption of the Holy Spirit as a gift to the Church and the world during each era.\textsuperscript{1274} As shown below, the Holy Spirit moves Christians to witness in Christ the one who is to save them and the one who calls them to be His Face as an answer to the misery of poverty and death in the world. However, in choosing this range of ecclesial realities does not mean the selection is representative of an era, a particular time or a type.

The first two exemplars arose during the period between the two world wars. The first is the houses of hospitality of the CWM, founded by Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin (see Section 3.3.1.1). The second is the Friendship Houses (later, the Madonna

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1270} CIV 5.6.
\textsuperscript{1271} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1272} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1273} ‘Instead of trying to resolve the question in terms of such a dialectic of principles, we should, in my view, opt for an historical approach, as befits the historical nature of the faith and of the Church’. Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’.
\textsuperscript{1274} ‘Every irruption of the Holy Spirit always upsets human plans … the Spirit works through human beings and does not simply free them from their weaknesses’. Ratzinger, ‘Ecclesial Movements’.
\end{footnotesize}
Houses), founded by Catherine de Hueck Doherty (de Hueck) (see Section 3.3.1.2). The two key figures, Day and de Hueck, encountered similar questions and challenges amid devastating economic and social turmoil and even enjoyed a personal connection and mutual support that lasted their entire lives. In her essay regarding Day and the CWM, Miller suggested that there was no coincidence in how Day and de Hueck conducted similar actions because both sought ‘to live among and in solidarity’ with the poor. However, there are some essential differences, for example, in the relationship with the institutional forms of the Church. Neither Day nor the CWM sought any form of canonical recognition, although Day never fought with the bishops about her mission and, in some instances, cooperated with them. Nevertheless, she never sought their support or approval for the work of the CWM. However, like de Hueck, Day never rejected the Church and never contested its teachings or the bishops’ authority, even if she disagreed with the lack of commitment to the poor. There were occasions of public differences that were due to her radical pacifist stance.

Conversely, de Hueck engaged with the bishops, including seeking approval and accepting directions to abandon her work. Beyond this difference and some differences in their methods, both exemplars are instances of ecclesial realities as NoCh, where each responded differently to the social crises of their time. As ecclesial realities, each exemplar emerged from the actions of their founder, who was an ecclesial person and a baptised follower of Christ and His Church. Both sought to live out the double command of love—the Shema.

The third exemplar, Focolare, was founded by Chiara Lubich during WW2 and spread through Italy before taking new energy from the Council. Finally, the fourth exemplar, the NCW, differs from the previous three because its roots are in the Council and because it is present primarily within the institutions and structures of the Church; conversely, the other three have a presence outside the structures of the Church. Kiko Argüello (Arguello) and Carmen Hernández (Hernandez) were the initiators of the NCW.

1276 Miller, ‘Hollywood’s Underbelly’, 313.
1277 The paper ‘The Catholic Worker’ was sold in many parishes across the USA and had strong support from many priests and some bishops.
1278 See Section 3.3.1.2 for a discussion about when de Hueck was ordered to stop her work in Toronto.
3.3.1. The Great Depression

3.3.1.1. Peter Maurin, Dorothy Day and Houses of Hospitality

In his penultimate ‘General Audience’ in 2013, Benedict identified Day as someone who had ‘the ability to oppose the ideological enticements of her time to choose the search for truth and to open herself to the discovery of faith’. He recognised how ‘God guided her to a conscious adherence to the Church, in a life dedicated to the underprivileged’. However, her journey to recognising God was an unusual one.

Day wrote three autobiographies. The first, written in 1923, was in the form of a novel, *The Eleventh Virgin*. The latter autobiography was an extended speech addressing a communist—her brother, John. The third, *The Long Loneliness*, published in 1952, was her spiritual autobiography. In this latter book, Day gave a fuller picture of how she came to know herself, through much suffering, as someone who was a subject of charity—a subject of God’s Love. Day was born a month before Saint Therese of Lisieux died in 1897.

---

1279 I discuss Maurin and Day together because they co-founded the houses, or rather, Maurin conceived and initiated it as part of his program and Day carried it forward. There are good grounds for suggesting that they should always be discussed together. However, in contemporary academia, he is very much in Day’s shadow. But see Volume LXXIV, Number 3, 1 May 2007, with its front-page headline of ‘Our Founder, Peter Maurin’ over a picture of Maurin.

1280 ‘The ability to oppose the ideological enticements of her time in order to choose the search for truth and to open herself to the discovery of faith was witnessed by another woman of our time, the American Dorothy Day. She confessed openly in her autobiography to having succumbed to the temptation to solve everything with politics, adhering to the Marxist proposal: “I wanted to be with the protesters, go to jail, write, influence others and leave my dreams to the world. How much ambition and how much searching for myself in all this!”. The journey towards faith in such a secularized environment was particularly difficult, but Grace acts nevertheless, as she pointed out: “It is certain that I felt the need to go to church more often, to kneel, to bow my head in prayer. A blind instinct, one might say, because I was not conscious of praying. But I went, I slipped into the atmosphere of prayer …”. God guided her to a conscious adherence to the Church, in a life dedicated to the underprivileged’. Benedict XVI, ‘General Audience’, The Holy See, 13 February 2013. http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/audiences/2013/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20130213.html.

1281 Ibid.


1283 Dorothy Day, *From Union Square to Rome*, (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2006). This book was written with a very personal, warm and lyrical tone, with all the characteristics of a letter sent to a dear friend or close family member. In this case, it was her brother John, then an active member of the Communist Party USA.

1284 John was a journalist, and she was close to him. She described her love of him when caring for him as a baby. He died in Helsinki, far away from his sister and not persuaded by her book. See also her appeal to him (in *From Union Square to Rome*, 13): ‘I believe you are trying to love Christ in His poor, His persecuted ones’.

Therese became important for Day, who later wrote a biography about her.\footnote{1286} Day recognised that there were many openings to God in her early life.\footnote{1287} She even identified inchoate signs of transcendence in the literature she read, and she developed a deep love for Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. They ‘made me cling to faith in God, and yet I could not ensure feeling an alien … [I] had nothing in common with that of Christians around me’\footnote{1288}. Her family gave her a deep familiarity with the Bible.\footnote{1289} Day was open to the transcendent, and God was certainly not alien to her, but she ‘did not search for God when we were children’.\footnote{1290} At university, her childhood Protestant religiosity died; she read radical novelists and engaged in socialist activism.\footnote{1291} She joined anti-war and labour movements such as the Industrial Workers of the World.\footnote{1292}

Day’s commitment to the poor, suffering and oppressed people was engendered during these years; however, she never became an ideologue. On the contrary, she suffered significantly after the end of the war during her search for something different.\footnote{1293} While Day thought she had every reason to continue her life of working to oppose oppression and exploitation, she discerned that her life was ‘disorderly’ and, consequently, became disengaged from the radical life.\footnote{1294} She called this period ‘A Time of Searching’ but not for God.\footnote{1295} The change came when she moved away from the bohemian and activist world of New York. In 1925, she moved to Staten Island to live in a common-law relationship with an atheist who helped her see the natural world’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1286} See Dorothy Day, \textit{Thereese}. (Notre Dame, IN: Christian Classics, 2016).
\item \footnote{1287} Day, \textit{The Long Loneliness}, 11, said: ‘“All my life I have been haunted by God” …This must indeed be so, as former friends and comrades have said this of me’.
\item \footnote{1288} Day, \textit{The Long Loneliness}, 43. Walter Scott, Victor Hugo, Charles Dickens, Robert Louis Stevenson, Fenimore Cooper and Edgar Allen Poe were among the authors she read during her childhood.
\item \footnote{1289} Day and John went to an Episcopalian church for a while, and it appears she was baptised, but not confirmed. Day, \textit{The Long Loneliness}, 29.
\item \footnote{1290} Ibid., 217.
\item \footnote{1291} Day, \textit{The Long Loneliness}. At university, she read Peter Kropotkin, Jack London, Upton Sinclair and other radical novelists, who shaped her sympathy for oppressed and the poor. The literature she noted only helped to create a feeling ‘that religion would only impede my work … I felt I must turn from it as from a drug’. \textit{Long Loneliness}, 43.
\item \footnote{1292} The Industrial Workers of the World (or ‘Wobblies’ as they were affectionately known) was primarily an industrial or syndicalist organisation seeking primarily to unionise the mass of industrial workers across the USA. It was sometimes linked to violent and mass strikes. Some of its adherents went onto form the Communist Party of the USA.
\item \footnote{1293} Wright, \textit{Dorothy Day}.
\item \footnote{1294} Day, \textit{From Union Square to Rome}, 99. Neither in \textit{From Union Square to Rome} nor \textit{Long Loneliness} did Day mention the events of her early failed relationship that lead to an abortion, which was ‘a great tragedy’ that haunted her for the rest of her life. In \textit{Eleventh Virgin} written under a pseudonym she gave details. See also Terence C. Wright, \textit{Dorothy Day: An Introduction to Her Life and Thought}, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2018), 26–8.
\item \footnote{1295} ‘I wanted to be with the protesters, go to jail, write, influence others and leave my dreams to the world. How much ambition and how much searching for myself in all this!’ Day, \textit{Long loneliness}, 60.
\end{itemize}
This beauty opened her to see the Love of God for her in her life and experience it as a joy, which heightened when her daughter, Tamar, was born and was further celebrated at Tamar’s baptism in 1927. At the age of 30, Day was baptised in the Catholic Church. However, before her reception into the Church, she had attended mass regularly and even slipped ‘into an atmosphere of prayer’. Prayer became a consistent feature of her life, and from then onwards, she focused on daily mass, reading the Bible, reading the Divine Office and saying the rosary.

However, she still did not consider herself one whom God Loved; instead, she only saw God in the beauty of her child. Later, she said she ‘found Him through his poor’. Day learnt that she needed to love her neighbour in order to love God. Following her baptism, she suffered from the end of her relationship with her common-law husband and also because she felt she was far from working people’s struggles.

Day’s suffering intensified when she identified that many people in the Church were not with the poor in their struggles. In particular, she experienced how some ‘priests were more like Cain than Abel’. For five years, she sought an answer about what she should do because she wanted to discover God’s task for her. The answer came unexpectedly. When she reported on the hunger march arriving in Washington in 1932, she visited the United States of America’s (USA) national Catholic shrine. There, she prayed ‘with tears and with anguish, that some way would open up for me to use what talents I possessed for my fellow workers, for’ the poor’. The answer came on

---

1296 ‘It was because through a whole love, both physical and spiritual, I came to know God’. Day, Long Loneliness, 140.
1297 1927.
1298 Benedict, ‘General Audience’, 13 February 2013, quoted Day: ‘It is certain that I felt the need to go to church more often, to kneel, to bow my head in prayer. A blind instinct, one might say, because I was not conscious of praying. But I went, I slipped into the atmosphere of prayer’.
1299 Day, From Union Square to Rome, 12.
1300 ‘It was human love that helped me understand divine love. Human love at its best, unselfish, glowing, illuminating our days, gives us a glimpse of the love of God for man’. Ibid., 155.
1302 She recalled the executions of Sacco and Vanzetti in 1926: ‘I thought of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Where were the Catholic voices crying out for these men’? Day, Long Loneliness, 145. This observation was preceded with her feeling that on coming into the Church, she was ‘betraying the class to which I belonged, the workers, the poor of the world, with whom Christ spent his life’. Long Loneliness, 144.
1303 Ibid., 150.
1304 Her prayer was made on the Feast of The Immaculate Conception, 8 December 1932.
1305 The USA national shrine is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary under the title, Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.
1306 Day, Long Loneliness, 166.
her return to New York, where Peter Maurin (Maurin) was waiting in her apartment to meet her.

From their first meeting, Maurin began teaching her his ideas, which became central to her life.\(^1\)\(^{307}\) He introduced her to a program for building a new society.\(^3\)\(^{08}\) Maurin envisaged this coming through a green revolution.\(^3\)\(^{09}\) He had a three-point program of action for roundtable discussions, open to all, regarding the STCC.\(^3\)\(^{10}\) Along with advocating for creating houses of hospitality and farms as agronomic universities, Maurin taught Day about the STCC.\(^3\)\(^{11}\) He first introduced her to *‘Rerum Novarum’*.\(^3\)\(^{12}\) After this, they read the encyclical *‘Quadragesimo Anno’*.\(^3\)\(^{13}\) Maurin taught her to read the encyclicals in the intellectual framework of distributism as articulated by G. K. Chesterton (Chesterton).\(^3\)\(^{14}\) He conceived the houses of hospitality (HoH) as a form of halfway house, which he argued the bishops had a responsibility to promote and even build in their dioceses.\(^3\)\(^{16}\) Third, Maurin envisaged ‘roundtable discussions’ in the houses to clarify what was needed to promote societal changes.\(^3\)\(^{18}\) His vision included

\(^{1307}\) Dorothy Day and Francis J. Sicius, *Apostle to the World*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), xviii, footnote 1. Day wrote: ‘Peter Maurin is most truly the founder of the Catholic Worker Movement. He brought to us Romano Guardini, Jacques Maritain, Eric Gill, Belloc and Chesterton. I was the active principle in the partnership, I admit, but then, women are always the practical ones, the housekeepers’. This quote was taken from a letter Dorothy Day sent to Brendan O’Grady, 2 June 1954, Catholic Worker Archives, Marquette University, DD-CW, Series W-10, Box 1. See also Robert Ellsberg, ed. *Dorothy Day: Selected Writings: By Little and by Little*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2018), 41: ‘Peter, the French peasant, whose spirit and ideas will dominate the rest of this book as they will dominate the rest of my life’.

\(^{1308}\) This was expressed differently over time. For example, this was to be for a ‘utopian, Christian communism’, and Day discussed building a ‘Christian social order’. Dorothy Day, ‘Aims and Purposes’, *The Catholic Worker*, February 1940, 7. See Ellsberg, *By Little and by Little*, 91. Maurin identified the need for a new society ‘in which it is easier to be good for people to be good’ because they can be good when they are happy. See Dorothy Day, Peter’s Program, *The Catholic Worker*, May 1955, 2, and also Long Loneliness, 170.

\(^{1309}\) This is understood as the counter to a red, violent revolution—a green revolution is understood as peaceful.


\(^{1311}\) Day, *Long Loneliness*, 172. See also Dorothy Day, To Christ – to the Land, *The Catholic Worker*, January 1936. Ellsberg also references this article in *By Little and By Little*, 70–1.

\(^{1312}\) Leo XIII, *‘Rerum Novarum’*.


\(^{1314}\) G. K. Chesterton was famous for his promotion of distributism.

\(^{1315}\) William D. Miller, *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*. 2nd ed. (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2005), 98, quoted Maurin (but did not reference the source) as saying: ‘We need houses of hospitality to bring the bishops to the people and the people to the bishops … We need houses of hostility to show what idealism looks like when practised’. See also Maurin’s Program. Maurin recalled how in the Middle Ages, it was the duty of each bishop to provide hospices for wayfarers.

\(^{1316}\) Maurin envisaged these roundtable discussions, headed by a priest, creating a lay apostolate.
a desire to take people back to the land by creating ‘agronic universities’ or farm colonies.\textsuperscript{1319} Maurin promoted the call, under the idea of distributism, for a ‘return to the land’ through worker farms.\textsuperscript{1320} He envisaged these as places where people went to build communities in line with distributism.\textsuperscript{1321} The colonies would become where the unemployed lived in communities and worked the land.\textsuperscript{1322} They were to be places for ongoing formation, with speakers and extended roundtable discussions.\textsuperscript{1323} He had a vision of building a new society from within the shell of the old.\textsuperscript{1324}

Maurin argued that these tasks required a newspaper to evangelise, educate and promote his ideas for a ‘green revolution’; thus, the Catholic Worker was established. Maurin’s involvement in the CWM was, however, only as a reflective thinker, inspirer and educator.\textsuperscript{1325} Day’s significance was the gift of her journalistic skills and talents and, more importantly, what Bridget Merriman (Merriman) described as her natural gifts of ‘companionship, hospitality, and compassion towards the other’.\textsuperscript{1326} Day carried Maurin’s program forward through the CW, which she edited and of which she was often the main contributor.\textsuperscript{1327} From 1934, the CWM HoH spread across the USA.\textsuperscript{1328}

Day insisted that the HoH were places for the poor to live in and where helpers could ‘live with them and share with them their suffering too. Give up one’s privacy,
and mental and spiritual comforts as well as physical’. 1329 Thus, everyone who came to stay and help encountered a call to commit to living in ‘voluntary poverty’ and precariousness, trusting in God’s Love. 1330 The HoH became centres for the practical application of the corporal works of mercy. 1331 And where there would also be spiritual works of mercy. 1332 Maurin and Day’s personalism fed into creating a deeper relationality, where volunteers were servants of those they supported, and worked and lived with.

Further, the relational bonds deepened, and a community emerged in HoH. 1333 The HoH became communities of servers, and the served, where there were bonds of communion and friendship. 1334 Day understood all these events and changes through the lens of the mystical body of Christ. 1335 For Day, in the body of Christ are ‘those who enter into his communion [. They] make His body present in the bonds they create though hastening together in the manner in which he hastens to them’. 1336 The HoH

1329 Wright, Dorothy Day, 62.
1330 For Day and Maurin, voluntary poverty is tied closely to precarity. See Ellsberg, By Little and By Little, 106–10, where Day wrote that voluntary poverty ‘is the only way we have of showing love’ (109). See also Day, ‘…poverty is no longer voluntary, no longer a counsel, but something which is laid upon us by necessity’. Dorothy Day, On Poverty. [This is a document composed of separate articles. It is in the Dorothy Day Library on the Web (DDLW), a section of The Catholic Worker Movement website. https://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/themes/On%20Poverty%20(Dorothy%20Day).pdf, (accessed February 24, 2021. Also see Day, Long Loneliness, 195, referenced Maurin, calling for voluntary poverty by ordinary people, with examples of going without luxuries, such as cars, radios, televisions, cigarettes and movies. See also Chap, ‘Precarity of Love’, 381, who wrote the article as a reminder to contemporary activists in the CWM (Chapp lives on a Catholic Worker farm in Pennsylvania) that voluntary poverty and precarity were at the core of Day’s work: ‘a central focus of her mission’.
1331 ‘The spiritual works of mercy include enlightening the ignorant, rebuking the sinner, consoling the afflicted, as well as bearing wrongs patiently, and we have always classed picket lines and the distribution of literature among these works’. Day, Long Loneliness, 220.
1333 Day, Long Loneliness, 187. described volunteers as ‘unwilling celibate and for the unemployed as well as for men and women, willing celibates, who felt that running hospices, performing the works of mercy, working on farms, was the vocation, just as definitely a vocation as that of the professed religious’.
1334 ‘A community was growing up. A community of the poor. Who enjoyed being together, who felt they were embarked on a great enterprise, who had a mission’. Ibid., 224.
1335 Regarding the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti in 1925, Day wrote:

   ‘The day they died, the papers had headlines as large as those which proclaimed the outbreak of war. All the nation mourned. All the nation, I mean, that is made up of the poor, the worker, the trade unionist—those who felt most keenly the sense of solidarity—that very sense of solidarity which made me gradually understand the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ whereby we are the members one of another.’ Day, Long Loneliness, 148.

   See also Ellsberg, By Little and By Little, 91: Day stated that it ‘involves the unions … the racial quartino, it involves cooperatives, credit unions, crafts; it involves Houses of Hospitality and farming communities. It is with all these means that we can love as though we all believed indeed that we are all members of another’.
become centres where love, gift and relationality flourish. They were more than centres for voluntary social work; they were centres for building a community where love is the basis. They became communities of love. They were communities, where living in mercy gives a witness, however tenuous, to the hope for a new society to come from within the old. Moreover, how the CWM set up HoH helps discern the meaning of Benedict’s call for building NoCh. The work of the CWM contributes to understanding how fullness in charity is essential in NoCh. A question remains about the spirituality of Day and how it shaped the life of the CWM and exemplified it as a community of faith and charity, such as the NoCh.

Several sources informed and contributed to Day’s spiritual development. Larry Chapp (Chapp) argued that Day had ‘a radical and orthodox faith’ that received significant inspiration from the ‘Sermon on the Plain’. Moreover, her spiritual life came through her suffering, maturing into a life often characterised as ‘Theressian’. From her Theressian spirituality, Day found ‘the answer to her longings in the great upheavals of humanity and the overturning of intractable power structures [where she] is forced, in gazing upon Therese, to meditate on the mundane’. Therese and Day both recognised the works of mercy as practices in the presence of God because in these practices, ‘one’s own vision of the world is transformed’. Merriman argued that Day understood the HoH as cells of the Christian life. Volunteers in the HoH regularly said the rosary and Divine Office, and attended mass daily. These spiritual practices

1337 In Part 3, I explore the selected exemplars to understand the key sentences in CIV 5 and the contribution this has made to the patrimony of the Church’s social doctrine.
1339 Lk 6–17–49. See also Day, Long Loneliness, 141: ‘The Sermon on the Mount answered all the questions as to how to love God and one’s brother’.
1340 De Lorenzo, Work of Love, 217. See also Day, ‘On Pilgrimage’, quoted in Merriman, Searching for Christ, footnote 43, 292, where she noted that ‘Peter Maurin was always talking of the primacy of the spiritual. It was in the depths of the Depression that Peter came to me as an answer to prayer, and his was the Little Way of St. Therese (though I did not think much of the Little Flower and her Little Way at that time)’. Dorothy Day, On Pilgrimage, The Catholic Worker, February 1977, 2,8.
1341 De Lorenzo, Work of Love, 216.
1342 Ibid., 218.
1343 Merriman, Searching for Christ, 223. Merriman did not reference this statement. Merriman described how Day ‘viewed Catholic Worker houses as “cells” of Christian life, a term which may be readily applied to membership in the mystical body of Christ as well as monasticism’ and added that Day ‘sought herself monastic affiliation as a Benedictine oblate’.
1344 Rausch, Radical Christian Communities, 140, wrote, somewhat dismissively, about how ‘Dorothy’s Catholicism would always be a very traditional one. She accepted the Church’s structures and authority without question and rarely challenged its hierarchical officials’.
were an integral aspect of the spirituality of the HoH.\textsuperscript{1345} Through these ‘traditional’ practices of faith, life in the HoH was able to sustain the struggle to continue living in precarity through voluntary poverty and trust in God’s Love.\textsuperscript{1346} However, a highly significant development in her spiritual life occurred in 1941, when Day attended a retreat run by a priest – John Hugo (Hugo).\textsuperscript{1347}

The 1941 retreat, which went for many days, focused on the call to live the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ in a radical way.\textsuperscript{1348} Day recognised this call required people ‘to work to increase our love for God and for our fellow man (and the two must go hand in hand), this is a lifetime job. We are never going to be finished. Love and ever more love is the only solution to every problem that comes up’.\textsuperscript{1349} Day knew that such a form of love was challenging.\textsuperscript{1350} When saying this, she recalled the words of Father Zossima that ‘love in action is a harsh and dreadful thing compared to in dreams’.\textsuperscript{1351} This retreat, and subsequent retreats, marked her spirituality for the remainder of her life.\textsuperscript{1352}

\textsuperscript{1345} ‘The centrality of Mass was crucial to Dorothy, and she considered it the greatest work of the day. In the early 1940s, when she addressed a group of “would-be-Catholic Workers”, she admonished them that “the Mass is the Work!” All their activities were to be offered to and then united frequently with sacrifice of Christ on the Cross and the altar’. Mark Zwick and Louise Zwick, ‘Introduction—Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement’. In \textit{On Pilgrimage}, Dorothy Day, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1990), 37. This was reprinted from \textit{Communio} 24 (1997). Day in 1963 reminded readers of Catholic Worker, (on her return from Rome to attend a gathering to welcome John XIII’s \textit{Pacem in Terris}) that the particular vocation of ‘The Catholic Worker is to reach the man in the street, to write about the glorious truths of Christianity, the great adventure of the Spirit which can effect so great a transformation in the lives of men if they would consent to the promptings of Spirit’. Dorothy Day, \textit{On Pilgrimage}, \textit{The Catholic Worker}, May 1963, 2.


\textsuperscript{1347} The retreat, led by Fr. Hugo, drew heavily from the work and inspiration of a Canadian Jesuit, Fr. Onésime Lacouture. See Jack Lee Downey, \textit{In coelestibus: The Spiritual Combat of Onésime Lacouture, S.J.}, \textit{Journal of Jesuit Studies} 5, no. 4 (November 2018): 549–66, 550. Lacouture’s “extreme” approach—an unrelenting critique of mainstream Catholicism’s capitulation to modernity—drew exacting scrutiny, which only escalated as Lacouture responded violently to superiors’ theological inquiries. These dévots shepherded the retreat southward, eventually intersecting with Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement, whose radical Christian anarchism proved fertile grounds for their evolutionary mutation of Lacouture’s work.

\textsuperscript{1348} Peters, \textit{Called to be Saints}, 53–92. The retreat lasted 25 days.

\textsuperscript{1349} Day, \textit{House of Hospitality}, quoted in Ellsberg, \textit{By Little and By Little}, 87.


\textsuperscript{1351} Fyodor Dostoevsky, \textit{The Brothers Karamazov}, trans. Constance Garnett. (London: Heinemann, 1912), 53.

radicalism of the Sermon on the Mount became the force that drove Day, in later years, to stand on picket lines, join anti-war demonstrations, promote pacifism and continue to write and publish the CW.\textsuperscript{1353} The ideas from the retreat also shaped the spirituality and radicalism of the CWM.\textsuperscript{1354} Importantly, in 1955, Day became a Benedictine Oblate, the spirituality of which also informed her life as an activist and Catholic.\textsuperscript{1355} Why did she feel the need to do this? Michael Luecken (Luecken) provided a summary of Day and her spiritualty, arguing that:

‘she showed that Christian discipleship necessarily involves a form of life since theology cannot be separated from daily life. Her integrated theology of resistance, and service to those most in need, gave a visible and concrete witness—a cruciform life vowed to service of the Church and Christ in the poor at the heart of the culture. Day may be the most vivid witness to the truth of Balthasar’s statement that ‘The form of sainthood … has become the form of the layman in the world’’.\textsuperscript{1356}

This brief summary of Day’s life in the HoH and the work of the CWM, along with her radicalism in spirituality and activism, indicates why she is progressing towards sainthood. Further, it illuminates how the formation and growth of NoCh, as Benedict imagines them, is a path to holiness and to contributing to social change. Day and the CWM exemplify the pattern in CIV 5.7, of a call to holiness to serve the poor through a form of life (what Luecken described as a ‘cruciform of life’). The discussion about the other exemplars indicates the same pattern—a radical conversion to create and live in a community in a life of holiness and service of charity, which is a source of social renewal, comes from recognising God’s Love. Day responded to the ‘commandment’ in CIV 5.7, which is the same, even in different forms, expression of community and arenas of action that de Hueck, Lubich and Argüello inspired.

\textsuperscript{1353} See the discussion in Section 1.1 on Ratzinger and the Sermon on the Mount in Jesus of Nazareth.

\textsuperscript{1354} The retreat was given again in the next year (1942) for the workers from CWM houses.


3.3.1.2. Catherine de Hueck Doherty and the Friendship and Madonna Houses

De Hueck, a contemporary of Day, lived a radically different life from Day, not only in her upbringing but also in how she suffered. De Hueck was born ‘rich, beautiful and brilliant’ in Russia in 1896 into a comfortable, aristocratic life with many privileges.\(^{1357}\) The faith and devotional practices of the Russian Orthodox Church informed her upbringing and substantially influenced her in later years.\(^{1358}\) Her mother was active in serving the poor, which shaped de Hueck.\(^{1359}\) However, tragedy struck her at an early age in three ways. First, though very young, she married a cousin who became a source of profound suffering throughout her life, even after they separated and obtained an annulment.\(^{1360}\) The next tragedy came with the First World War, which led her to work as a nurse on the Russian front, facing Germany, until the front collapsed in 1917. She witnessed the soldiers’ immense suffering that drove many to welcome the Bolsheviks’ seizure of power in 1917.\(^{1361}\) Following this, she witnessed what happened to people, including priests, after the Bolshevik’s coup d’état.\(^{1362}\) Her family suffered persecution, with confiscation of their lands and property, leading her to become a poverty-stricken exile from Russia.\(^{1363}\) De Hueck and her husband left Russia for Finland, where she nearly starved to death due to local soldiers stopping access to any food. It was at this point, she promised to give her life to God. This promise informed...

---


\(^{1358}\) Although she was baptised as a Roman Catholic, the atmosphere in her home ‘was profoundly religious’ and very much in the spiritual tradition of the Russian Orthodox Church, whose liturgies she frequently attended. Elizabeth Louise Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning: A History of the Friendship House Movement’ (PhD diss., Texas Tech University, 1977), 15.

\(^{1359}\) Her parents, especially her mother, were ‘important formative influences leading her into the particular way of life she has chosen’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 17.

\(^{1360}\) She was engaged at 15 and married at 16 to her cousin Baron Boris de Hueck. Lewis, *Victorious Exile*, 25–6.


\(^{1362}\) ‘Her love for priests was extraordinary because she knew what it was to be without them. She describes when one of the last priests in Petrograd was murdered. It was 1918, a dangerous time to have been celebrating Mass …. ‘At the moment of the consecration, when the priest lifted up the Host, the main door flew open. ‘Stop that nonsense!’ A single shot rang out. Slowly a crimson stain appeared on the back of the white vestment. The priest swayed, then toppled sidewise down the altar step, his out flung arms letting go of the Host, which rolled slowly, and came to rest on the polished floor of the lower step. The Host was ground into the floor, and 24 hours later the priest was buried’’. Robert Wild, *Catherine Doherty: Servant of God*, (Combermere, Ontario: Madonna House Publications, 2005), 57.

\(^{1363}\) ‘Both Catherine and Boris served on the war front. He as an officer and she as a nurse’s aide and supplying food to the troops. During the Bolshevik revolution, militants’ violent attacks traumatized her and her family. Many of her family members were killed while she and her husband barely survived’. Rademacher, ‘Allow Me to Disappear’, 75.
the rest of her life in the tasks she undertook and the suffering she encountered. They then travelled onto Great Britain in 1919, where she entered the Catholic Church, before they travelled to Canada in 1921.

In Montreal, the de Huecks enjoyed a brief status as quasi-aristocrats among the colony of Russian refugees. However, her husband’s serial infidelities and financial incompetence isolated her and pushed her, in 1924, to find work in New York. There, she suffered poverty and exploitation, including meagre pay and demeaning and discriminating conditions of employment. Outside work, she experienced further discrimination because of her accent and religion, and experienced ongoing victimisation and hostility.

In 1926, her material condition improved through giving lectures on Russia and against communism; however, despite this new level of comfort, she continued to have a ‘hunger of the heart and of the soul’. She tried to fill this hunger with prayer and reading the Gospels. In her desire to do the work of God, she began to live in voluntary poverty and work with the poor in 1929. In 1930, she renewed her promise to God: ‘in some sort of way I will offer my life to you’. The answer came from what she called the ‘Little Mandate’; her action plan:

Arise—go! Sell all you possess. Give it directly, personally to the poor. Take up My cross (their cross) and follow Me, going to the poor, being poor, being one with them, one with Me. Little—be always little! Be simple, poor, unpretentious.

---

1364 *At the family estate in Finland [she] and her husband were held as prisoners and condemned to death by starvation by local militia loyal to the Bolsheviks. They were rescued by Finnish forces hostile to those supporting the Bolsheviks. It was in this time she made a promise to God: ‘If you save me from this, in some sort of way I will offer my life to you’. Duquin, *They Called Her the Baroness*, 51.

1365 Including gross sexual harassment from customers and employers and the wage theft.

1366 This was mostly because she was a Russian. Often, she was accused of being a communist or sympathiser by those who distrusted her work, including many Catholics. She was referred to as a ‘Polack’, particularly because of her strong Russian accent.


1368 ‘On 1 January 1927, Catherine became a novice of the Third Order of Saint Francis and about a year later was professed, taking the name of Mary Magdalene’. Ibid., 32.

1369 Duquin, *They Called Her the Baroness*, 118.

1370 Ibid., 50–1. See also Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 24, where she discussed the threat of starvation imposed on a couple by some local Red Guards: ‘It was here when face-to-face with death that Catherine achieved a profound insight into the meaning and value of life, and experienced God as a reality in a deeper way than ever before’.

childlike. Preach the Gospel with your life—without compromise! Listen to the Spirit. He will lead you.¹³⁷²

Nevertheless, after two years of suffering, in which her marriage crumbled in a torrent of abuse and infidelities, debts and isolation, she tried to find a way, some space, where the Love of Christ could be lived out; a place where she could serve and live with the poor. In this desire to give her life, she tried to establish projects to carry through her vision three times. Her first effort was in Toronto where she opened a place of hospitality with an apostolate against communism. Then, from Toronto, she went to Harlem, New York, where she started a Friendship House (FH) committed to an interracial apostolate in the USA, serving both the Catholic Church and society. Lastly, in Combermere, Canada, she began a rural apostolate that flowered into the Madonna Houses MH). Some features were common to all three ventures: service to the poor, whether by way of providing clothes, food or other support, such as continuing medical help; providing education by offering reading material on Catholic Church teaching, including social questions; creating an outreach of evangelisation; and living a spiritual life in common. However, the FH she established were different from those of the CWM because each FH ehad a different mission. This difference between the missions continues with the MH today. The next step is to examine the characteristics of the missions and ways of living in the FH carrying through de Hueck’s several initiatives.

De Hueck left Montreal in 1930 to become active in Toronto in different ways and forums.¹³⁷³ She started a program of corporal works of mercy and support through various measures, including starting businesses and finding jobs for people in need.¹³⁷⁴ She gathered people around her in a study club to explore STCC and gave many talks on STCC, Russia and communism. She had contact with Day, who sent copies of CW, which de Hueck distributed to parishes and factories.¹³⁷⁵ During this time, she came to a more profound realisation of God’s Love for her.¹³⁷⁶ This helped her understand that her vocation was to open a house as a place where she made ‘friends with those who

¹³⁷² ‘The mandate also called Catherine to “be hidden” and to “pray always”. She moved back to Toronto where Archbishop Neil McNeil (1851–1934) hired her to investigate and prepare reports on communist activities in the city. She saw how successfully the communists drew people into their ranks and devised a plan to counter their endeavour with a radical Christian community based on the little mandate’’. Rademacher, ‘Allow me to disappear’, 79.
¹³⁷³ De Hueck insisted the best method for combatting communism ‘was to do what the communists did, but from a Christian perspective’. 122.
¹³⁷⁴ This included food and clothing. See Duquin, They Called Her the Baroness.
¹³⁷⁵ Ibid, 126-127.
¹³⁷⁶ Ibid.
need friendship above all’. So, in 1934, after receiving diocesan permission, de Hueck opened a FH in Toronto.

The FH sought to organise like the CWM—providing shelter, food, clothing and support to destitute people, whether immigrants or unemployed. De Hueck ensured that the FH supplied Catholic reading material, and she gave talks about Catholic beliefs and social teaching for Catholics and others to receive an education in the Church’s teaching on social questions of unemployment and poverty and help them answer the communists, who were active during The Great Depression. From the start of her work, de Hueck told Archbishop McNeil of Toronto (1912 to 1934) about her ‘strange desire to live in the slums’. McNeil told her the idea was 50 years ahead of its time and suggested that she wait. A central feature of the FH was its spiritual life.

The FH initially spread to Ottawa, Montreal, and other places, but within two years, these collapsed following the closure of the Toronto FH in 1936 due to the city’s hostile atmosphere. The hostility arose from a mixture of local gossip, some Catholic priests openly undermining her and

---

1377 Ibid., 129.
1378 ‘At the same time, while the Catholic Worker began in 1933 in New York City with no formal ecclesiastical input, de Hueck Doherty’s Friendship House was chartered by the Archdiocese of Toronto. She lacked the protective cover of a male co-founder, as with Catholic Worker’s Peter Maurin; more importantly, she possessed a strong sense of ecclesiastical tradition that she had learned “at my mother’s knee”, as she put it. In contrast, Day had been raised in the vaguest sort of Protestant household and then came to see herself as something of an anarchist’. Julie Leininger. Pycior, ‘Bearing Witness: Catherine de Hueck Doherty and the “Gospel of Dorothy Day”, U.S. Catholic Historian 26, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 43–66, 44.
1379 Each papacy addressed the different social questions of their era. For example, contraception and abortion, international development or nuclear war were not as central for Pius X or Pius XI as they were for John XXIII, Paul VI and John Paul II.
1380 Duquin, They Called Her the Baroness, 122–23.
1381 ‘As time went on, Catherine began to feel that although she and her full-time workers wished to remain a lay group, they needed to become affiliated with some established religious order within the Church in order to have the support of a more structured community life and a more clearly defined authority’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 82–3. The volunteers became Tertiaries of the Society of the Atonement of the Third Order of Saint Francis, Living in Community. The first friendship house, formed in 1934, was canonically affiliated to this order.
1382 ‘Their ideal was to perform Catholic Social Action in the area of greatest need. But to be successful it was essential that the apostolate rest on the foundation of personal holiness. The members would give complete personal and corporate obedience to the hierarchy and Pope. They would assist at daily Mass and receive Communion and would make a morning meditation of fifteen minutes. The members were to wear a specific uniform. The men and women had separate community houses under separate local superiors’. Ibid., 84–5.
1383 Duquin, They Called Her the Baroness, 137.
internal disputes in the FH which lead to a lack of support.1384 These difficulties came in addition to the suffering she experienced from her child’s waywardness and the pain of her marriage ending. As a result, she escaped to Europe, meeting Jacques Maritain, Nikolai Berdyaev and Frank Sheed, among others. On her return, she started again in New York.

She went to New York in 1938 to discover what God wanted from her.1385 She moved into Harlem with the support of local Catholic priests living by herself in poverty.1386 She named the apartment after Martin de Porres.1387 She soon attracted people to an interracial group that studied STCC and the racial question. She built a library and started an outreach and service for the poor in Harlem.1388 Her work in Harlem developed into an apostolate to address racial discrimination in the Church and society.1389 Some critical changes occurred over time from her efforts; these included changes in the attitudes of some Catholic bishops in the USA.1390 And even some changes in the Society of Jesus.1391

1385 Catherine de Hueck, Friendship House. (London: Catholic Book Club, 1947). This is an important book about her struggle to bring racial justice to the Catholic Church.
1387 Schorsch suggested her decision was influenced by Day and by some local priests. See also Duquin, They Called Her the Baroness, 98.
1388 Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 138–39. While in Harlem, she engaged with people, such as Ellen Tarry, and radicals like Claude McKay, a communist poet, who later entered the Catholic Church. See Jonathan David McGregor, ‘Breaking Bread with the Dead: Social Radicalism and Christian Traditions in Twentieth-Century American Literature’ (PhD diss., Washington University, 2016), 140–45.
1389 De Hueck was told how ‘Catholic hospitals refused to treat black patients and the way Catholic priests resisted bringing Communion to the sick and elderly in tenements’ in Harlem. Duquin, They Called Her the Baroness, 194–95. Lewis, Victorious Exile, 136, recorded that ‘many in and out of the Church thought Katya and Friendship House should be silenced’. One significant but not well-known fact was the Jamaican poet Claude McKay, a left-wing homosexual, who later converted to Catholicism, often visited the Harlem FH.
1390 Lewis, Victorious Exile, 121–2, recorded that when de Hueck asked Cardinal Spellman to enrol a black person from Harlem in a diocesan high school, he demurred, arguing he was concerned that the reaction of wealthy benefactors would be to withdraw their funding, leaving the school unable to pay the mortgage. She responded with: ‘you will wind up paying for that mortgage twice, once here and once in hell’. He later changed his mind, although many bishops did not agree with de Hueck. In 1955, after de Hueck left for Canada, the FH in Shreveport, Louisiana was closed on the orders of the then bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Shreveport, who feared a backlash from local white people. Less than five months later, in December 1955, Rosa Parks refused to move from her seat in a ‘non-coloured’ section of the bus to allow a white person to sit there. Albert III Schorsch, ‘“Uncommon Women and Others”: Memoirs and Lessons from Radical Catholics at Friendship House’, U.S. Catholic Historian 9, no. 4 (Fall 1990): 371–86, 380.
1391 Schorsch, ‘Uncommon Women and Others’, 375–6. De Hueck described: ‘In her later autobiography Fragments of My Life she told the story of her three-year effort to convince the Jesuits of Fordham University to admit African Americans’. After speaking to students at Fordham she met in a ‘two-hour meeting with “about 20” Jesuits of Fordham University. According to Catherine’s account, she countered their stated fears of economic backlash from bigots if African Americans were admitted with uncompromising Scriptural positions, saying: “Oh, excuse me Father, I thought you were teaching Christianity here”’. Schorsch, ‘Uncommon Women and Others’, 375–6.
A significant event for the Harlem FH was an interracial summer school held in 1946.\textsuperscript{1392} Here she reported people experienced ‘the social encyclicals, interracial living, the lay apostolate, daily Mass and Communion … in a life of voluntary poverty’.\textsuperscript{1393} The apostolate’s work developed rapidly because the FH was one of the few places where interracial communities gathered to receive an education in STCC.\textsuperscript{1394} FH then spread to many Catholic dioceses across the USA.\textsuperscript{1395} De Hueck only opened a FH if there was support from the bishop, whereas Day never sought permission for the CWM’s work.\textsuperscript{1396} However, both shared an insistence that the volunteers shared and participated in the spiritual life of the various FH. Thus, the volunteers in the FH were required to live according to ‘the traditional Friendship Houses life of complete poverty’\textsuperscript{1397} and a ‘single, celibate vocation’.\textsuperscript{1398} The FH were centres where ‘staff workers gave their time totally, gave up their jobs to live in poverty, were fed on scratch meals … clothed from the room of cast-offs … and took part in a spiritual life of … morning Mass and meditation, evening Rosary and Compline’, religious practices markedly similar to those in the CWM houses.\textsuperscript{1399}

De Hueck’s apostolate was one of many at the forefront of the fight for interracial justice in the USA, which led to an invitation from Bishop Sheil of Chicago to start a FH in Chicago.\textsuperscript{1400} Nicholas Rademacher (Rademacher) suggested that

\textsuperscript{1392} Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 156.
\textsuperscript{1393} Ibid., 163.
\textsuperscript{1394} ‘Before the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955, the different FH, along with the Catholic Interracial Councils, provided some of the few sites where Catholics could publicly devote their full-time efforts to interracial justice, and where “white” Catholics, for the first time, could converse face to face with African Americans in a non-threatening setting’. Schorsch, ‘Uncommon Women and Others’, 381.
\textsuperscript{1395} ‘Wisconsin (1946); Washington, D.C. (1949); Portland, Oregon (1951); and Shreveport, Louisiana (1954). There would also be a farm in Montgomery, New York, in connection with the Harlem House, and one in Burnley, Virginia, in connection with the Washington House’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 125.
\textsuperscript{1396} It spread on the basis that ‘the policy of Friendship House was to start a new foundation only at the invitation of a bishop, and with the understanding that (1) they would have no connection with Catholic charities, (2) they would be allowed to live the Friendship House way of life, (3) they would be given a (priest) moderator, (4) they would expect no help from the bishop with strings attached, and (5) they would be allowed to beg in the diocese’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, footnotes 3, 145.
\textsuperscript{1397} Ibid., 147.
\textsuperscript{1398} Wild, Catherine Doherty, 27.
\textsuperscript{1399} Pycior, ‘Bearing Witness’, 54.
\textsuperscript{1400} Nicholas Rademacher, ‘ “Allow Me to Disappear … In the Fetid Slums”: Catherine de Hueck, Catholic Action, and the Growing End of Catholic Radicalism’, U.S. Catholic Historian 32, no. 3 (Summer 2014): 71–100, 92. See also Pycior, ‘Bearing Witness’, 59, noted that ‘Catherine truly influenced Bishop Sheil in interracial justice. As a result, he hired black people to be department heads, wrote about interracial justice, and was a powerful apostle’.

194
Chicago is where de Hueck had a deeper engagement with the life of the poor.\footnote{Ibid., 72–3. She reported that, during that audience, God called her to abandon her pioneering interracial work in Chicago—for which she had gained significant notoriety—to disappear into the city’s ‘fetid slums’. Having already lived in impoverished, segregated African American communities in Chicago and New York City, she felt called to embrace an even more extreme form of solidarity by leaving the security of community life and her leadership of Friendship House to encounter God on a more personal level. She faced a potentially life-changing decision: would she heed the call of the self-described mystical experience to ‘disappear into the fetid slums’ and encounter Christ in the poorest of the poor, away from the relative safety of her community and out of the spotlight? Ibid., 72. Rademacher, ‘Allow Me to Disappear’, 73, argued it was an ‘innovation that she offered to radical Catholic social thought and practice: to go even deeper into solidarity by entering into the lives of the poor without the comfort of community or access to resources, however limited they had been before her entry into the “slums”’.}

De Hueck later published \textit{Dear Bishop}, an open letter to the bishops in the USA describing her experiences in her time in the fetid slums.\footnote{Rademacher references de Hueck reporting Bishop Sheil as saying: ‘I want you to stay here, take a room in the slums, use any nom de plume you wish and take a series of jobs and find out what the worker thinks, youth armed and Civilian thinks, women, men in the various walks of life in America think and feel and let me know … Will you do it for Christ and the Church?’. Letter from Catherine De Hueck to Furfey, June 2, 1942. Paul Hanly Furfey Papers at The American Catholic History Research Center and University Archives, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. De Hueck further wrote that she wept upon hearing “the request … She decided to become Katie Hook. She lived in a “drab rooming house” and took odd jobs, including machine operator at a factory, chambermaid at the YMCA, laundress and “saloon waitress” … She experienced extreme hunger and chronic fatigue … She experienced a desolation such that she could write “The Baroness has died for a while. Katie is on her own … alone no glamour … no rapt audiences … no companionship of like spirits … no light and love of the FH crowd. Nothing”. Rademacher, ‘Allow Me to Disappear’, 96.} Sheil actively supported the FH and became close friends with de Hueck, even marrying her to Eddie Doherty in 1943. Four years later, this marriage resulted in the end of de Hueck’s involvement in the FH.\footnote{De Hueck wrote in the form of letters to a bishop describing her experiences in the slums of Chicago. They were to give a ‘a little word picture of our Way of the Cross, the Workers’ Way … each step of it an agony all of its own’. Catherine de Hueck, \textit{Dear Bishop}, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1949), 5.} Many people on the leadership team resented her for marrying while keeping their commitment to celibacy as the FH rules required. They challenged her leadership of the FH.\footnote{Pycior noted how, in 1943, de Hueck was ‘consumed with love for prominent national journalist Eddie Doherty’. Pycior, ‘Bearing Witness’, 60.} On this De Hueck and Doherty withdrew to Combermere, where a new path was ahead, although she did not know what was to come.

The various FH continued working against segregation through community organising without de Hueck. Later, the FH morphed from a volunteer body into a paid

\footnote{It appears there was also conflict about de Hueck’s leadership style and exercise of authority: ‘Catherine had a particular vision of this movement of Friendship House that was inspired by God and emerged from her Russian background. This vision was not shared by the American members who had been formed by democracy’. Cheryl Ann Smith, ‘Catherine Doherty, Lover, Martyr and Prophet’, \textit{Faith}, 1 May 2013.}
workforce. After this, the movement dwindled to closure, with the New York Friendship House closing in 1960. However, the FH’s work and its contributions to interracial justice in the USA are still not widely known. Nonetheless, their work is a model of what Benedict seeks in NoCh.

De Hueck and Doherty began again in Combermere, Ontario, which was then a remote farming area. However, the fresh start was not without difficulties and further suffering. Initially, their work started as a rural apostolate for the people living in the surrounding district. In Combermere, de Hueck reflected on her spirituality and Russian roots as she struggled to understand why they had moved to Combermere and what it meant to create a community.

1406 In 1956, the U.S. branch changed from the tradition of Friendship House as a way of life somewhat resembling a religious community and using volunteer staff workers, to an organization devoted to the work to be done in interracial justice and staffed by persons hired for a specific job and paid a small salary’. Schorsch, ‘Uncommon Women and Others’, 380.
1408 Pycior talks of how ‘despite its demise Friendship House exercised a significant half-life, especially in synergy with the ethos of the Catholic Worker. These two lay apostolates have had a profound influence in particular on community organizing, which itself constitutes one of the few hopeful signs in a democratic process increasingly corrupted by large financial contributions. Community organizing first emerged in 1939 with a Chicago initiative chaired by the Baroness’s good friend and spiritual advisor Bishop Sheil: The Back of the Yards campaign of Saul Alinsky. For her part, Dorothy Day reported to her readers in 1950 about her visit with Alinsky as a model of what Benedict seeks in NoCh.
1409 Combermere is almost halfway between these two cities and the same distance from the Canada–USA border.
1410 ‘The first three years following her and Eddie’s arrival in 1947 were filled with a darkness and pain akin to that of a seed falling into the ground and dying. But they were days of prayer and of faith, and finally the seed took root and began to sprout forth in new life’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 579. Ibid, 172, added how for de Hueck:

‘it was rather the anguish of facing God and asking herself what she had failed to do that she should have done to carry out the mission. He had entrusted to her, to convey to them the vision and the insights He had given to her. So, she lived the poverty of the new beginnings in a spirit of prayer and fasting, saying to herself, “This is good. God makes us fast for what I have left undone. And there was poverty, stark poverty, especially in those first years”.

Rademacher, ‘Allow Me to Disappear’, 61, provided a deeper analysis of this period as an experience of loneliness for de Hueck, where the rejection reminded her of the rejections in Toronto and Harlem:

‘Such a sojourn deepened Doherty’s awareness of loneliness, made so real in her being rejected by those with whom she sought to work. In her inability to find human communion, she sought the Lord ever more ardently. In all of her trials, rejected in Toronto, Harlem, and then in Chicago, Catherine admitted that she was losing heart. Taking her struggles to one she simply names “a holy Capuchin”, she hears: “Catherine, you are getting there. First, you were rejected by the outsiders; now you have been rejected by your own. This is the test that God gives to foundresses”’.

1411 Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 171–172. They provided clothing and food, organised medical nursing, dental services and general support for the sick, established credit unions and cooperatives and helped local people obtain work. This is called ‘restoration’, which is still conducted today.
From these reflections, she wrote a document that became the constitution for the Combermere FH. The object of the constitution was ‘the restoration of man and his institutions to Christ. Members in the FH were to do this by living the Gospel and the law of love in their daily lives’. Specifically, their work consisted of doing anything a bishop might ask. After four years of working and continuously praying, de Hueck started organising summer schools and retreats, which were successful. A surprise came when a Father Callahan, who, after he gave a talk at Combermere, fell ill and stayed to recuperate, and then later asked to stay permanently. Thus, he became the first priest of FH. Other priests then moved to live at Combermere, finding the spirituality of FH attractive. Later that year, following a meeting with the future Paul VI, de Hueck applied for recognition of FH as a secular institute. Although her request failed, in 1954, de Hueck re-established the FH as the Madonna House Apostolate. De Hueck’s chosen motto, ‘To Restore All Things In Christ’, exemplified the vision for the MH work.

With the changes came a new constitution that provided a formation programme requiring both female and male participants to make vows of chastity, obedience and

---

1412 Ibid, 586.
1414 ‘A Father Callahan returned to conduct the annual retreat for the staff in April 1951, but during it became ill. The doctor ordered him to spend several months in complete rest, and he did so at MH. It was during this time that he felt a call from God to join their apostolate. Catherine was delighted. In her fondest dreams she had never envisioned having priests belong to her community … More priests followed. Three other young men found their vocation at MH and were ordained specifically for that apostolate; namely, Fathers Robert Pelton, Thomas Zoeller, and Richard Starks’. Ibid., 580.
1415 ‘A new community grew up around her, and the apostolate expanded. MHA opened in the Yukon to work with the native peoples, in Edmonton and Regina to feed and clothe the needy, in Peru and Bangladesh, to assist the poor in whatever ways were possible … Presently we have 13 houses throughout North America, and five in other parts of the world—Belgium, Carriacou (West Indies), England, Ghana, and Russia. The apostolates vary from the original soup kitchens mentioned above, to parish work, prayer/listening houses, retreat centres, and a variety of other expressions of both the spiritual and corporal works of mercy’. Wild, Catherine Doherty, 28.
1416 A second important development in MH history began when Catherine went to Rome in 1951 as the official delegate of Bishop William Smith of Pembroke, Ontario, for the World Congress of the Lay Apostolate: she met Baptista Montini, the Papal Secretary of State and future Paul VI. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 582–83.
1417 Wild, Catherine Doherty, 14.
poverty, echoing rules of other secular institute. The changes and spiritual development led to new ways of people being together in MH, which, for Robert Wild (Wild), separated MH from other ecclesial realities. The changes included a turn to asceticism and the emergence of an authority structure that did not follow a single-leader pattern; instead, the method required unanimity in all decision-making. Such a radical change in the MH’ authority structure was due to the influence of Russian Orthodox spirituality. Wild argued that these developments and others that followed arose directly from de Hueck’s spirituality, drawing on her earlier experience and knowledge of the rich devotional liturgy and practices of Russian Orthodoxy.

The significant changes included the practice of a person spending time, sometimes up to several days, living apart in a hut, a poustinia, as if going into the desert, with little food and water and entering into the ‘silence of the desert’ in prayer. By doing this, the people become poustiniki, who allow ‘themselves to be emptied so as to be able to enter into a new relationship with God and others’. These practices were a growth into ‘Christian forms of asceticism’. A further change occurred with the move from a single leader to a tripod model of governance. In this structure, women, men, and priests were organised into separate groups under their own director-general (DG). Along with an overall DG, the three DGs always had to reach a unanimous decision on every issue. A further difference was in the election of the DGs. The method was based on a Russian spiritual value—sobornost. Sobornost

---

1418 ‘Formation: A new member of MH was to spend a period of from three months to a year as a “Working Guest” during which time the person simply stayed and lived the life. Then for three months to a year, the person was a “Visiting Volunteer”, which corresponded to a postulant in the traditional training of religious orders. Next followed a period of nine months as a “Staff Worker Applicant”, during which the person received full instruction on the nature of the MH way of life. He or she was, of course, free to leave at any time during this period. But if the person wished to join the community, he or she then made promises, first for one year, then three times for two years each. After living in promises those seven years, the person made promises for life. At the time of the first promises, the staff worker received a silver cross on which were inscribed the words “Pax Caritas”. This was the only external sign distinguishing the members of MH’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 584–85, footnote 3.

1419 Wild, Catherine Doherty, 73.

1420 ‘All the memories of Holy Russia flooded back into her. It seemed the time had arrived for her to now draw as well upon her Orthodox roots for the enriching of Madonna House and the Church’. Ibid., 22.


1423 ‘It is a call to silence, to prayer, to reflection on the Word of God. On the grounds of Madonna House, in Combermere, we have over 20 small cabins where people may go for a whole day of prayer and silence’. Ibid., 46.

1424 Ibid., 41.
requires everyone to work and pray to reach unity in mind and heart to ensure the outcome is unanimous.\textsuperscript{1425} An election did not proceed if there were two competing candidates.\textsuperscript{1426} If there was a possible ‘conflict’, the community entered a time of reflection. In summary, the communities’ formation was to become ‘a community of love, with the Trinity as our model’, just like the Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth.\textsuperscript{1427} Today, many MH, with their unique structure and spirituality, exist across the world, including in Russia.

These brief sketches of Day and the CWM, and of de Hueck and her work reveal some common features. They shared a commitment to the poor and the marginalised. Both extended the meaning of love of neighbour in a radical and important direction towards charity as fraternity. Their houses were relatively close-knit communities in which volunteers shared the house with poor and disadvantaged people. Both had ways of working that centred on a radical spirituality, although each had a different emphasis and drew on different traditions.\textsuperscript{1428} Day undertook spiritual practices common to her era, which she complemented with a Theresian spirituality and a radical commitment to living the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. De Hueck, after her time with the Friendship House, returned to her Russian spiritual roots in the Madonna houses.\textsuperscript{1429}

\textsuperscript{1425} ‘In our “Way of Life” she calls us to achieve a total unanimity in the election of a Director. This has not been easy, but so far, with the grace of God, this has been achieved. The theology behind it is that if everyone is truly in a deep relationship of love with God and with one another, the Spirit will inspire all with the same choice’. Ibid., 43.

\textsuperscript{1426} ‘If two people have a following, and there seems to be friction, all the members eligible to vote will go into the poustinia [for] a week to pray and fast. It is immaterial that the work might suffer during this time because a division in the community would endanger it anyway. This is not an easy way to operate, but one that MH sees as necessary for the deep unity of love they are trying to achieve’. Sharum, ‘A Strange Fire Burning’, 591.

\textsuperscript{1427} After five days in a poustinia, de Hueck emerged to declare that ‘Madonna House is a community of love, like the Holy Family of Nazareth’. Ibid., 44.

\textsuperscript{1428} ‘Catherine de Hueck ran a cleaner, more orderly community than the one forming around the self-described radical Dorothy Day and her vagabond-prone cohort, Peter Maurin. At the same time, the two women’s contrasting styles could also prove powerfully complimentary, with the Baroness imparting her confident, European-bred sense of the Church’s spiritual roots much like French-born Peter Maurin, while Day possessed an autobiographical knowledge of the American culture’. Pycior, ‘Bearing Witness’, 46.

\textsuperscript{1429} The atmosphere of the Madonna House ‘was different from that of the Catholic Worker, for Madonna House was tightly structured and more intellectually oriented. And in another contrast, the Canadian group has always included priests among its regular community members … and all volunteers take vows of poverty, chastity and obedience … [even though Madonna House] was not dedicated directly toward the peace movement nor [sic] to giving shelter’ to the poor. Ibid., 61.
Finally, Day and de Hueck shared a profound and radical Christological outlook in their work.\textsuperscript{1430}

Their journeys reveal how NoCh are entities, even with diverse features and differing spiritualities, that share a common goal of seeking to live a new form of life. Like many religious communities before them, their visions responded to the needs and times where they emerged. Day’s and de Hueck’s work started during The Great Depression, and de Hueck’s work on interracial justice continued to be at the forefront until the FH dissolved. Although the need to serve the poor continued, it became less of a feature in their work after WW2 ended and the economy grew, and a welfare system emerged. Day continued her campaigns against war during the post-war years, promoting a pacifism rooted in the Sermon on the Mount. Conversely, de Hueck developed communities grounded in the spirituality of Russia. Nevertheless, both shared a passion for renewing all in Christ.

Day and de Hueck established ecclesial realities with new forms of life. These are no less a social reality than other social structures, even while they differ from other social realities in civil society, such as trade unions and cooperatives. As NoCh, they differ from each other in how they operate from and within a spiritual framework; however, both always focused on a life of holiness and service with an outlook marking them as agents for cultural renewal. However, they are a product of the era in which they emerged. During the post-war era, the Church encountered new difficulties were Church and different responses emerged.

3.3.2. \textit{A Post-War World}

In 2007, Benedict addressed a gathering of bishop friends of Focolare; he noted that the ‘movements and new communities have therefore shown that they can effectively stand up against the relativistic mentality and at the same time reignite and sustain Christian hope in the serious situations of poverty that afflict so many

\textsuperscript{1430} What they shared in common included:

personal sanctification as the starting point; recognition of the importance of ‘studying, propagating, and living the doctrines of the Mystical Body of Christ’; a foundation in the liturgy, especially the Mass and Communion; interest in ‘cultivating above all the Spirit of God’s Charity and Justice’; co-existence [sic] with the poor; and the acceptance of poverty without security. Rademacher, ‘Allow Me to Disappear’, 87–8.
nations’.

With this in mind, Section 3.3.2.1 outlines Lubich’s ideas and experiences, leading to the beginnings of Focolare. Next, Section 3.3.2.2 examines the spirituality of Focolare, which is the core that led to the emergence of the concept of the EoC. Finally, Section 3.3.2.3 explores the ideas and practices that shaped and continue to shape EoC, showing how it is a fruit that illuminates a meaning for NoCh.

3.3.2.1. Origins of the Focolare Movement

In 1943, Chiara Lubich (Lubich), who was born in Trent, northern Italy, worked as a teacher. At this point, her spirituality was that of the Order of Friars Minor Capuchin. In the year 1943, she found herself, with a small group of younger friends, struggling with the question of how God could allow the suffering of people resulting from WW2, particularly from the ongoing and relentless bombing of Trent by the Allied Powers. In December of 1943, she reached ‘a new understanding of God’s personal Love for her and for other people. She began to see God “present everywhere with his Love” ’. She accepted this as a call to a vocation different from other types of religious vocations, such as religious life, consecrated virgin or marriage. Lubich identified the need for a “fourth” way [of] combining all of these vocations into one’. She recognised the profound experience of the love of God as an ‘inspiring

---

1431 *In the rich Western world, where even though a relativistic culture is present, at the same time a widespread desire for spirituality is not missing, and your movements witness the joy of the faith and the beauty of being Christian in great ecumenical openness. In the vast depressed areas of the earth, they communicate the message of solidarity and draw near to the poor and the weak with that human and divine love that I wished to repropose to the attention of all in the Encyclical Deus Caritas Est’.


1432 Brumfield, Benedict Proposal, 165–80, suggested that Focolare is an example ‘embodying Ratzinger’s ecclesiology’.

1433 Her first name was Silvia. However, at her confirmation, she took the name Chiara (Clare). ‘From her mother, a traditional devout Roman Catholic, she absorbed a deep religious sensitivity. She was particularly close to her father, a socialist whom she described as “large of heart” and broad of mind’. Thomas Masters and Amy Uelmen, ‘Focolare: Living a Spirituality of Unity in the United States’, (New York: New City Press, 2011), 23.

1434 She was invited to become a member of the Third Order of Saint Francis, however, she did not accept it.

1435 The bombing was intense and relentless for almost a year as the Allied powers tried to cut off the supply of war materials passing along the railway, and other traffic coming through the Brenner Pass in the Alps from Nazi Germany into Italy. Trent is a key railway junction.


spark.\textsuperscript{1438} and dedicated herself to God.\textsuperscript{1439} With this, she started on the path of growth into an instrument of grace.\textsuperscript{1440}

Lubich’s companions refused to leave Trent, although many in the city were leaving due to the intensity of the bombing. The group lived as a community they called Focolare.\textsuperscript{1441} The community served the poor, read the Gospels in flimsy bomb shelters and searched for an ideal to live by.\textsuperscript{1442} They heard Christ’s instruction in the Gospel of John: ‘This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you’. Drawing further on John’s Gospel, they read: ‘Just as I have loved you, you should also love one another’. This shaped the group in how they lived together and experienced a communion centred on love.\textsuperscript{1443} Lubich and her companions considered their experiences a call to love, in a way that extended to having a readiness to die for each other.\textsuperscript{1444} They read the command to ‘love your neighbour’ in the Gospel of Luke, which inspired them to live through sharing in a ‘communion of goods’. Their first step was to share whatever they had or earned between themselves. The community then learnt to divest themselves of what they did not need, even to the extent of giving away what they needed for themselves, in order to help others. The community learnt to live the Gospel

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1439} On 7 December 1943.
  \item \textsuperscript{1440} ‘It was this profound experience/belief in the love of God that she called the “inspiring spark”’. Cerini, \textit{God Who Is Love}, quoted in Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 144.
  \item \textsuperscript{1441} Masters and Uelmen, \textit{Focolare}, 39. The apartment they shared became known as Focolare; ‘the hearth’ or ‘home’ in Italian. Another, slightly more up to date word for hearth might be ‘fireside’. A person living in a Focolare household is a focolarina or focolarino (plural is focolarine/i). Gold, ‘Making space’, 75, described somewhat poetically, ‘Focolare is the symbol of “hearth and home”, the most intimate image of a family, love, security, warmth. Within Italian culture, it summons the image of a bygone age, when poetry was widespread and life was harsh, but nothing could take away from the closeness of family and friends huddled round an open fire, telling tales and sharing food in an atmosphere of serenity and peace’.
  \item \textsuperscript{1442} ‘… The idea for this movement was God’s; it was a project from heaven. … In 1943 war raged in Trent: ruin, destruction, death. … One day I found myself with my new companions in a dark, candle-lit cellar, a book of the gospels in hand. I opened it. There was Jesus’ prayer before he died: “Father … may they all be one” (Jn 17:11, 21). It was not an easy text to start with, but one by one those words seemed to come to life, giving us the conviction that we were born for that page of the gospel’. Lubich, \textit{Essential Writings}, 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{1443} Lubich, \textit{May They all Be One}, 45.
  \item \textsuperscript{1444} ‘Chiara recalls them all gathering in a circle and making a pact: “I am ready to give my life for you; I for you, I for you; all for each one”’. Lubich, \textit{Essential Writings}, quoted in Masters and Uelmen, \textit{Focolare}, 25. Lubich was quoted as recalling how, in the first community, ‘before going to Mass … we would ask ourselves: “Are we ready to die for one another?”’.
\end{itemize}
Lubich understood the neighbour as the person ‘who passes by in the present moment of our daily life. We must love that person in such a way that Christ may be born, grow and develop in him or her’. They learnt to trust in what the Gospel of Matthew proclaimed: ‘Ask, and you will receive’. They found that this came true in their lives. From these experiences, the early focolarini developed a deep trust in God’s Love and providence.

The work by the initial group of eight inspired others to follow their path. The local bishop recognised and accepted Focolare as a valid Catholic community. Focolare then spread rapidly throughout Italy, establishing networks of Focolares in houses where people committed themselves to live with others in society as

---

1445 ‘The spirit of unity in charity was the ever-living flame that kept this fraternity alive … in some ways it was similar, in others dissimilar, to that first Christian community. In fact, whilst having the same aim, it did not require everyone to sell all that they had and to bring it to unity, but rather everyone gave what they possess, depriving themselves of what they could without causing harm’. Lubich, quoted in Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 148.

1446 ‘We addressed our attention to all the poor of the city. We invited them to our houses, to eat at our table … When we could not receive them in our home, we arranged to meet them somewhere, and we gave them whatever we had managed to put together. We visited them in their dismal shacks, and we comforted them and offered them medicines’. Lubich, May They All Be One, 44.


1448 Master and Uelmen, Focolare, 36.

1449 ‘This tradition of believing in God’s providence has continued throughout the Focolare down the years and still remains a key point for understanding the interrelationship between economic affairs and spirituality’. Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 146.

1450 Mt 7:7. The phrase was a way of understanding the level of generosity from those living in Trent who gave gifts to help the group serve the poor.

1451 ‘People arrived at their flat with bags of food, clothing, firewood, and other items so that they could distribute to [the poor] … This help … was seen as providence: a visible sign of God’s blessing on the work being done’. Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 145.

1452 Ibid., 144.

1453 Purcell, ‘Focolare Movement’, 162. ‘These first companions formed the first little community that became known as a “Focolare”, or “family fireside”. Their relationships with God and with those around them changed through living the gospel, so that people who had not known each other became brothers. And in this way, the Word generated the community. After only two months, in Trent five hundred people of different ages, vocations and social classes lived this extraordinary experience together’.

1454 Lubich, Essential Writings, 17. The community met under the auspices of the Franciscan Third Order until in 1947. The bishop of Trent recognised the group and associates as the Movement of Unity; later, it was called the Focolare Movement.
The Focolare houses became centres for adherents who, though not living as focolarini, provided support and resources for charity work. Yearly summer meetings of focolarini, adherents of Focolare and visitors occurred under the banner of the ‘Mariapolis’ (City of Mary). Mariapolis has come to describe the ongoing centres of Focolare, established in many different countries, some of which grew into small towns. The first of these was Loppiano, near Florence. The movement rapidly spread internationally and produced many fruits.

The growth of Focolare also lead to the development of different vocations within the movement, including vocations to the priesthood and religious life, to engage in political life and to develop programmes for young people’s formation. Focolarini, living in community, understood their vocation as responding to a call to ‘leave everything to follow God’s call and being available to work of the building of the kingdom of God, wherever there is a need’. For those who participated in a community, this call signified a ‘readiness to leave country, language, and culture, as well as relinquishing the possibility of marriage and family’. Following the crushing of the Hungarian uprising in 1956, Paul VI called for Christians to live out their faith in society. In response, Lubich invited the focolarini and adherents to live in their local society, engaging in social and political activity with holiness in all aspects of their lives. As a result, many people entered the movements as Volunteers of God, which became the core of Focolare’s social movement, the New Humanity Movement. In 1958, Lubich opened a series of interreligious dialogues. First, with Christians who were not Catholic

---

1455 Master and Uelmen, *Focolare*, 26. The original community grew to 500 within months. Over several summer meetings, larger numbers attended from across Italy. Focolarini live in the Focolare.
1457 Masters and Uelmen, *Focolare*, 58.
1458 Ibid.
and later, with non-Christians, including Buddhists and Muslims. John Paul II described the focolarini as ‘apostles of dialogue’.  

3.3.2.2. A Spirituality of Unity

Focolare presents itself as a movement of and for unity, a ‘movement of spiritual and social renewal’. They created in the focolare centres for the spirituality of unity. If there is a central aim of Focolare, it is, as Gold stated, the drive for the fulfilment ‘of Christ’s prayer “May They All Be One”’. This prayer meant working for greater social and spiritual communion ‘above all through personal and communal witness’. These words of Christ encapsulate the spirituality of Focolare as a spirituality of unity. Lubich stated that ‘unity is the word that sums up the life of our movement. For us it is the word that carries every other supernatural reality, every other

1459 Her discourse came to be accepted and welcomed by Anglicans, members of the Reformed Church, Lutherans, and other Protestants’. Bernhard Callebaut, A Sociological Reading of a New Cultural Scene: Jesus Forsaken in the 1940s. Claritas: Journal of Dialogue and Culture 4, no. 1 (March 2015), 62–74, 73. See also Lubich, Essential Writings, 320–59. The initial dialogue with the non-Catholic Christians was followed by a dialogue with non-Christians, including Buddhists in Japan, Hindus in India and Islamic movements in the USA and North Africa: ‘In Algeria, a deep friendship was begun among Christians and Muslims in the 1970s, which then spread in the city of Tlemcen. This gave rise to a Focolare community that was almost entirely made up of Muslims’. See also Robert Catalano, ‘Gülen, Focolare, and Rissho Kosei-kai Movements: Commonalities for Religious and Social Renewal’, Claritas: Journal of Dialogue and Culture 4, no. 1 (2015): 42–61, also see Callebaut, ‘A Sociological Reading’, 73.


1462 Maria Voce, addressed the European Mariapolis, at Tonadico, Northern Italy, on 10 August 2019, celebrating the anniversary of Lubich’s speech on 30 August 1959 calling for unity: [Focolare] responds to this appeal by fostering dialogue among different political parties (for example, through the Movement for Unity in Politics), by encouraging the communion of goods and the culture of giving (through the Economy of Sharing), by studying the doctrine of unity (for example, at the Sophia University Institute); by promoting unity in places of professional and social engagement and by way of many specific projects and initiatives (through the New Humanity Movement).

1463 Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 143.

1464 Ibid.

practice or commandment, every other religious approach’.\textsuperscript{1466} The origin of these understandings was rooted in their experience of the early years in Trent.

The communion among the early focolarini shaped the new movement and opened a path of dialogue that was unexpected during the 1940s. Lubich considered the call she had received as being one side of a coin, where the other side was the idea of Jesus Forsaken.\textsuperscript{1467} Early in 1944, a Capuchin priest told Lubich that he believed the moment Christ suffered the most was when he cried out, ‘My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?’. His observation had struck Lubich forcibly. The realisation became something that framed what the small community aimed for. Lubich declared that Christ was ‘the living personality in our lives’.\textsuperscript{1468} She explained that ‘he was the one who made unity possible, paying for it with his cross, his blood, and with his “cry”’.\textsuperscript{1469} For Lubich, the ideal of unity and Christ forsaken were unified.\textsuperscript{1470}

Lubich reflected further on the idea of ‘Jesus Forsaken’ when she was with the community, meeting in a Mariapolis in the Dolomites in the summer of 1949. Igino Giordano, whom she had met a year earlier, joined her at the meeting.\textsuperscript{1471} He gave the new community the realisation that they were a gift to the Church, a charism.\textsuperscript{1472} Towards the end of the period of reflection and prayer that Lubich and Giordano shared, they had a mystical experience that developed into a written ‘pact of unity’ between themselves.\textsuperscript{1473} The pact was of a Trinitarian communitarian spirituality that became

\textsuperscript{1466} Lubich, \textit{Essential Writings}, 16.
\textsuperscript{1467} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1468} Ibid., 21
\textsuperscript{1469} Ibid., 20.
\textsuperscript{1470} ‘Unity and Jesus Forsaken: and we speak of them as two sides of the same coin’. Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{1471} Brendan Leahy, ‘New Paths for Dialogue: Chiara Lubich’s Ecumenical Legacy’, \textit{One in Christ} 42, no. 2 (2008): 246–69, 249, noted that ‘Igino Giordani (1894–1980), a renowned Italian scholar and ecumenist, politician and author, met the then twenty-eight-year-old Chiara Lubich in 1948 and was immediately attracted by her evangelical spirituality’. See also Masters and Uelmen, \textit{Focolare}, 27. Lubich went to meet him with three priests from the three branches of the Franciscan orders. It was something he had not witnessed before, given the history of disagreements between the Franciscan orders (Conventual, Friars Minor and Capuchin). He considered it a sign of something new. See also Amelia Uelmen, ‘Reconciling Evangelization and Dialogue through Love of Neighbour’. \textit{Villanova Law Review} 52, no. 2 (2007), 303–330, 321, who stated that ‘he described his encounter with the founder of [Focolare], Chiara Lubich, and the spirituality of unity as “the voice that, without realising it, I had been waiting for”’.\textsuperscript{1472}
\textsuperscript{1472} Masters and Uelmen, \textit{Focolare}, 27.
\textsuperscript{1473} After this meeting, Lubich referred to him as a co-founder of Focolare. She stated: ‘Giordani was one of the most precious gifts heaven ever gave to’ Focolare. Quoted in Franca Zambonini, \textit{Chiara Lubich: A Life for Unity}, (New York: New City, 1991), 58. Is there here an echo of the conversation between Monica and Augustine at Ostia? Augustine, \textit{Confessions}, IX, 10-11.
foundational for Focolare and its work.\textsuperscript{1474} The inspiration for entering interreligious dialogue also governed the inspiration for the EoC. Although Focolare had many other activities and projects, the focus here is on the concept and practices of EoC, which Benedict highlighted in CIV as a new way of living and doing business.\textsuperscript{1475}

3.3.2.3. \textbf{Economy of Communion}

Lubich conceived the idea of EoC when visiting Sao Paolo in Brazil in 1991.\textsuperscript{1476} She saw the deep poverty in the favelas surrounding the city.\textsuperscript{1476} She realised that although the Focolare members in Brazil were trying to live with the principles of the movement in giving to the poor, their efforts were insufficient, even to meet those Focolare supporters’ needs who lived in the favelas. Lubich grasped that the issue went beyond Focolare to the whole community of the poor in the favelas. She drew on two elements to develop her economic vision. The first was a reliance on God’s providence, and the second was the need for a communion of material goods.\textsuperscript{1477} Both ideas were (and still are) integral to how Focolare operates, even as part of their internal budget process for new projects, such that, as Gold commented, ‘if the necessary resources do not arrive, this is a sign that a given development is not in God’s will’.\textsuperscript{1478}

For Focolare trusting in God’s providence is the key to understanding ‘the relationship between economic affairs and spirituality’.\textsuperscript{1479} One consequence of this act of trusting is Focolare communities do not accumulate debt. However, Providence is not considered a magic formula; rather it is a ‘sign of God who is accompanying his people’.\textsuperscript{1480} Lubich envisaged the communion of material goods as a means for redistributing wealth to contribute towards emancipating the poor and as a spiritual gift

\textsuperscript{1474} ‘But when two of us, knowing ourselves to be nothing, made it so that Jesus Eucharist formed a pact of unity on our two souls, I was aware of being Jesus. I felt the impossibility of communicating with Jesus in the tabernacle. I experienced the thrill of being at the peak of the pyramid of all creation as on the point of pin: in the point where the two rays converge: where the two God (so to speak) made a pact of unity, becoming trinitized where, having been made Son in the Son, it is impossible to communicate with anyone except with the Father, as the Son communicates only with Him’. Chiara Lubich, ‘The Pact’, \textit{Claritas: Journal of Dialogue and Culture} 2, no. 1 (March 2013): 4–6, 5.

\textsuperscript{1475} CIV 46.


\textsuperscript{1477} Providence is not an easy term to grasp. Gold considered it in NT terms as the ‘mercy of God who makes the sun rise and set on everyone’. Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 144.

\textsuperscript{1478} Ibid., 146.

\textsuperscript{1479} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1480} Ibid.
for living the Gospel’. She believed that the disjunction between people wanting ‘possessions for oneself as opposed to feeling connected to others’ was at the heart of the problem. For Lubich, wealth distribution was a matter that required people to learn to be brothers and sisters to each other and, most especially, the poor.

Moreover, the answer was to a spiritual question no less critical than proposing how to give money or goods. Lubich’s understanding from Brazil was not to look for a new form of, or even more extensive works for, charitable giving. She did not make a more robust call on the state to enhance social welfare, or to look for some form of a utopian opting out of life or to stress the social responsibility of corporations. Instead, she proposed that Focolare enter economic life differently.

Three basic concepts framed how entry into economic life was, and still is, to occur. First, businesses needed to base themselves on spiritual values and Focolare principles, which recognised and accepted the entrepreneurs’ role. Focolare accepts that entrepreneurs are the central economic actors. Second, the businesses must work to make profits in the market and always comply with the relevant ethical and legal standards. Third, however, the resulting profits must be distributed radically: one third goes to the ‘poor’, who are not recipients of handouts, but co-operators or participants in the project. A second part (one third) is retained for reinvestment in the business, and the final third is invested in cultural formation, supporting initiatives for building up human society, such as education, and Focolare’s social projects.

In developing the EoC model, some enterprises were grouped into business parks, of which the local poor could become part-owners. In some instances, the parks link into a Mariapolis, which uses their resources to support and assist those businesses working to incorporate spiritual values in their day-to-day operations. Many in the EoC

1481 The early Christians were a source of fascination for Lubich and Focolare. Ibid., 148.
1482 Ibid., 147.
1484 Bruni, Economy of Communion, 529.
1485 Callebaut, EoC, 75.
1486 Ibid., 80. Callebaut noted that while Lubich was concerned for the poor, she grasped that the middle classes of Brazil needed to be engaged for their skills, talents and dynamisms and because it would create a preferential option for the poor.
1487 Ibid., 71.
1488 Callebaut discussed how Lubich though that ‘EOC’s search for a more solidarity-oriented economy is the realisation of the religious significance of linking at a deeper level the two figures, the poor and the entrepreneur’. Ibid., 81.
businesses have reported that working with the principle of providence is not easy.\textsuperscript{1489} Although there have been some failures, there is, in Gold’s opinion, ‘a tenacious belief in providence’, which continues to underpin EoC.\textsuperscript{1490} Bernhard Callebaut (Callebaut) noted how Lubich suggested that economic activity should ‘ultimately be love articulated as concrete “reciprocity” or “communion”’.\textsuperscript{1491} In this arrangement redistribution of wealth is not an act of charity incidental to economic production but an integral part of the economic activity of the enterprises, illustrating that the state needs not to be the only or central agency for redistributing wealth.

The ethos of unity is central to the EoC businesses if communion is to arise. For maintaining communion within the competitive ethos of the ‘free market’, EoC businesses are managed ‘according to a charismatic logic of relationality, gift, gratuity, an ascetic motivation, together with a heightened acute sense of the exceptional outside the daily routine of modern life.’\textsuperscript{1492} With the communion of the community, there is a strengthening of interpersonal relationships while the businesses remain competitive, even though the maximisation of profit is not the central objective, there is still a requirement for a profit be made not least to enable the businesses to continue..\textsuperscript{1493}

In short, through the EoC project, Lubich has put ‘“holy enrichment” at the service of the poor where Focolare practise a new form of “holy poverty”’.\textsuperscript{1494} When Benedict has promoted the idea of gratuitousness and gift in CIV others saw only difficulties because they lacked a vision of the possibility of orientating their lives in a way that EoC suggests. EoC is not unique in making efforts to integrate the principles and ideals of the STCC within commercial enterprises’ operations. *Communio e Liberazione* initiated the *Compagnia dell’ Opere*, which seeks ‘to become an important point of reference for Small and Medium Enterprises, the heart of the Italian production system, through a new socioeconomic concept, based on the subsidiarity principle and the growth of the non-profit sector’.\textsuperscript{1495} The work of these entities is a sign that the contemporary economic crises may find a resolution not in revolution but in the patient

\textsuperscript{1489} ‘Within the context of the commercial world the workings of providence are regarded principally as a response to good ethical choices’. Gold, ‘Roots of the Focolare’, 150.
\textsuperscript{1490} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1491} Callebaut, EoC, 77.
\textsuperscript{1492} Ibid., 79.
\textsuperscript{1493} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1494} Ibid., 82.
work of building trust and integrity through the gift of the self in economic life. This work of NoCh is as important as the work involved in giving direct charity. CIV, through the call for NoCh is a contribution to cultural renewal by inserting gratuitousness into economic life. In Section 3.3.3 the focus moves to one of the many ecclesial realities that emerged after the Council – the NCW.

3.3.3. From the Second Vatican Council

Many ecclesial realities emerged and flourished after the close of the Council. These include L’Arche, a reality for serving those with disabilities, particularly intellectual disabilities. L’Arche emerged after the Council closed, although it started in 1962 before John XXIII called the Council. More information about this reality was provided in Section 3.2. Another ecclesial reality is the Community of Sant’Egidio (Sant’Egidio), which developed from the student revolts during the late 1960s with students who wanted to serve the poor in the slums of Rome, and then. Sant’Egidio moved into international peace work.

Along with these and other ecclesial realities, the NCW is the fourth exemplar selected for several reasons. First, the NCW’s call seeks to bring Christians into the fullness of their baptismal faith through a catechumenate to renew the baptism many may have received in ignorance of what it means. Second, it understands itself as an ‘itinerary of Catholic formation’ and not a movement or association, which marks it off from other ecclesial realities. The NCW did not emerge from a community focused on meeting the poor’s social and economic needs through charitable or spiritual works of mercy. Instead, the NCW started from a slum outside Madrid and afterwards received invitations from parishes and dioceses, to form communities for a catechetical journey to come to an adult and mature faith. The first communities began in Madrid after a long

---

1496 L’Arche was founded by Jean Vanier (1928–2019). See Jean Vanier, The Story of L’Arche: A Spirituality for Every Day, (Toronto, Canada: Novalis, 1995). L’Arche communities include adults with learning disabilities living alongside and the people who care for them. Faith and Light is linked with L’Arche. The core idea of L’Arche is the need for friendship with people who often lack the means of communicating a response, except maybe through signs. Underpinning this is a Christological decision to serve only in small communities. There is no catechesis or requirement for faith. The more able persons serve as assistants rather than superiors. Although inspired by Catholic notions, L’Arche is not a Catholic body; however, it is recognised by the Roman Curia.

1497 Kiko Argüello, Carmen Hernández and F. Mario Pezzi, eds. Statute of the Neocatechumenal Way. Final Approval, (Rome: Neocatechumenal Centre, 2008)., art. 1 states that: (1) ‘the nature of the Neocatechumenal Way is defined by His Holiness John Paul II when he writes: “I recognize the Neocatechumenal Way as an itinerary of Catholic formation, valid for our society and for our times”’.
gestation in a poverty-stricken slum area of Madrid. The NCW understands its mission is as an itinerary of initiation and ongoing formation of Christian life for the new evangelisation.

3.3.3.1. Kiko Argüello and the Origins of the Neocatechumenal Way

Argüello was born into a Spanish, middle-class, Catholic family. He abandoned his Catholic faith when he entered the Royal Academy of San Fernando to study Fine Arts. He experienced there a culture hostile to religious beliefs, and he began to hold to an existential atheism that rejected any meaning of God’s existence or a purpose of life. Later, he reflected this atheism came in part from the lack of any witnessing to faith in his family as to God’s presence. His peers at the Art School had shaped his atheism in their rejection of Franco and, by association, the Catholic Church. Argüello referenced writers such as Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus as important influences in his early thinking. As a talented artist, he gained national recognition in Spain. However, doubts about atheism emerged. He rejected atheism after reading Bergson. He adopted Bergson’s idea about intuition, which he accepted a method for

---

1498 All the real property (e.g., buildings) NCW uses are either owned by a parish, diocese or other religious entity. Sometimes, canonical agreements between nominated people in NCW and the applicable Church entity govern this use. Under its statues, NCW is not permitted to own property, such as land or money, and has no legal status in civil law. All land and buildings used for seminaries are the property of the dioceses where they are erected. Argüello, Statute of the Neocatechumenal Way, 1, 25, art. 4.

1499 This does not mean the other exemplars are not present in some way, even if only through its members or adherents also being parishioners. Each exemplar intersects with the ecclesial structures in different ways and to different extents. The earlier exemplars have their ‘work’ and ‘houses or centres’, which are ‘outside’ parochial and diocesan structures. All the exemplars have had priests and bishops, either as supporters, promoters, co-operators or members of the ecclesial reality.


1502 Ibid., 22.

1503 In 1959 in Madrid, he won an Extraordinary National Prize for Painting.

1504 Ibid.

1505 ‘I read Bergson, a philosopher of Jewish origin, who said “intuition is a means towards a knowledge of truth superior even to reason”.’. Ibid., 24.
arriving at the truth about beauty and nature and identified that this was pointing to a horizon where God appears.\textsuperscript{1506}

From that moment on Argüello developed a desire for a faith that led him to work with the \textit{Cursillos de Cristiandad} as a catechist.\textsuperscript{1507} His passion for art however never left him, although he only painted religious art.\textsuperscript{1508} This passion led him to a retreat with the Little Brothers of Jesus.\textsuperscript{1509} There he heard about the life and death of Charles de Foucauld. He received an inspiration to follow de Foucauld’s example of living in the desert and to move somewhere to live with the poor, although the opportunity to do so only came later.\textsuperscript{1510}

After completing his military service in 1964, Argüello moved to Palomeras Altas, then a desperate poverty-stricken slum on the outskirts of Madrid. He had heard about the slum from his parent’s maid who lived in Palomeras. She told Argüello about her suffering from her violent husband.\textsuperscript{1511} The inspiration of de Foucauld’s move to the Saharan desert moved him to live in the desert of the slum. Where there was the most profound and degrading poverty for the many who lived there — gypsies, \textit{quinquis}, prostitutes, violent men, oppressed women and vagabonds—the poor. He did not go to give away food, teach or do social work, but only to ‘bear witness, living amongst them in silence, like Jesus in Nazareth’.\textsuperscript{1512} Argüello followed de Foucauld in believing he

\textsuperscript{1506} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1507} This is an ecclesial reality founded in 1944 in Spain.
\textsuperscript{1508} Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 30–1. Arguello in time became more than an artist, ‘writing’ many icons, copies of which are to be found in Neocatechumenal communities including homes. Arguello went onto to be an architect, designing several seminaries throughout the world, including Redemptoris Mater Seminary in the Archdiocese of Sydney. He designed churches of which two examples are: the Holy Family of Nazareth Church, in Oulu, Finland and The Cathedral of Our Lady of Arabia in Bahrein. In addition, he designed the Domus Galilaeae, on the Mount of Beatitudes, in Israel, which has become a centre for Jewish Christian dialogue. Furthermore, he wrote a symphony ‘The Suffering of the Innocents’ as an offering to the Jewish people to be ‘a bridge of love and reconciliation’. Arguello insisted on the need for a ‘New Aesthetic’ to contribute beauty to the ‘New Evangelization’.
\textsuperscript{1509} The Little Brothers of Jesus was inspired by Charles de Foucauld. Many other ecclesial realities arose in the time of the Second Vatican Council also received inspiration from the spirituality of de Foucauld.
\textsuperscript{1510} After the retreat, he went on a tour of Europe, exploring art and architecture in the company of a Dominican friar. ‘Upon my return from this trip which turned out to be a very serious and important one for me’. Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 35. ‘Charles de Foucauld gave me the formula: To live in silence at the feet of Jesus Christ crucified. At the feet of Jesus Christ in amongst these people. I knew a social worker who showed me a place in Palomeras Altas where there was a wooden shack, a refuge for dogs … There in that place, began more or less everything’. Kiko Argüello, ‘New Evangelisation and the Third Millennium: Convivence in New York’, (New York: Neocatechumenal Way, 1995), quoted in Robert V. Thomann, \textit{A Hemorrhaging Church: Evangelization and the Neocatechumenal Way}, (Ridgewood, NJ: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013), 104.
\textsuperscript{1511} The Argüello family’s maid gave her story of the abuse and violence she suffered at the hands of her husband. This led Argüello to try to speak to him in the slums of Palomeras Altas, where he saw the extent of the poverty and conditions in which people lived.
\textsuperscript{1512} Quoted as speech of Argüello, though without a reference to the source.
could not expect anything but death. He found a place to live in an empty, broken shack. Following de Foucauld’s pattern, he went with very little only, a Bible and a guitar. There he started to learn about the suffering of those living in Palomeras. He learnt to see Christ in the people living there, and he came to realise that in that slum there was not only ‘a Real Presence of Christ, but I thought that the suffering of those innocent people was also a real presence of Christ’. What occurred was not what he anticipated or planned as he underwent a long transformation into an instrument of grace to build a new reality.

A new reality started growing in Palomeras Altas where there was no belief in God or the Church coming from the questions addressed to Argüello from the people living in Palomeras: Why are you here? Why do you read the Bible? Who is Christ? Who is God? To find an answer to these and other questions, Argüello entered into a dialogue with his questioners and others. A community emerged from those listening to the announcement of the Resurrection of Christ (the kerygma), experiencing the Word of God in a liturgy, celebrations of the Eucharist and coming together on Sunday to sing lauds and then share a meal. The community developed a way of living based on three points: the Word of God, the Eucharist and the community meeting which met to celebrate and share. These become a tripod and is a marker for the NCW. A tripod Ratzinger identified as the content of Christianity. In the language of the ‘Dogmatic Constitution’, the community progressed as a pilgrim of people on a journey of faith, a Way.

Two key ideas emerged during this time. The first was if the Church was to address the unbelief among non-Christians there was a need for a post-baptismal catechumenate echoing what the early Christians offered to those seeking entry into a Christian community. Further, this catechumenate was also for those already baptised.

1513 Charles de Foucauld was murdered at Tamanrasset, Algeria in 1916.
1514 At that time, Palomeras Atlas was one of the worst slum areas in Madrid. It has now been cleared.
1515 Argüello, Kerygma, 37.
1516 This rhythm of community life is the pattern for every community of the NCW.
1517 The formation of community is significantly different in the NCW from other ecclesial realities. Participants in Focolare houses are formed over a number of years. Opus Dei ‘numeraries’ live in communities. L’Arche has a formation for those wishing to enter this new way of living. In Madonna houses, people go through a process of formation, sometimes up to two years, before living in a house. The CWM houses may have a period of ‘apprenticeship’ to learn to live in poverty and participation in the spiritual life of the house. For the NCW, the formation is through walking in a community as a part of the parish, although the community does not live together sociologically, but does spiritually with strong bonds being formed, as the communities continue for as long as possible.
1518 Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 374.
Ratzinger understood this need from his early days as a priest and theologian when he identified how the catechumenate was linked to a community.\[^{1520}\]

Ratzinger understood that the need was necessary to ‘bring about again in our days a personal and communal appropriation of baptism in a shared journey’.\[^{1521}\]

In 2019, as Pope Emeritus, he repeated this recognition of the necessity of a catechumenate in the face of the pressures and threats from contemporary society when he stated that ‘even today something like catechumenal communities are necessary so that Christian life can assert itself in its own way’.\[^{1522}\]

Second, all people (Christians, non-Christians and anyone with significant intellectual ability or limitations on their ability) are to be invited to an initial catechesis as an introduction to the catechumenate. A catechesis for people who listen and accept entry to a community and start a faith journey through the catechumenate. A journey could be a time of discovering that baptism is a foundational sacrament for the reality of Christian life, making the journey a time of formation. As Argüello described it, ‘the Lord forced us through the poor to find that which afterwards became the catechesis that we now give in parishes’.\[^{1523}\]

The development of this catechetical formation arose with difficulty, as Argüello learnt during his time with the people living in Palomeras Altas. He learnt how to preach Christ and of the kerygma of his death and resurrection from them.\[^{1524}\]

Sometime later Carmen Hernández joined Argüello in this work. Hernández, a former nun with a degree in chemistry and a lifelong interest in science, and also a specialist in the liturgy with a licentiate in theology, came to live in Palomeras Altas seeking to share her life with the poor. She met Argüello and witnessed what was happening and why. With Argüello and others, Hernández developed the liturgical practices that are now an integral aspect of the lives of the communities in the NCW. Hernández grasped the importance of all the documents from the Council. She understood the need for a liturgy, responding to the Council’s call for a mission to the

---

\[^{1520}\] See Section 3.2 of this dissertation.
\[^{1523}\] Ibid., 45.
Further, she introduced Argüello to the Council’s call for evangelisation. The archbishop of Madrid who witnessed the experiences of what was happening in Palomeras Altas, and saw the community being formed wanted this to occur in his diocese. He invited Argüello and Hernández to present the itinerary to the parishes. From this invitation, the experience of communities walking on a catechetical journey spread across the diocese of Madrid. By invitation from priests and bishops the NCW then spread across Spain. Later, a priest from Madrid highlighted to Argüello and Hernández that they needed to go to parishes in Rome to offer what had emerged.

Argüello and Hernández arrived in Rome shortly after the May 1968 riots that started in Paris, France and had spread across Europe. Their first visits to parishes were a failure, with the parish priests refusing to recognise any value or purpose in what they proposed. Argüello’s response was to wait, and he went to live with the poor in the Borghetto Latino, where he waited for a sign of God’s favour to bring what had started in Spain to Rome. The sign came late in 1968 when Argüello met a group of young, left-wing, radical Catholics seeking a new way of being in the Church.

Argüello and Hernandez talked to them about the radicality of the Paschal Mystery and the kerygma. A catechesis was given in the parish of the Canadian Martyrs in Rome, and communities were formed from this encounter. From this parish,
other parish communities opened and spread across Rome.\textsuperscript{1531} From Rome, the NCW grew across Italy, Europe and the world.\textsuperscript{1532} There are now many thousands of communities in dioceses worldwide, some of which have been ‘walking’ for over 50 years.\textsuperscript{1533} Further, many parishes may have more than one community. A parish in this way can become a community of communities.\textsuperscript{1534} The start of this process is always the initial catechesis.

Following the initial catechesis, a community can forms only if those who listened express a desire and consent. Then, the community starts on a catechetical journey, moving through passages that parallel the baptismal liturgy, to structure the ongoing formation in communities. The catechetical process parallels the RCIA program in following the baptismal rite’s liturgical steps, although the RCIA occurs over a much shorter period. The catechetical process is at the core of the NCW and shapes its structure and the communities.\textsuperscript{1535}

The NCW is headed at the international level by a team responsible to the Pope under the NCW Statutes and this team leads the NCW’s work.\textsuperscript{1536} The team oversees the groups of itinerant catechists and ‘responsibles’ in each country or region.\textsuperscript{1537} Many of these responsibles are itinerants who gave up jobs and careers to devote their lives to this work. Each team responsible for a region or country oversees in turn the work of catechists in dioceses and parishes in that country or region. The parish and diocesan teams are drawn come from the community after passing through a specified step in the

\textsuperscript{1531} ‘As if by a miracle, the first Neocatechumenal community was born, with fifty brothers’. Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{1532} Some figures suggest more than a million people walk in Neocatechumenal communities in thousands of parishes in approximately 120 countries.
\textsuperscript{1533} Some parishes have many communities going through different passages of the itinerary of formation.
\textsuperscript{1534} This vision was presented during the first night of parish-centred catechesis over several weeks: ‘The living Church, the Church of the little communities, the parish Church, the movements, must form as many centres as possible in the outskirts and thus help to overcome the difficulties that the leading politics obviously cannot manage to resolve’. Benedict XVI, ‘Pastoral Visit to Loreto on the Occasion of the Agora of Italian Youth: Prayer Vigil with Young People’. The Holy See. 1 September 2007. http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2007/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20070901_veglia-loreto.html. Parishes in the UK had many different realities. For example, St Ignatius in Preston in mid 1800s, then under the care of the Jesuits, had multiple sodalities, groups for different ages and purposes, where each parishioner could find something to help them live their faith. Anthony Holden, History of the Church and Parish of St. Ignatius, Preston, 1833–1933, (Preston, Lancashire: Snape & Co, 1933). Further, many parishes before the Reformation had sodalities and guilds, to which parishioners belonged and were centres of liturgical activities. Eamon Duffy, Stripping of the Altars Traditional Religion in England, c. 1400–c. 1580, (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press 2005).
\textsuperscript{1535} The structure of the NCW is set out in the Statutes. See Argüello, et al eds. Statute of the Neocatechumenal Way.
\textsuperscript{1536} The first team was Argüello, Hernández and, after some time, Father Prezzi joined them. On the death of a member, a name must be put to the Vatican for approval. See Argüello, Final Approval.
\textsuperscript{1537} The current International Team of Responsibles includes Argüello, Maria Ascension (who replaced Hernández) and Prezzi. This team has been approved by the Pontifical Council for Promoting the New Evangelization (previously, the Vatican Dicastery for Evangelisation) See Argüello, Final Approval.
catechetical journey. None of the responsibles or catechists receives pay or support, and any financing comes through voluntary collections, gifts or personal resources.

All the national teams of responsibles and catechists meet with the international team in a convivence once a year. First, a catechesis is given on a theme from the magisterium during the convivence, along with daily prayers and a *scrutatio* (scrutiny) of a text from the New Testament. After this, practical issues and difficulties are discussed.\(^{1538}\) Then, the national teams transmit what they received at a national or regional convivence to catechists from dioceses and parishes. In turn, these catechists transmit the same, through oral messages, to the local communities in an area or parish.

The Final Statute sketches out, in canonical language, the structure and responsibilities of the NCW.\(^{1539}\) The responsibilities require a fuller explication of the NCW in the concrete circumstances of a diocese or parish.\(^{1540}\) This is because it highlights how the NCW differs from other ecclesial realities and offers an insight into what Benedict might have been discussing when he called for the renewal of the catechumenate.\(^{1541}\) Moreover, as previously mentioned at section 1.3.3.1, Benedict understood how a renewal of a catechumenate could not be separated from communities of faith.\(^{1542}\)

Argüello stated that when the NCW begins in a parish we explain ‘it is necessary and urgent to pass from a pastoral of sacramentalisation to a pastoral of evangelisation, understanding pastoral of evangelisation as bringing the gospel to many who do not know it or have abandoned the Church’.\(^{1543}\) The message is an invitation to understand how the parish’s work needs to shift from being a centre primarily for administering sacraments to the faithful.\(^{1544}\) Although many baptised people still have faith, what they received from their parents and school was often weak, as revealed by the increasingly significant number of baptised Catholics falling away from the Church across the broad

---


\(^{1539}\) Argüello, *Final Approval*.

\(^{1540}\) An irregular feature of the NCW is the itinerancy of Two by Two. Sometimes, at international or national convivences, teams of two, which are chosen at random, go to different parts of the world without money (often the Gospel of Luke is used as an example—see Lk 9, 1–6:22, 39) to proclaim the kerygma to bishops, priest and whoever will listen that God loves them as they are. For a detailed account of an itinerancy in 1984, see Gacka, ‘Itinerancy ’84’.

\(^{1541}\) See quotes from Ratzinger, *Salt of the Earth*, footnote 1202; Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, footnote 1203.

\(^{1542}\) See quote from Benedict Emeritus, ‘Scandal of Sexual Abuse’, footnote 1320.

\(^{1543}\) Argüello, *Kerygma*, 88.

\(^{1544}\) A decision of Cardinal Gerald Lacroix, the Archbishop of Quebec in early in 2021, was a sign that this is now understood. See Vaillancourt, ‘As Resources Shrink’.
These changes affect the parishes’ viability as functioning communities and challenge the continuity of parishes even as centres for delivering the sacraments in their current mode. The need is for evangelization of those in the church who can then be ‘completely permeated by the love of God and of neighbour’.

The NCW identified an answer to the parishes’ crises in moving to evangelisation by witnessing faith. Such an evangelisation can only occur, however, when a catechesis starts in a parish and a community forms. for NCW communities only start in a parish with the permission of the parish priest.

A community may form after the initial catechesis is given in a parish, though not all catecheses lead to a community forming. Those who respond to the initial call to constitute a community of people are ‘from different starting points: unbelief, personal disaffection, a worldly anti-Christian spirit, a natural religion unable to resist the powerful secularisation of their surroundings, a perfectionistic moralism of a pharisaical nature [or] a faith intermixed with political ideology of one kind or another’. In this context, a community is where a miracle happens. A community is where Christian adults will be born who are ‘realistic but full of hope, humble but bold, fraternal and a “mystic” as well as a witness in the world’.

All of this requires time.

The journey of a NCW community is long because it is a serious journey. In the catechetical journey, communities move through three phases: pre-catechumenate,
catechumenate and election.\textsuperscript{1551} The length of time is questioned by those who want more immediate outcomes to justify the energy and effort.\textsuperscript{1552} However, the NCW understands the journey as a time of receiving gifts from the Church and that those who accept these as a real gift for their life give back to the Church through a life of witness.\textsuperscript{1553}

Part of that witness comes in breaking the attachment to money. As is the case for the other exemplars (see Sections 3.3.1.1 to 3.3.1.2 and 3.3.2.1 to 3.3.2.2) discussed previously, the communities have to understand the problem of money. There are many calls to renounce money during the journey and opportunities to demonstrate renunciation of money and trust in God’s providence.\textsuperscript{1554}

The core of living the spirituality of the NCW originates from the text, on the Icon of the Holy Family, ‘written’ by Argüello which calls people ‘to live in “simplicity, humility, and praise”’.\textsuperscript{1555} With these words, the Holy Family of Nazareth is the model for the community.\textsuperscript{1556} The three elements forming the life of a community are based on those in Palomeras Atlas—a liturgical life of listening to the Word of God weekly and

\textsuperscript{1551} The same passages as in the \textit{Ordo Initiationis Christianae Adultorum} (Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults), which were promulgated on 6 January 1972 but over a longer period. Argüello and Hernández explained how when they presented themselves for questioning about what they were doing to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, the congregation were surprised at the catecheses given by the NCW. The congregation understood how the structure of the catecheses matched the \textit{Ordo}, and the catechetical structure of the NCW was confirmed. See also Pasotti, \textit{Neocatechumenal Way}, 10–12.

\textsuperscript{1552} Parish priests, who often only have a short tenure in a parish (maybe six years maximum), can be frustrated by the length of this journey and for not being able to show ‘fruits’ for the parish. Benedict warned against this mentality.

\textsuperscript{1553} The Church gives to the faithful four things: ‘the symbols of Faith, the Our Father, the commandments of God summarized in the Shema and in loving one’s neighbour as oneself, and the sacraments. So, in a sense these have to be given back’. Blazquez, \textit{Neo-Catechumenal Communities}, 75.


\textsuperscript{1556} ‘The model for the Neocatechumenal community is the Holy Family of Nazareth … Why? Because it is ‘the historical place where the Word of God, made man, became an adult’. Statutes, art. 7(2). See also \textit{Awarding of the Doctorate}, 15.
celebrating the Eucharist on the vigil of Sunday.\textsuperscript{1557} The third element is building a community of faith (not for social purposes, although that may flow later) by meeting monthly in a convivence to share their experiences of how God is acting in each person’s life.\textsuperscript{1558} Blazquez stated that the ‘kerygma, way and community are the three dimensions which structure this initiative raised up by God in the Church’.\textsuperscript{1559} This tripod parallels Benedict’s definition of charity in CIV as ‘gift, acceptance, and communion’.\textsuperscript{1560} The tripod is a metaphor for life in a community, offering gift, acceptance and communion, in ‘an intense way of catechesis’.\textsuperscript{1561}

The catechesis is an invitation to live a Christological life, which is possible in ‘the presence of Christ’\textsuperscript{1562} where there is an encounter with a person. Ratzinger understood that living in a community is a time of coming to know the person Christ.\textsuperscript{1563} He recognised that for such an encounter to occur and receive strength, ‘the Eucharist is essential to the Neocatechumenate since this is a post-baptismal catechumenate lived in small communities’.\textsuperscript{1564} For Ratzinger, ‘the centrality of the mystery of Christ celebrated in the liturgical rites is a privilege because it is an indispensable way to build living and persevering Christian communities’.\textsuperscript{1565} Ratzinger recognised, as Argüello put it, the need to ‘form Christian communities that will give these two signs; love for the enemy, love in the dimension of the cross, and perfect unity, that relationships of the Divine Persons are found in the Holy Trinity. These signs of love and unity are the light of the world’.\textsuperscript{1566} The formation of new communities showing signs of love for their enemies, never mind their neighbours, whether at work, in their home or locality, involves some people coming forward to be catechists, go on a mission or be itinerants

\begin{enumerate}
\item The rites of the Eucharist as celebrated in a NCW community has been questioned from traditionalist and liberal perspectives. One asserts deviations from the proper rubrics, while the other challenges the separation in the journey of renewal of faith and the claim this leads to a form of ‘angelism’ (i.e., non-engagement from social questions, along with concern for the so called ‘conservatism’ of the NCW). It is also a stumbling block for parish priests who do not understand what the NCW purpose can help achieve.
\item Convivence involves living together though only in a monthly gathering rather than in shared living. Thus, the NCW communities are not monastic communities.
\item Benedict XVI, Address to the Communities of the Neocatechumenal Way’. The Holy See. 20 January 2012. \url{http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2012/january/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20120120_cammino-neocatecumenale.html}.
\item Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 84.
\item Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 84.
\end{enumerate}
(even in another country). These are instances of a vocation to be a witness of Christ in their lives.

In witnessing Christ, the communities of the NCW shape the social and cultural context in which they live because the communities, as ‘new ways of living’, invite and include people from far away. The communities become sources of hope that allow them to live as ‘models of new life in new ways and will once again present itself in the wasteland of technological existence as a place of true humanity’.

Ratzinger’s statement raises a question about how this helps illuminate the meaning of NoCh. To this end it will be helpful to consider some of Benedict’s observations and comments about the fruits of the NCW communities.

### 3.3.3.2. Some Fruits: Families, Catechises and Mission

The number of itinerant catechists at the local, national and international levels who offer their lives to announce the kerygma is a sign of a fruit of the communities. The commitment and dedication of these itinerant catechists enables the NCW to continue giving the gift of a way of formation in faith to the Church. Itinerant catechists give the initial catecheses in those parishes that invite the NCW. When a community is formed, the catechists accompany the communities through the various phases, steps and passages as described in Chapter IV, Articles 19 to 21, of the Statutes. A new layer of itinerant catechists comes through in each generation to work at the international, national, Church, diocesan and parish levels. Benedict praised the itinerant catechists for how:

in these decades of the Way’s life, one of your firm commitments has been to proclaim the Risen Christ, to respond to his words with generosity, often giving up personal and material securities, even leaving your own countries, facing new and not always easy situations. Bringing Christ to

---

1567 Ratzinger, _Salt of the Earth_, 126–27.
1568 International catechists can often include a wife and husband team, with or without children. They may do this for 40 years or more, as they have in Australia. See toto Piccolo, ‘Neocatechumenal Way’, *Australasian Catholic Record* 89, no. 2, (2012): 174–85, footnote, 174:

‘Toto Piccolo was born in Tuscany on 16 September 1952 and has been married to Rita for thirty-seven years. They both met in the Neocatechumenal Way in St. Titus Parish near St. Paul’s Basilica in Rome in 1971. In 1977 they were sent to Australia by Kiko and Carmen, as itinerant catechists, to open the Neocatechumenal Way, with the blessing of Pope Paul VI. Their itinerant mission was confirmed many times by Blessed John Paul II. During their thirty-five years of missionary work in the Dioceses of Australia their six children were born,’

1569 The Statutes, chapter IV, 44–9, provides the Neocatechumenal itinerary: the first phase is the rediscovery of the pre-catechumenate (art. 19); the second phase is the rediscovery of the catechumenate (art. 20); and the third phase is the rediscovery of the election (art. 21). Arguello, _Final Approval_.

---
people and bringing people to Christ: it is this that enlivens every evangelizing action.\textsuperscript{1570}

An unanticipated fruit of the NCW is the rebuilding of many marriages and families and the celebration of children born into Christian families. Marriages and children are at the heart of every community.\textsuperscript{1571} In 2009, Argüello received a doctorate from the Pontifical John Paul II Institute for Studies on Marriage and Family for, in the words of Livio Melina (Melina), the President of the Institute, ‘his contribution to the reconstruction of a culture of the family’\textsuperscript{1572} In his address, Jose Noriega (Noriega) also of the Institute observed that the family is vital because it is where God is made present in a particular way.\textsuperscript{1573} Benedict, in an address celebrating 40 years of the NCW in the Diocese of Rome, mentioned other fruits when he noted:

‘how many men and women and how many families who had drifted away from the ecclesial community or had abandoned the practice of Christian life through the proclamation of the kerygma and the process of the rediscovery of Baptism have been helped to rediscover the joy of faith and the enthusiasm of Gospel witness!’\textsuperscript{1574}

Benedict emphasised his gratitude for the communities in a later address, recognising that ‘marriage preparation and offering guidance to families in their often difficult progress, particularly in the important task of raising children, is the fundamental way to regenerating the Church ever anew, and also to revive the social fabric’.\textsuperscript{1575} Benedict welcomed the work with families, observing that it occurs ‘in a way that helps those who have already received Baptism to rediscover the beauty of the life of faith, the joy of being Christian’.\textsuperscript{1576}

\textsuperscript{1570}Benedict, ‘Communities of the Neocatechumenal Way’.
\textsuperscript{1571} Paul VI’s Humanæ Vitæ is an encyclical that is lived in its fullness in many of the families and communities of the NCW.
\textsuperscript{1572} The doctorate was awarded for ‘the fruitfulness of the post-baptismal Way of formation in enhancing the value of the family as an ecclesial and social subject in full accord with the thought of John Paul II’.\textit{Awarding of the Doctorate}, 8.
\textsuperscript{1573} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{1576} Benedict, ‘Communities of the Neocatechumenal Way’.
Another development in the work of the NCW emerged with an initiative to send families on mission. Starting in 1987 with two families, and then in 1988, the NCW sent groups of families with presbyters and others on a mission, often to areas of dechristianisation, social deprivation and suffering.\textsuperscript{1577} The groups are sent by the Pope at that time: John Paul II, Benedict and Francis. John Paul II sent out 72 families on a mission in 1998.\textsuperscript{1578} Benedict presided over a gathering of the NCW communities to send out 17 families in 2012.\textsuperscript{1579} He noted that ‘these are families who leave without much human support but who are counting first and foremost on the support of divine Providence’\textsuperscript{1580} He called on the families to be:

‘docile and joyful witnesses, walking the highways of every continent in simplicity and poverty, sustained by ceaseless prayer and listening to the Word of God and nourished by participation in the liturgical life of the particular Churches to which you are sent.’\textsuperscript{1581}

Some families go on ‘missio ad gentes’ (mission to the peoples) to areas where Christianity is no longer present in practice or name. In some instances, the mission involves sprawling new suburbs where churches are left behind.\textsuperscript{1582} Some families go behind the former Iron Curtain, such as Chemnitz in the former German Democratic

\textsuperscript{1577} Awarding of the Doctorate, 29, summarised the distribution of families across the world in 2009. See also Giuseppe Gennarini, ‘The Role of the Christian Family in Announcing the Gospel in Today’s World’, \textit{L’Osservatore, Weekly Edition in English}, 19 October 1987, 18, introduced this article quoting a couple, Peter and Maureen, who, with their six children, were sent on mission by Pope John Paul II to: ‘a part of London so notorious that milkmen, postmen, taxi drivers and even the police do not want to go there’. Peter stated: ‘God has sent me to this district where there are so many people destroyed, to make me—who has so many times doubted the love of God—share the experience of St. Thomas: to put my hands into the wounds of Christ, which are these the poor’.


\textsuperscript{1579} ‘Benedict XVI sent out 17 missio ad gentes teams: 12 to Europe (Albi, Nice, Bayonne, Toulon, Strasbourg, Lyon, Antwerp, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Tallinn, Vienna, Manchester), four to America (three in Boston and one in Venezuela), and one in Africa, in Libreville (Gabon). In addition, other families for the missio ad gentes were also sent, already formed, to the Ukraine, among the Australian Aborigines [sic], and to Papua New Guinea. These teams are added to the other 40 that have already been sent all over the world by Benedict XVI in previous years’. Salvatore Cernuzio, ‘‘1,000 Families on a Mission: Pontiff Sends Out 17 More Neocatechumenal Way Groups’, \textit{ZENIT}, 20 January 2012. https://zenit.org/articles/1-000-families-on-a-mission/, (accessed July 31, 2019)/

\textsuperscript{1580} Benedict, ‘Communities of the Neocatechumenal Way’.

\textsuperscript{1581} Ibid.

Republic. These are areas where religious life is still suffering from the history of oppression or has disappeared altogether.\textsuperscript{1583} In 2012, Benedict observed how:

\begin{quote}
‘sometimes you are present in places where a first proclamation of the Gospel is necessary, the ‘missio ad gentes’; often, instead, in areas which although they have known Christ have grown indifferent to faith: secularism has eclipsed the sense of God there and has clouded the Christian values.’\textsuperscript{1584}
\end{quote}

Often, the areas chosen are contemporary instances of Palomeras Altas. Further developments led to communities in large cities that had come to the end of the Way and relocated to areas of spiritual and social need as \textit{communitates in missionem}.\textsuperscript{1586}

Here, they are called to serve the parishes of the poor living on the margins of society. Benedict presided at a sending out in 2012 of some of Rome’s oldest communities to the outlying areas of Rome where migrants and the poor live. Francis also sent families on a mission in 2016.\textsuperscript{1587}

A visible sign of the fruits of the NCW is the high number of vocations to religious life. At each World Youth Day, on the day after the Pope meets with the pilgrims, the NCW holds a vocational gathering. Argüello calls on those present to answer to their vocation, whether that is to go on a mission as a family, to be a sister on mission, to enter religious life, to enter a diocesan missionary seminary, to go on itinerancy announcing the Gospel or to marry. The number of people who initially respond is significant, and through a process of discernment while continuing to walk in their community, some go forward in a vocation. The number of those who go forward, though much fewer, is still significant. The seminaries are both diocesan and missionary, are in over 120 dioceses or countries at the time of writing.

\textsuperscript{1583} Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 141–44, described the activities of these primary apostolic communities, including weekly gatherings in public, house to house visits and inviting people to hear how God loves them; they ‘live in the midst of the world, constitute a real court of the gentiles, in which men can get close to God’. \textit{Kerygma}, 144.

\textsuperscript{1584} Benedict, ‘Communities of the Neocatechumenal Way’.

\textsuperscript{1586} Argüello, \textit{Kerygma}, 92. Communities that have completed the passages of the way can be asked to relocate to an area of need for the Church, which is often an area of great social need. The only significant move has been in Rome, which involved moving to parishes on the outskirts of Rome, where migrants of all nationalities were gathered.

\textsuperscript{1587} Francis. Address to Members of the Neocatechumenal Way. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2016. http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2016/march/documents/papa-francesco_20160318_movimento-neocatecumenale.pdf. At this meeting Francis sent out 250 families on \textit{missio ad gentes} to Ireland, France, Luxembourg, Sweden, Britain, Lithuania, Latvia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Cyprus, Serbia, Austria, Ukraine, Russia, Kazakhstan, Canada, the United States, Peru, Brazil, India, China, Ethiopia, the Ivory Coast, South Africa, Equatorial Guinea, Nigeria, Australia and Papua New Guinea.
The seminary formation follows a different path than other seminaries because the seminarians continue to walk in a community. During this experience, the seminarians enjoy another type of formation where they live through the liturgical and social engagements with laypeople in their community. In many instances, seminarians meet with laypeople more than once a week in a liturgy of the Word of God or a Eucharist, where they learn about the suffering and joy of the laity.1588

3.3.4. Conclusion

The arguments and material in Section 3.3 contributes to development of a reading of the ecclesial movements as exemplars of the call in CIV 5.7 to create NoCH. First, each exemplar in their origins, development and fruits reflect CIV 5.7, insofar as there is a belief of the founder/initiator and in the communities that the basis of their work is God’s Love. Their services to the poor are not merely a type of charity only sharing out of a surplus but a service coming from a gift of self to the other who is seen as the neighbour and where God is to be found. It is a form of social charity. Second, there is a Christological outlook to the spirituality of these exemplars. The spiritual and theological core of each exemplar and their commitment to living these in their practical creation of NoCh reflects the nature of CIV as more than a treatise setting out a Catholic view of the answers to the world with its economic, social and political issues. The diversity of the exemplars illustrates the vocation of Christians in NoCh. In these exemplars, NoCh are communities in which persons in the fullness of their relationality self-gift themselves in myriad ways to be a service of love for others. Such a communitarian perspective, grounded in the relationality of humans, is where love is the reality that opens out the horizon of what might otherwise become narrow social groupings into a wider world through serving the other. The exemplars reflect the era in which they emerged. Further, this has also shaped what they gave to the Church and the world through the fruits of their work.

1588 ‘The primary characteristic of a Neocatechumenal Way seminary is that everyone is part of a small Christian community [outside the seminary]. All go to the community’s weekly Eucharistic celebration, participate in the midweek Liturgy of the Word and set aside one Sunday month or a common retreat. The discernment of a vocation to the priesthood therefore also involves to some degree a discernment by the community of an individual’s calling. Community support both before and after ordination explains the comparatively small number who leave the priesthood’. Charles M. Murphy, Models of Priestly Formation: Past, Present, and Future, (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 2006), 67.
Part 4. Love of Christ and the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church

Benedict located the foundation of the STCC in the Shema. He articulated in CIV 5.8 that NoCh are a dynamic of charity. The generation of that dynamic originates in the Love of God, which is the basis of the human person as relational being and thus also of the social structures which can build the relationality for a self-gift in love. Part 3 demonstrated that love is the only rationale for people to enter into a self-gift that fruitfully serves others. In CIV Benedict placed love at the heart of the STCC because, as Part 4 argues using the logic of relationality, love leads to self-gift in the social world. This is what the Church gives to the world. Schindler points to Benedict’s conclusion in CIV 5.8 where it was written: ‘The Church’s social teaching [...], in a word, is “caritas in veritate in re sociali: the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s love in society (n. 5)’. For Schindler this is the ‘root proposal of the encyclical’. Here there is a dimension of love which informs the call for Christians to live out their vocation through communities of ‘Love-caritas’. Paragraph 5 of CIV is situated within a larger text which gives a context which is also a framework for the development to the reading of CIV 5.7. CIV 5.8 extends the reading of CIV 5.7 in two ways. First, the action of persons in community being in the dynamic of charity respond and change the world in which they live; but most critically this dynamic gives rise to a teaching which is not about politics or principles or power but a radical truth – the love of Christ is fully present and fully active in society through the working of the Holy Spirit. As the earlier line in paragraph 5 observes: “Love is revealed and made present by Christ (cf. Jn 13:1) and “poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit” (Rom 5:5)”. Section 4.1 explores the dimension of loves through an examination of Archer and Donati’s engagement with CIV and the STCC, where each of them provide a perspective on the principles of the STCC within their theory of relational sociology. Both make substantial contributions in deepening the meaning of the principles in particular subsidiarity and solidarity from within the horizon Benedict placed before

1589 Schindler, DL, Anthropological Basis, 559.
1590 CIV, 28.
1591 Ibid, 5.
his reader in CIV - the ‘humanum in which relationality is an essential element’;\textsuperscript{1592} the perspective of the relational person provides the backdrop to Parts 4.2 and 4.3.

Section 4.2 explores Benedict’s contribution to the STCC, framed in terms of the Love of God where he argued the principles of the STCC orientate people to God. This is particularly explored in part 4.3, which brings together the call for formation of NoCh, and what this means for the Church and the World. This is a programme less for advancing (or even defending) civilization and most especially the human person, not least in recusing that every person is unique and wanted. Rather, its purpose is to promote the ‘quest for truth, beauty, goodness and communion with others’.\textsuperscript{1593} From this can come the authentic development of people through IHD

\textbf{4.1 Caritas in Veritate 5.8 and the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church}

\textbf{4.1.1 Responses to Caritas in Veritate}

\textbf{4.1.1.1. Archer on Caritas in Veritate}

Archer did not offer a general assessment of CIV.. Instead, her focus was the relationship between relational sociology and CIV which she addressed in the PASS sessions occurring in 2010, 2011 and 2013, and further in accompanying articles.

Benedict’s explicit identification of the need for human relations to be at the core of society is a key to reading Archer’s address given in 2010. In the address, she explained how relational sociology articulates STCC in a relational key and how the four principles are necessary for changes to happen.\textsuperscript{1594} She rewrote this address and in the rewrite reframed the challenge CIV has posed to social scientists as a challenge to the Church itself.\textsuperscript{1595} Archer’s challenge was how to move from the ‘micro-level of personal identity to the macro-level of societal fraternity’.\textsuperscript{1596} Archer recognised how CIV posed a ‘fundamental challenge to the social sciences …[which is].. to place the

\textsuperscript{1592} Ibid, 55.
\textsuperscript{1593} Ibid, 51.
\textsuperscript{1595} Margaret S. Archer, ‘Caritas in Veritate and Social Love’. International Journal of Public Theology 5 (2011): 273–95. The assumption here is that ‘Church’ refers to the body of the faithful, of the laity, rather than only those with authority and responsibility in the institutional forms of the Church. Although Archer is a sociologist, she may be more comfortable thinking about structures.
\textsuperscript{1596} Archer, ‘Social Love’, 274.
well-being of global humanity at the top of their agenda’. \footnote{1597} She welcomed Benedict’s warning in CIV that highlighted the danger of how ‘the exclusively binary model of market plus-state is corrosive of society’. \footnote{1598} Archer insisted that neither the state nor the market can provide for ‘human relations nurtured in civil society’ because human relations are more than ‘exchange relations and command relations’.

\footnote{1599} For her in order to challenge this view of human relations requires a grasp of personal identity as ‘fundamentally relational in kind and thus, indispensable to’ IHD. \footnote{1600} She drew on SpS, where it stated that ‘life in its true sense … is a relationship’.

\footnote{1601} She insisted that recognising the relational nature of the human being is essential because social relationships make the person distinctly human and remove ‘a serious ambiguity attaching to “human dignity”’. \footnote{1602} The argument as summarised is that relational sociology and STCC share a common understanding that the human person’s anthropology is as a relational being—*homo relatus*. And this is a key to CIV’s advocacy for IHD.

Archer argued the concept of IHD is a key feature of CIV noting how the concept appears 22 times in the text. \footnote{1603} She viewed the idea as amplifying the significance of human dignity in how CIV included this amongst one of the key conditions required for IHD. She welcomed Benedict’s insistence that understanding the human person in the social and economic order requires ‘a deeper critical evaluation of the category of relation’. \footnote{1604} She argued that humans as relational beings acquire a form of sanctity through a comparison to the Trinity. \footnote{1605} Further, this led her to suggest that CIV is an invitation to ‘sanctify every human encounter with fraternity’. \footnote{1606} For Archer, the

\footnote{1597} Margaret S. Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, *The Tablet*, 18 July 2009, 10–11, 11. The subheading summarising Archer’s view of CIV is to see CIV as: ‘rather than being a theologian’s work, it represents a dialogue with social scientists’.

\footnote{1598} CIV 39.

\footnote{1599} Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, 10.

\footnote{1600} Ibid. ‘This line of thought stretches ‘from Aristotle, through Aquinas and permeating Catholic social doctrine’. Ibid.

\footnote{1601} SpS, 27.

\footnote{1602} Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, 10.

\footnote{1603} Ibid.

\footnote{1604} Ibid. The italicisation in CIV 53, is followed.

\footnote{1605} Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, 10.

\footnote{1606} Ibid.
centrality of relationality in CIV led her to welcome CIV’s recognition of how human relations are nurtured in ‘subsidiarist’ entities, leading to solidarity.  

Archer gave another reading of CIV through the lens of solidarity in a paper titled ‘Solidarity and Governance’. She identified a critical element of building solidarity is in finding bottom-up solutions rather than reforming from the ‘top-down’, because she held only the bottom-up approach is the way to build society. She highlighted the emphasis in CIV on how economic forms based on solidarity build up society. However, she did question whether CIV is too utopian in seeking the build-up of civil society. She argued such a building up of civil society requires developing solidarity organisations based on subsidiarity. In this reading of CIV while she recognised the call to weave NoCh as communities, she cautioned that such communities would not emerge quickly. In this way, Archer recognised that Benedict’s call to renew culture and social order through NoCh needs time for social love to emerge.

Archer read CIV as expressing the idea of social love. She defined ‘social love’ as the valuing of ‘our social relations for themselves, as the source of deeply fulfilling “internal goods”, [and which] ... necessarily creates “external goods” beneficial to wider society’. Thus, Archer interpreted Benedict’s call to build a civilisation of love as echoing this concept of social love.

---

1607 Ibid., 11. Note the word ‘subsidiarist’ is not yet accepted by some editors. There is no recognition in the OED, or Macquarie Dictionary of this term. The dissertation holds that it is an adjectival word describing those entities or processes, as well as patterns of behaviour that encourage, build and sustain an effective subsidiarity. The word is in use in the following references: “subsidiarist state”, Society for U.S. Intellectual History at https://s-usih.org/tag/subsidiarist-state/, (accessed July 25 2021); further see use of ‘subsidiarist’ to replace the word ‘distributist’, in David S. Hogsette, Writing That Makes Sense, 2nd Edition: Critical Thinking in College Composition, 559. (Eugene, Oregon: Resource Publications, 2019). Further see Mike Konczal, The Forgotten State, Boston Review, Jul/Aug 2016, Vol. 41 Issue 4, 46-49, 48.

1608 Archer, ‘Solidarity and Governance’.

1609 Ibid., 23.

1610 Ibid., 24.

1611 Ibid.

1612 Ibid.

1613 Ibid., 25. ‘because ‘weaving is slow work and the better the rug, the longer it takes’.

1614 Archer adopted this phrase from John Paul II, ‘Supreme Pontiff Encyclical Letter’, section 15. Paul VI identified the Eucharist as the source of social love, though Archer does not take up this argument. Paul VI argues ‘Devotion to the divine Eucharist exerts a great influence upon the soul in the direction of fostering a “social” love, in which we put the common good ahead of private good, take up the cause of the community, the parish, the universal Church, and extend our charity to the whole world because we know that there are members of Christ everywhere’.


Archer did not consider social love a sentimental idea. On the contrary, this love emerges from the reality of people who enjoy ‘interpersonal trust, confidence and concern’ with others and who are ‘the foundations of the functioning of the good society’. The relations that generate goods outside people come from social love by regenerating trust, mutuality and reciprocity. This regeneration increases social solidarity through such goods as ‘free giving, volunteering and participation that are necessary for subsidiarity to be realised’. Solidarity arises from organisations responding ‘to the real needs of … neighbours’.

Archer argued that by expanding organisations of ‘circles of social love’, which are to be considered as instances of NoCh, a ‘common good grows as an emergent property and power’. Thus, social love can become the source of ‘solidarity’ and ‘subsidiarity’. However, Archer’s use of the phrase ‘social love’ leads to a question about what it means for the idea of relationality. The answer is, at least in part, that social love is a form of a gift of self, leading to the fullness of relationality in loving the other, which in itself is a form of fraternity.

Archer welcomed the idea of free giving, which recognises the concept of gift as an ‘expression of fraternity … [belonging] to “normal economic activity”’. Her concern was that if the gift of self is to be at the heart of the current economic order, it needs to go beyond what she called ‘virtue ethics’. She argued that appeals to people to adopt virtues as an approach to addressing social problems is insufficient and acknowledged that much of the social science is also inadequate to provide an answer. Nevertheless, her dismissal of relying on virtues as a strategy for social change is only correct if it is seen as the only way to address social problems. The countervailing argument is that a person with virtues, such as integrity, hope, trust and charity, who loves the other can become an effective agent for change (if not more). A person with virtues is what sustains social organisations of love, such as NoCh.

1616 Archer, ‘Current Crisis’, 122.
1617 Archer, ‘Social Love’, 293.
1618 Ibid., 294.
1619 Ibid.
1621 Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, 10.
In her research on meta-reflexives, Archer recognised that virtues are a part of the makeup of a person who seeks to bring others into the process for social change.\textsuperscript{1622} However, she did not locate gift at the level of personal actions but as something ‘given’ at a level beyond the personal. Three questions challenge the idea that gift leads towards fraternity: Is there a capacity within human beings to act according to the principle of gratuitousness? Second, what do social institutions need to do to foster fraternity? Finally, what can be done to overcome resistance to free giving in economic activity?\textsuperscript{1623} Archer believed that the answers lie in the concept of gratuitousness in CIV.

Archer argued that gratuitousness opens up an understanding of how the gift of self occurs when a person becomes someone to another in a less closed way. A person in a meta-reflexive mode generates an openness within and from themselves to engage with the other person/people. This involves more than just an intentional action for there is also a reframing of how to see and engage with other humans in the form of social loving for the other through constitutive circles of love. Accordingly, there is a generation of a desire to act as a relational being with others to create communities that give love and care to others. Archer insisted that humans enjoy interacting with others as relational beings because they can give to each other; this is what constitutes the human person as \textit{homo relatus}.\textsuperscript{1624} A good example is friendship as a path to fraternity arising from the free giving in a relationship.\textsuperscript{1625}

Archer holds that where free giving sustains such relational goods into becoming an expression of fraternity, there is still a requirement for an institutional form to deliver and sustain fraternity.\textsuperscript{1626} The remainder of Archer’s paper discussed some of the barriers that need to be overcome if free giving is to enter into fully into economic activity. However, she noted the caution in CIV that law cannot manufacture gratuitousness.\textsuperscript{1627} After noting the emerging types of meso-level organisations orientating to free giving, she concluded that CIV is an encouraging document, not least in her reference to NoCh, which she considered an exemplar of a meso-level

\textsuperscript{1622} The relationship between virtues and the development of meta-reflexivity is an unexplored area.
\textsuperscript{1623} Archer, ‘Logic of the Gift’.
\textsuperscript{1624} Ibid., 2–4.
\textsuperscript{1625} Ibid. See the earlier discussion on friendship in Section 3.1
\textsuperscript{1626} ‘Fraternité which encapsulates the Catholic “model” of what it is to be human in society and the social, economic and political institutions that would realise the “common good” for humankind’. Ibid., 8.
\textsuperscript{1627} CIV 39, quoted in Archer, ‘Logic of the Gift’, 13. ‘The market of gratuitousness does not exist, and attitudes of gratuitousness cannot be established by law’. CIV 35.
organisation.\(^{1628}\) This is despite having extracted NoCh from its context in CIV 5.7, even while recognising that it proposed a social subject.

In conclusion, Archer agreed with Benedict’s view in CIV that there are no top-down solutions which can overcome the corrosion of social solidarity.\(^{1629}\) She recalled how society is built up historically from social movements promoting human dignity, such as the campaign for women’s rights and improvements in working conditions. Therefore, Archer recognised CIV’s call, as a call for the ‘building up of civil society through solidary’ organisation through subsidiarity.\(^{1630}\) Thus, Archer recognised that working for change requires people to live with gradualism in the slow building of NoCh because this is the ‘only realistic way of slowly re-building [sic] social integration’.\(^{1631}\) Moreover, sustaining slow weaving requires people with virtues, in a secular sense; however, by arguing this, Archer implicitly challenged Christians to take up Benedict’s edict for those who know of the persistence of God’s Love to form NoCh. Archer’s engagement with CIV leads to considering how Donati has approached CIV, and CIV in particular.

\section*{4.1.1.2. Donati on Caritas in Veritate}

Donati, in his analysis of CIV focused on the statement in CIV on how ‘the exclusively binary model of market-plus-state is corrosive of society, while economic forms based on solidarity … build up society’.\(^{1632}\) Donati understood this to mean that for people to go beyond this binary model, relational sociology needs to find a new form of society in which relational goods develop.\(^{1633}\) He argued that the dominant form of the political and economic order is based on a ‘lib/lab’ configuration (and even more so

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \(^{1628}\) It encourages us in “weaving [NoCh]” and the caring relations created and expressed by groups of unpaid voluntary workers reinvigorate social solidarity. Weaving is slow work and the better the rug, the longer it takes. In the immediate future it appears that we will have to live with gradualism and encourage it’. Archer, ‘Logic of the Gift’, 15.
\item \(^{1629}\) Archer, ‘Solidarity and Governance’, 23.
\item \(^{1630}\) Ibid., 24.
\item \(^{1631}\) Ibid., 25.
\item \(^{1632}\) CIV 39.
\end{itemize}
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in the world’s advanced economies). He described this lib/lab ordering as a structure of compromise (an unstable one) between the state, with its power, force, and revenue, and the market with its wealth-generating powers and quasi-anarchic behaviour. In managing economic crises, the two (state and market) are intertwined in mutually supportive structures. Donati argued that this binary logic needs to be replaced with a relational configuration. He proposed CIV needs ‘to be read and interpreted in this light’.

Donati perceived that the turning point of CIV is in its focus on the quality of relations at all levels of society—micro, meso and macro. Society needs to be based on an adequate anthropology because ‘the social question has become a radically anthropological question’. He called this the ‘fil rouge’ of CIV and linked it to the question of love. Further, he insisted those who have an ‘ultimate concern’ can effectively shape the quality of social relations. He emphasised that though love is a gift of God it is an ultimate concern of every human person, even if many are not aware of this truth.

He emphasised that love/charity is the source of every good, including relational goods. Thus, he understood CIV places love as the core principle of societal organisations. Donati’s argument links back to the discussion on charity in Section 1.3 where charity in NoCh is defined as a ‘relationship of gratuitousness, mercy, and communion’. Such relationships live out the fraternity that is needed to create a new social ordering from the family to the international order. Donati noted that truth is a requirement for this to occur because truth frees charity from emotionalism and, more especially, the ‘mutual interchange between charity and truth’ indicates the need to think relationally because the ‘unbreakable link between charity and truth is the relation that characterises the humanum’.

Donati’s engagement with CIV although paralleling Archer’s focus on the relationality inherent in CIV was richer because he insisted on understanding how the
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1634 Donati, ‘Need for a Civil Society’, 336. The world system (or globalization), marked by the economy’s financialization, is the outcome of this current worldwide societal lib–lab structure.
1635 ‘Crony capitalism’ describes the relationship where large corporations cooperate with the state to receive favourable regulations and subsidies, and thus, avoid serious competition for market shares.
1637 Ibid.
1638 Ibid., 77.
1639 CIV 6.
1641 Ibid.
‘deepest message of the encyclical … [lies] in betting on a new ethical interaction between consciences and intellects’, leading to a new vision.1642 For Donati, this is a new vision for meeting the ‘challenge of the new interdependencies among individuals and among peoples’.1643 Benedict envisaged a life that is human insofar as it is relational. Donati extended this to argue this is also the basis from which a new society can arise. Like Archer, Donati promoted new social relations to ground the relational goods and find a new form of social ordering. His reading of CIV led him to summarise the STCC in relational terms, which is discussed later in Section 4.1.3.

The engagement of Archer and Donati with CIV reflects their dominant concern with understanding how the relationality of a person is a source of energy for delivering change. However, there are some critical observations to make about their contributions. First, neither Donati nor Archer engaged with the Christological thinking in CIV and how this informs the human person’s relationality. Further, there was little engagement with what charity might mean in relational terms and neither analysed the three elements in CIV 5.7, that constitute NoCh. However, both have indirectly identified NoCh as social entities, which recalls the issue under discussion in the review of Archer’s contributions to CIV. Further, Archer’s and Donati’s reflections are important because they have connected the personal virtues, meta-reflexivity of persons, development of social virtues, such as fraternity, reciprocity and gratuitousness, and centrality of love by recognising how these elements, in the social form of NoCh, will contribute to cultural renewal.

4.1.2. Relational Sociology and Social Teaching of the Church: An Introduction

Archer and Donati have as relational sociologists interpreted the contemporary world through understanding the interactions between the human person’s relationality and social change. Their approach is the key for interpreting, explaining and promoting the STCC in its four principles: the dignity of the person, subsidiarity, solidarity and the common good.1644 The Compendium identified these as ‘the very heart of’ STCC.1645

1642 Ibid.
1643 Ibid.
1644 Whether these are core principles or whether ideas can be added as core principles is an active debate in many parts of the Catholic Church, wider academia and world of activists. Donati in his Relational Sociology and Archer in her many texts have not given any attention to concepts such as ‘the preferential option for the poor’ that some argue are key principles of the STCC. In this regard see Cahill and Hollenbach in Section 1.2.2.
Principles which are ‘of a general and fundamental character since they concern the reality of society in its entirety’. Archer and Donati have provided an interpretation of the principles from the perspective of relational sociology and used the logic of these interpretations to offer steps towards reaching the truth of what these principles indicate.

The challenge for Donati, was with how the Compendium reflected an ‘organic and vertically stratified picture of the society … [because it] first asserts the primacy of politics and secondly places the State at the apex of society, with the role of protecting, ruling and creating civil society’. He emphasised that the STCC ‘can no longer make reference to the society of the past or to a purely abstract idea of society’. He urged that ‘the social doctrine … must enlarge its horizons on the common good through an adequate widening of its relational vision … [to] develop its potential for illuminating and supporting new politics and social practices’. Thus, these principles are the ‘four fundamental principles of a good society … [and] must be understood and must operate in a relational and reflexive manner’. Moreover, they are applicable for shaping the contemporary world.

4.1.2.1. Current Situation

1646 ‘These are principles of a general and fundamental character, since they concern the reality of society in its entirety … the Church presents them as the primary and fundamental parameters of reference for interpreting and evaluating social phenomena, which is the necessary source for working out the criteria for the discernment and orientation of social interactions in every area’. Ibid., 161.

1647 Regarding the four principles of STCC:

These are principles of a general and fundamental character because they concern the reality of society in its entirety: from close and immediate relationships to those mediated by politics, economics, and law; from relationships among communities and groups to relationships among peoples and nations. Because of their permanence in time and their universality of meaning, the Church presents them as the primary and fundamental parameters of reference for interpreting and evaluating social phenomena, which is the necessary source for working out the criteria for the discernment and orientation of social interactions in every area.


1649 The cautionary note is that ‘only in so far as it widens and deepens the relational basis of the common good and derives the necessary consequences from it in terms of applications and operative principles in the new context of globalization’.

1650 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 229. ‘The four fundamental principles of a good society …. Must be understood and must operate in a relational and reflexive manner. Each is defined through the others’.

Archer and Donati analysed the contemporary era as a time ‘after modernity’ and identified there was a shift from ‘modernity’ to ‘after modernity’. Porpora sketched his analysis of these changes during the twentieth century, including those relating to lack of agreement on moral values and ways of behaving in society. However, his summary offered little more than a sketch of the reality underlying Donati’s and Archer’s arguments that society is moving from morphostasis to a morphogenetic society. Porpora’s terms reflect that before these highly significant social changes occurred, people generally knew something about their role, and the fixed expectations of that social role were the principles in families and communities. These are high-level generalisations that contrast the eighteenth and seventeenth centuries with the changes in social thinking, nature of social organisations and ways of behaving with what has occurred during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and in this century, which highlight the extent and rapid pace of changes in all aspects of society. Archer summarised this:

The key idea is that we are living in a time of where with … the advent of modernity onwards, the individual has become the object of increasingly complex and contradictory conceptualizations: at times, the individual has been considered as completely autonomous and, at other times, as completely dependent; at times he or she has been treated as ens realissimum and, at other times, as a phantasm; in the end, the individual became a mere ‘point of reference for communication’.

Donati expressed these changes as ‘after modern’ because there has been ‘a radical discontinuity with modernity, and not simply a radicalization of modernity as indicated by the term[s] “post-modern” or “late modernity”’. Donati argued that the twenty-first century is when people can begin to ‘live in a “relational order of reality”. That is, people are living in a time of high levels of social change, particularly in social relations, and it is an ongoing’. He observed that ‘Rerum Novarum’ recognised this when it expressed a ‘new consciousness of the fact that modern society was creating social relations more and more detached from natural ones and, in this way, called for

---

1653 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 16.
1655 Donati and Archer, Relational Subject, 19.
new principles to understand and guide them’.\textsuperscript{1656} In the current social order, such phenomena are more extensive and moving at a faster pace. This provides the context for a discussion in Section 4.1.3 on the relationship between CIV, CIV 5, and how relational sociology engages with the principles of the STCC.\textsuperscript{1657}

4.1.3. The Four Permanent and Fundamental Principles of the Social Teaching of the Church

In this section each principle of the STCC is addressed separately, and the insights of relational sociology are separated to elucidate the contribution of relational sociology to understanding each principle as an organising principle of the STCC. Each section briefly outlines how Archer and/or Donati have explained their relational perspective regarding each principle and how they interconnect to reveal their coherence.\textsuperscript{1658} This coherence is only possible by understanding the human person as a relational being.

4.1.3.1. The Dignity of the Human Person as a Relational Being

Challenging the models that characterise the human person as either ‘\textit{homo economicus, homo sociologicus} or \textit{homo inconstantus}’ is central to relational sociology.\textsuperscript{1659} Archer argued in strong language that these models draw upon a reductive anthropology and a spiritually barren understanding of the human person.\textsuperscript{1660} They are ‘foreign to the idea that a human person has an inherent dignity’.\textsuperscript{1661} Archer insisted that the question regarding what is human dignity is the ‘single most important question to

\textsuperscript{1656} Donati, \textit{Relational Sociology}, footnotes 6, 29.
\textsuperscript{1657} Some of this material is discussed in Section 4.3 of this dissertation.
\textsuperscript{1659} Archer, ‘Social Love’, 293. See also Archer, ‘Logic of the Gift’, 2. These models of the human being not only deny the logic of subsidiarity but also the dignity of the human person. Archer, Logic of Gift, 3–4. Note that the term ‘homo inconstantus’ refers to a ‘serially reinvented man, a species without social structure that therefore shows “exhausting concern with status. Archer, Social Love, 279.
\textsuperscript{1660} Archer, ‘Current Crisis’, 125.
\textsuperscript{1661} ‘The common denominator of the three “models of man” briefly reviewed is that all are foreigners to the notion of the dignity of every human being’. Ibid.
ask and to answer in any social epoch’. She stated that human beings have their dignity as God's image, which ‘stands firm because of our divine filiation’. However, there is more to the question of human dignity.

Archer sought to overcome the ambiguity that arises when dignity is perceived as only being about the person and not social relationships. She argued that human dignity necessarily involves other people. Human dignity ‘requires active recognition by others to become a lived reality for anyone at all’ because no one is recognisably human outside their social relations. Social relations are where the person acquires what is needed to live out their human dignity in participation with the social order in which they are born, develop and live. Further, love is central in all of this. Thus, ‘to love and be loved; to give, to receive and to share; to trust and become worthy of trust; to be recognized for oneself and to confer recognition on the value of the “other”; to be cared for and to become caring’ are relationships that confirm human dignity.

Donati also posed the question: what is human dignity? He answered by identifying the relational nature of the human being.

First, he defined the question negatively, arguing that dignity is not something the person owns or decides about, nor is it an aggregate of ‘a quality pertaining to all members of a community’. Instead, for the human person, dignity is something ‘coming before them and going beyond them’. Nevertheless, the person neither divides nor alienates their dignity. Dignity is ‘connected and inherent in the relationships of the person with the whole creation’. Human dignity is a necessity to achieve the common good because ‘the good is common thanks to its dignity’.

Moreover, dignity is common because it ‘spreads to the relationships in which individuals express’ themselves. As a community of love, the family is a common
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1662 ‘The Catholic Church has consistently based its defence of human dignity four-square upon each and every human being made in the image of God. Through this divine filiation each and every one has an inviolable worth and dignity. In the history of thought, no secular answer has been forthcoming that establishes the claim of every human being—regardless of their abilities, attainments or contributions—to be treated as possessing worth and dignity’. Archer, ‘Current Crisis’, 126.
1664 Ibid.
1665 Ibid., 290.
1666 Ibid.
1667 Ibid.
1668 Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 236.
1669 Ibid.
1670 Ibid.
1671 Ibid.
1672 Ibid.
1673 Ibid.
good when it is considered a ‘particular relationship that realises the dignity of the human person’.

Donati emphasised that a violation of one person’s dignity is sufficient to place the surrounding community in suffering, and further, it becomes a wound to the possibility of pursuing the common good. In Archer’s terms, this is a wound to fraternity.

Archer argued that Benedict’s repeated reference to the need for IHD is an amplification of all people’s human dignity. Further, such an amplification generates a connection between human dignity and fraternity. Archer proposed that ‘fraternity’ is the single word capturing the ‘Catholic ‘model’ of the human person and those ‘social, economic and political institutions’ needed for the common good. Archer understood CIV as an invitation for everyone to ‘sanctify every human encounter with “fraternity”’. Moreover, these are encounters that open into the possibility of transforming humanity into a global family. Just as dignity is not the basis for upholding individualism, fraternity is not the same as collectivism.

Rather, fraternity is understood as the basis for envisaging ‘larger scale forms of sociality than those generated by “self-interest” and “necessary constraint”’. Thus, fraternity is to replace those ‘political, economic and social philosophies of Modernity … promoting individualism’. Fraternity as friendship involves elements of ‘interpersonal trust, confidence and concern’. It is suggested that these are elements significant in building a society that ensures the dignity of human beings. These are elements that constitute ‘social love’. Fraternity understood in this way has two dimensions. First it illustrates the logic of the dignity of being a creature of God who is relational, and therefore, can live out this logic in moving move to friendship in their immediate existential world. The second aspect is grasping how friendship can be the

1674 Ibid.
1675 Ibid.
1676 Archer, ‘No Man is an Island’, 10–11.
1678 Ibid.
1679 Ibid.
1681 Ibid.
1682 Ibid.
1683 Ibid.
ground for a different society. For through friendship, there arises something constituting the other and the self to create a social relation with its own emergent powers and property, leading to subsidiarity. In this way the Shema at its simplest is the expression of a fraternity with God and the neighbour.

Archer and Donati insisted that STCC presents fraternity as necessary for human life in its social ordering. Archer stressed that love is the key to fraternity. Her argument resonates with Benedict who placed love at the heart of the STCC. Donati offered similar reasoning but expressed it somewhat differently when he argued for maintaining a close link between human dignity and the common good, with the meaning of both and their connection arising from the actions of people who serve the other. Further, as Archer expressed it, service makes fraternity the root of subsidiarity and solidarity.

4.1.3.2. Relationality and the Principles of Subsidiarity and Solidarity

Donati began his analysis of the relational foundations of subsidiarity with a warning that it is ‘a slippery, multifaceted and polysemic concept’. Despite this difficulty, he recognised that subsidiarity is a principle which, without developing a long history on the topic, is a consistent feature of the STCC (since at least ‘Rerum Novarum’, if not before). When Donati noted that ‘Rerum Novarum’ expressed a ‘new consciousness of the fact that modern society was creating social relations more and
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1684 Both Donati and Archer have commented on how ‘fraternité’, raised during the French Revolution in 1793, disappeared, with only ‘liberté’ and ‘égalité’ remaining. STCC recalls this principle. Archer, Current Crisis, Section 2.

1685 ‘Reciprocity is upheld and is effective as long as it is firmly grounded upon a recognition of the dignity of the other. The common good takes root in the human person precisely because it exists and derives its meaning from serving the other person in his or her dignity’. Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 226.

1686 ‘This is the source of “solidarity” and “subsidiarity” alike’. Archer, ‘Current Crisis’, 136.


more detached from natural ones and, in this way called for new principles to understand and guide them’, he argued this highlighted the logic of the relations embodied in the concept of subsidiarity.\footnote{Donati, Relational Sociology, footnotes 6, 29. For a more recent addition to the literature see also Iain T. Benson, “’Subsidiarity: Origins and Contemporary Aspects’, in Nicholas Aroney and Ian Leigh (eds), Christianity and Constitutionalism (Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2022). A pre-publication copy is held on file.} He argued the definition of subsidiarity in ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ had a political cast, leading to subsidiarity being understood only as a limiting principle in the ordering the exercise of power.\footnote{Pius XI, ‘Quadragesimo Anno’, 79.} The argument is that the debate regarding subsidiarity became one about the limits of the higher-level bodies in the social order and how far, when and why these should exercise power over the lower-level bodies. Against this Donati offered a broader understanding of subsidiarity than that provided in ‘Quadragesimo Anno’.

He argued that subsidiarity focuses on balancing the levels and functions in society so that each entity is responsible for its own tasks.\footnote{Pierpaolo Donati, ‘Old and New family Policies: The perspective of relational sociology’, May 2007. Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas 54. 127-159, 149.} This defines subsidiarity as more than a non-interference principle but rather has a positive role, where subsidiarity is about freedom within a responsibility. Moreover, subsidiarity works as an expression of the ‘relation of reciprocity in the development of respective tasks’. Thus, subsidiarity is a principle governing ‘the sphere of relations where the common good comes into play’.\footnote{Ibid., 147.} That is, subsidiarity seeks to help people do what they need to do, though this requires a community, whereas the political view envisages the role of the state as intervening in communities.\footnote{‘This is a reductive view’. Ibid., 149.} This alternative view empowers relational communities to carry out their responsibilities, which guarantees the common good.\footnote{Donati, ‘Pacem in Terris’, 440–41.} Thus, larger communities come under a positive obligation to ‘work towards increasing the autonomy of the smaller groups, creating conditions for their independent development’.\footnote{Donati, ‘Old and New family Policies’, 149.} Benedict indirectly acknowledged the basis for smaller entities to shape the workings and policies of the State when he advocated for fiscal subsidiarity. He recognised this as a form of reverse subsidiarity which seeks to influence how the
State taxes and spends its income. This illustrates that subsidiarity is not a concept that works within a single dimension.

Donati developed a more complex model of subsidiarity operating indifferent dimensions. First, he recognised the concept of subsidiarity in vertical terms such that when viewing society in pyramidal terms, the authority moves downwards from the supranational level to the person. Such a model is a political model for managing the relations between social strata. Second, alongside this understanding, Donati formulated the idea of horizontal subsidiarity as a measure of the relationships ‘between state and organizations of civil society’. That is, the state and civil society are operating on an equal level.

Nevertheless, he postulated a dimension of subsidiarity within civil society, which he called lateral subsidiarity. Lateral subsidiarity captures the idea of relationships between diverse elements. The fourth vector is relational subsidiarity for helping ‘the other to do what he or she should do’. These four understandings operate within hierarchical organisations and societies. The vertical subsidiarity operates within markets and networks where the horizontal, lateral or circular subsidiarity are also functioning. For Donati, subsidiarity is a principle, despite the vertical, horizontal or lateral form in how it operates, is essential for the ‘development of innovative relational networks’ leading to ‘a new national and international civil society’. However, where do such innovative networks come from?

Donati and Archer developed their reflections on a relational perspective for subsidiarity, considering it an approach constitutively active in supporting associations for bringing about social and cultural renewal. Moreover, these are associations constituted by and composed of human persons acting in their relational mode who seek...
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1696 ‘One possible approach to development aid would be to apply effectively what is known as fiscal subsidiarity, allowing citizens to decide how to allocate a portion of the taxes they pay to the State. Provided it does not degenerate into the promotion of special interests, this can help to stimulate forms of welfare solidarity from below, with obvious benefits in the area of solidarity for development as well’. CIV 60.
1697 Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 228.
1698 Ibid., 229
1699 Ibid. Lateral defines where subsidiarity is among and between ‘the subjects of civil society (for instance, family and school; between an enterprise and the employees’ and clients’ families, and so forth) that may be called’. Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 229.
1700 Ibid.
1702 Ibid.
to implement these visions through their community.\footnote{1703} Subsidiarity derives from centring on humans as ‘people with gifts or talents (munera), willing to serve others in need and form fellowship with them’.\footnote{1704} These fellowships are ones where the human person, with others, places their own ‘munera at the service of one another’, fostering relational goods in a manner that no one else does.\footnote{1705} That is, solidarity involves sharing responsibility through the rule of reciprocity. The reciprocal actions of the free giving person within the community are what generates the relational goods. Thus, a subsidiarist relationality produces a ‘community that is a centre of spontaneity and freedom … where a gift is inscribed within a network of free giving–receiving reciprocating actions that relate a complex chain of actors together’.\footnote{1706} Donati identified the principle of reciprocating action as the ‘social norm that contains and links together subsidiarity and solidarity’.\footnote{1707} Linking subsidiarity and solidarity together is a ‘linkage to free-giving—based upon affect, concern and involvement in the lives and well-being of others’.\footnote{1708} Throughout this discussion, Donati did not mention love. However, the principle of subsidiarity needs more than the self-interest of people or a community. Serving the other and taking responsibility for sustaining a community in the service of the other is, ultimately, only possible through love. Moreover, neither Archer nor Donati would disagree that the Love of God is driving this love. This extended reflection on subsidiarity captures the idea of NoCh.

Donati argued that subsidiarity is an architecture for conceiving a social order ‘based on the recognition of natural rights of human beings and their reflexive social forms and on a fair distribution of tasks between all subjects, individual and collective’.\footnote{1709} In this form of society, civil society occurs when the ‘lifeworld constituted by private social networks [is where] the human being may unfold his primary relationality’ and where it flourishes.\footnote{1710} Thus, subsidiarity ‘represents the way by which new emergent social effects (common goods as relational goods) can be
produced’. However, such agencies are under threat from ‘an invasion of everyday life by market forces’ as well as the ‘enlarged iron cage of bureaucracy [imprisoning] the initiatives of subsidiarity’. For solidarity to become a feature of culture and the social order, challenges to subsidiarity need to be overcome because their coexistence as a ‘necessary and mutual reinforcement … is under threat when both are undermined’. What does this mean for how subsidiarity and solidarity work together?

Donati answered this question by identifying that subsidiarity ‘allows the other to accomplish his/her tasks, namely, to do what he/she should do, what is up to him/her and not to others (munus proprium)’. With subsidiarity operating in such a way, solidarity involves the sharing of responsibility, in which people work according to the rule of reciprocity. Here, he recognised that the two principles ‘are necessarily interconnected and actively interrelating principles in their coexistence, where each reinforces and supports the other in a mutual fashion’. However, this relationship is not symmetrical because it ‘is possible for solidarity to be high and for subsidiarity to be low’. Nevertheless, subsidiarity does work without solidarity. The gap between the two principles widens when this is not recognised, and the common good recedes. Reciprocity is the key to this relationship; therefore, reciprocity must be discussed before discussing solidarity.

Donati proposed that reciprocity is the link between solidarity and subsidiarity. As the fruit of relational goods, reciprocity, along with the social values of trust, mutuality and cooperation that also arise from relational goods, is not a mere mechanical link. However, reciprocity is not relationality, and even though it may involve that, ‘it retains its own linkage to free-giving’. This free giving is found in entities with subsidiarity where the participants’ ongoing relationality generates internal goods of love, affection, trust, gratitude and caring and creates and sustains them.

1713 Ibid., 131–32.
1715 Ibid.
1716 Archer, ‘Current Crisis’, 131–32.
1717 ‘As was the case in early modernity’. Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 215.
1718 ‘The role of “reciprocity as the social norm that contains and links together subsidiarity and solidarity”’.
1719 Ibid., 237.
These internal goods promote free giving and reciprocity, replacing an exchange of equivalents.\textsuperscript{1721}

Donati argues ‘reciprocity exists in society as an irreducible phenomenon. It is neither a sharing of utilities … nor a sharing for sharing’s sake’.\textsuperscript{1722} Instead, reciprocity is a mutual helping, performed in a certain way … ‘Reciprocity is help concretely given … in a context of solidarity (i.e., one of shared responsibility and recognised interdependency)’.\textsuperscript{1723} Free giving is necessary if subsidiarity is to be realised in external goods, such as reciprocity, or in social entities that are ‘responsive to the real needs of fellow human beings when truly regarded as neighbours’.\textsuperscript{1724} However, reciprocity only nourishes the relationship between solidarity and subsidiarity when ‘it is firmly grounded upon a recognition of and service of the other in their dignity’.\textsuperscript{1725} At the core of that service is love as Benedict insisted in his four encyclicals. Reciprocity provides fruits in what Donati called the ‘upward spiral, which reinforces solidarity’.\textsuperscript{1726} This upward spiral generates the development of ‘mutual obligations and practices of mutual support’ and a deepening of friendship. The social identity of those in the solidarity of an association is increasingly important.\textsuperscript{1727} However, this perspective of solidarity is not a common one.

In a presentation on intergenerational solidarity, Donati identified four different meanings of solidarity. One use reflects a view of society as a ‘body constituted by members that exist in solidarity … in a reciprocal, organic relationship’.\textsuperscript{1728} A second use focuses on solidarity as ‘benevolent action, charity, caring for the other’.\textsuperscript{1729} Another approach conceives it as a ‘sharing of ideals or interests’. And the fourth defines solidarity as a ‘synonym of justice or equity in the distribution of goods’.\textsuperscript{1730} None of these adopts the relational perspective where solidarity becomes the measure of the interdependence between parties ‘directed toward the common good’.\textsuperscript{1731} Instead, Donati proposed understanding solidarity as encompassing the assistance given to
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\textsuperscript{1731} Archer, ‘Solidarity and Governance’, 20.
another to enable them, in subsidiarist bodies if possible, to do what they should do.\textsuperscript{1732} Thus, solidarity comes from the social entity or group offering ‘reciprocal protection, care and trust’ because both want to preserve the value they generate relationally.\textsuperscript{1733}

Solidarity is a relationship where there is a ‘worth that exceeds them as two individuals as well as objectively being irreducible to them’.\textsuperscript{1734} Therefore, solidarity is what both people in the relationship do because of the ‘responsibility that everyone has toward the common good’.\textsuperscript{1735} Archer summarised that ‘solidarity exists only when relations of friendship become general’.\textsuperscript{1736} From this, Archer provided three elements of a relational meaning of solidarity. First, there is an ‘acceptance of common responsibility between two parties for some state of affairs’, which is the consequence of their mutual ‘recognition of their interdependence’.\textsuperscript{1737} These two elements combine to make the third element that when there is a reciprocal response that is not due to an external artifice, such as exchange or coercion, it ensures solidarity is intrinsically relational.\textsuperscript{1738} In this way ‘solidarity is about reciprocal orientation’.\textsuperscript{1739} Nevertheless, there are various forms of solidarity, ranging from solidarity coming from redistribution to free giving, reciprocity or solidarity contracts.\textsuperscript{1740} However, these relational aspects of solidarity, and this approach frames Donati’s argument that the STCC ‘must enlarge its horizons on the common good through an adequate widening of its relational vision’.\textsuperscript{1741} Thus, the common good, which is the subject of Section 4.1.3.3, has relational origins as the fruit of the reciprocity between subsidiarity and solidarity in their mutual interactions.\textsuperscript{1742}
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4.1.3.3. Relational Roots of the Common Good

Donati draws on the definition of the common good given in ‘Gaudium et Spes’ - ‘the whole conditions of social life that allow groups, as well as the single members, to completely and quickly reach their own perfection’ - to emphasise that it is a good that is neither a static ordering of society, an accumulation of individual goods nor something preconceived and pre-organised. Instead, the common good has a relational character because it arises from people’s mutual interactions in entities with subsidiarity and the reciprocal actions of subsidiarist communities which generate solidarity. Human beings are the only contributors to and generators of the common good. As a social link, people gain from the common good both their non-material, spiritual and material goods. The common good is the moral good of social and community relations. These relations produce indivisible relational goods that do not survive any separation in the relations or attempts to share them. Likewise, the ‘common good cannot be parcelled out amongst those producing it’. The common good is indivisible when it is held as a property in common or as a power shaping the social environment where it emerges; therefore, the common good becomes ‘conducive to the flourishing of all human beings throughout their life course’. Donati insisted that there is a first common good which is the dignity of the human person. This means that any injury to human dignity is ‘to wound the possibility of pursuing the common good from the start’. An injury to dignity injures the mutual trust and concern embodied in the spirit of free giving. Further, reciprocity does not emerge without free giving. Thus, where an injury to human dignity undermines the feasibility of a common good emerging and where there are reciprocating interactions between subsidiarity and solidarity, the common good enhances and affirms the ‘value of the dignity of the human person’. However where the common good is neither
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static, planned nor an accumulation of other goods, how does it arise and spread outwards across a community or society?

For Archer the common good arises through an expansion of ‘circles of social love’. \(^{1752}\) That is, through expanding the ‘networks of relations until they are fully inclusive’. \(^{1753}\) When this happens, trust and concern generate at every level of society to bring about what Paul VI and Benedict called the ‘civilisation of love’. Archer connected this idea to Benedict’s ‘recognition of the human being’ as ‘someone whose very being is fundamentally relational’. \(^{1754}\) A manufactured or imposed public good does not generate the trust, care or concern that is a feature of the common good because the common good requires ‘subsidiarity and solidarity … to operate as forms of recognition of the dignity and rights–duties (munera) of the human person’. \(^{1755}\) The conditions that enable the common good to emerge are human dignity, solidarity and subsidiarity at both the person and institutional level. The common good can only be achieved when these principles are in active relation with each of them. The relations between persons generate the human flourishing that needs to emerge, which is the only path to human flourishing. Archer saw the logic of this is to identify that what is generated and nurtured is social love on a small scale because love is something that human beings cannot thrive without, whether in the giving or receiving of it, making love ‘indispensable to the good society’. \(^{1756}\) Thus, on a small scale, social love becomes circles of social love, and circles of social love are relational goods. \(^{1757}\) Moreover, expanding these social, relational circles means the common good grows as the supreme relational good. \(^{1758}\)

### 4.1.3.4. Vision and Tasks Ahead for a Relational Society and Economy

The material above demonstrated how the four principles of the STCC have an inner coherence that connects them in a way that can lead to the generation of an overall relational good for all people. This coherence reveals how each principle is necessary in different ways and through various forms to build a social order where people live as

\(^{1752}\) Archer, ‘Social Love’, 294.

\(^{1753}\) Ibid.


\(^{1755}\) Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 235.

\(^{1756}\) Archer, ‘Social Love’, 292.

\(^{1757}\) Ibid., 294.

\(^{1758}\) CIV ‘calls for “a deeper critical evaluation of the category of relation”. This is not only because of its negativity towards the above models but is consistent with the fact that the summum bonum of STCC is the Common Good as the supreme relational good’. Archer, ‘Logic of the Gift’, 5–6.
human beings, thus developing a society where all human beings flourish and where flourishing is the action and consequence of love. Archer and Donati have expressed that this is desirable. Section 4.1.3.4 discusses their approach as a prequel to analysing Benedict’s contribution to the STCC in Section 4.2.

In *Relational Sociology*, Donati argued that relational theory reveals how ‘society is made up of social relations in respect to which human beings are both immanent and transcendent’.

Moreover, such a theory enables a vision ‘of what society could be if it actualized the potentials which it derives from the richness of the human being and of the relational potential that s/he carries’. Therefore, the task is to ‘contribute towards modifying the relational contexts that formalize, constrain and limit relations to structures incapable of corresponding to the vital needs of social agents as human beings’.

Furthermore, the task is to clarify how and why these contexts are limiting and why they need addressing if there is to be a social order in which humans flourish. Archer articulated that the task is to generate the ‘social conditions required for transforming late modernity into a civilization of love’. The generation of such social conditions involves finding those who have the ‘creative and human potential for social relationality’. Moreover, these must be people who desire to experience new relationships that emerge by expressing ‘truth, justice, charity and freedom’. These people encounter the call to bring the relational goods of relationships ‘within reach of everyone’.

Donati echoed Archer’s call for human relationships that are creative of social relationality, and which can ‘reformulate the criteria of what is human through good practices’. Donati identified four human practices that are necessary for the common good to emerge. He argued that good practices include accepting the gift of human dignity, recognising the need for interdependency between people, understanding how people seek to empower the other and there is a care for the ‘relationships among

---

1759 Donati, *Relational Sociology*, 212.
1760 Ibid., 56.
1761 Ibid., 96.
1763 Donati, *Relational Sociology*, 95.
1764 ‘We must include the task of establishing new relationships in human society’. John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, 163.
1766 Donati, ‘What Does “Subsidiarity” Mean?’, 236.
persons as goods in themselves’. Donati insisted that any reforms in society cannot come from structural changes that are separate from the people because the people need to adopt the new ways of thinking, which come from reflecting and acting on the four principles. For Donati, renewal begins with people, although the social institutions and state have a role. Further, striving for the common good requires the responsibility of people, the state and their involvement. This involvement needs to be ‘in a completely new way—of the intermediate social bodies’. Donati described the intermediate new bodies as a ‘civil societarian network’ that plays ‘a fundamental role in mediating the processes by which the common good emerges’.

The common good comes from bottom-up entities, which the state needs to support. Nevertheless, for Donati, the common good also comes from those ‘horizontal and lateral processes that depend neither on the state nor on the market’. Donati concluded that ‘it is a matter of a pluralism of participation in the network of a “caring society” which is ruled on the basis of a post-socialist and post-liberal principle of subsidiarity’ where the common good becomes a relational good and a good that renews society.

4.1.4. Conclusion

The Section 4.1.3 set out how the proponents of relational sociology have developed an explanation of the STCC, providing an impetus for Christians to recognise in Benedict’s call for NoCh how God’s Love, once it is known, transforms into communities generating social change. CIV 5.7, calls for communities of charity where there are new relationships. New relationships which can arise from a free giving of self in an order that has subsidiarity and produces fruits in ever-growing circles of love and of solidarity. While Archer framed these relationships in secular terms, Benedict insisted that what is required to thrive and produce fruits, especially in adversity, is for human relationships to be grounded in God’s Love. For Benedict, love is the source of
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creativity for a social relationality that serves the other. It is suggested Love is what makes these relationships a measure of what is human. NoCh are the fruits of these relationships. The growth and maintenance of NoCh are central to a Christian effort to renew culture and society grounded in recognition of the human dignity of all human beings. There is a renewal of society where the common good upholds all human beings’ dignity from their conception into life to their bodies’ death. A common good is the outcome of the interrelationship between subsidiarity and solidarity in human terms; to be human is to move towards the common good.

Moving to the common good involves a commitment to a ‘bottom-up’ way of effecting change, rather than top-down activity from the state, the market or a larger association. Archer and Donati recognise the genesis of a relational good in the most minimal interaction between people; thus, every act of free giving and openness towards the neighbour is an action towards the common good. Thus it can be fairly stated that understanding the principles of the STCC in relational terms means understanding how to generate the openings for a different way of living in which upholding human dignity is greater than the demands of the state and/or market. Such an effort comes from NoCh as circles of social love. Reading the STCC as the action of double love highlights the necessary integration of the liturgical action of worship and logical consequences of loving the neighbour, where love is a liturgical action of prayer and worship. Donati explained it this way:

‘when Christ says ‘whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me’ (Matt 25:40), identifying himself with the least of his brothers, he does not mean that these people (his brothers) are Christ himself, but he means that you do an action to Christ because you are related to the other as Christ is related to him, as he loves him … This reciprocity, understood as symbolic exchange or mutual donation (not like a do ut des), has a Christological basis.’

4.2. Benedict XVI and the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church

The triptych of DCE, SpS and CIV demonstrates a Christocentric presence and grounding for the STCC. In DCE and SpS, Benedict revealed the centrality of the
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relationship between Christ and the human person, where the Shema is the Christological core of the STCC. DCE and SpS discuss the person, CIV discusses the social and the encyclicals share their Christological presentation of Christ as a point of unity. In CIV Benedict identified Christ as the basis of the social order and the changes needed to enable IHD. From these brief notes, the discussion leads to Benedict’s engagement with the four fundamental principles of the STCC. Benedict interpreted how these principles interrelate in a mutually supportive and constitutive form to demonstrate that the STCC is the proclamation of the truth of Christ’s Love in the world. Section 4.3 concludes Part 4 by discussing NoCh as the Shema’s orthopraxis and thus understanding these are the communities of love needed for building the social order as a civilisation of love.

4.2.1. Benedict, Christology and the Social Teaching of the Church

Christ is the centre of Benedict’s thinking and at the centre of his life of faith. Two authors have revealed the depth of how Christocentrism is suffused through his life and thoughts.\(^{1777}\) De Gaál captured the Christocentric form of his theology and legacy of the Christocentric shift in Ratzinger/Benedict’s writings.\(^{1778}\) A reading of these illuminating texts offers a substantial account of Benedict’s Christology and the depth of his Christocentrism. De Gaál identified several points at which Ratzinger/Benedict preached, taught and wrote on Christ.\(^{1779}\) In de Gaál’s opinion, these have moved the Church towards a more Christocentric form of thinking, talking and acting. De Gaál noted how CIV’s starting point was not the Global Financial Crisis, but the ‘revelation of God in Jesus Christ [that] is the decisive point d’appui’.\(^{1780}\) Unfortunately, de Gaál did not discuss this further. In his observations on CIV de Gaál implicitly supported a reading of the STCC through Benedict’s overall Christology rather than looking for a particular subset of reflections. Though Benedict did not offer an integrated way of thinking about Christology and the STCC, there are however significant Christological reflections in Benedict’s encyclicals, addresses, homilies and messages, contributing to a fuller Christological perspective on this teaching.

\(^{1777}\) De Gaál, *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*. For an analysis of the beauty of Benedict’s spiritual Christology, see McGregor, *Heart to Heart*.

\(^{1778}\) De Gaál, *O Lord, I Seek Your Countenance*.

\(^{1779}\) Ibid., 3.

\(^{1780}\) Ibid., 13.
In an interview in 2010, Benedict reflected on two themes that have been central to his life and work: ‘Christ as the living, present God, the God who Loves and heals us through suffering … [and] love … because I knew love is the key to Christianity’.\textsuperscript{1781} These themes have been at the forefront of his reflections and thinking on the STCC. Moreover, love is central to his understanding of the human person as a relational being who is the image of God and who only lives in the social order through communities of social entities, which become the social faces of imago Dei.\textsuperscript{1782}

For Benedict, these two faces come together in Christ. The first is the person who, as a relational being, is entirely themselves in knowing how they love and are loved. The social realities constituted and created by humans in their relationalities as gifts to the other become the second face. The social realities, when built through love, lead to a higher form of social creation. In all their capabilities and disabilities, the person comes from a social order of social entities—the family—which is the only path into society. This poses the question: what or who is the central force as the creator and responder to what is around persons in social and natural terms?

In order the person and a social reality such as NoCH reach their fullness and for the common good to emerge, both need a relationship with Christ.\textsuperscript{1783} In DCE, Benedict reiterated the necessity of a personal relationship with Christ if a person wishes to be active as a missionary of Christ’s Love in works of the charity of the Shema. Further, the Christological dimension in CIV reveals that, for a social entity, Christ is the principle that orders the social world that humans create and inhabit. Here, Benedict identified Christ as the foundation and source of the human person and, thus, the social world, where humans create and interact with others. None of this denies the human person is a being with the freedom to act or not act in the social order; however, the ultimate basis for renewal of social reality is Christ.

### 4.2.2. Christ in the Person and Charity in Deus Caritas Est

Benedict argued that a Christian is called to an encounter with the person of Christ. In that encounter, the person ‘experiences the meaning of the world as a person’.\textsuperscript{1784} A Christian’s constant presence in this event, an event of love, is central to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1781} Ratzinger, \textit{Light of the World}, 102.
\item \textsuperscript{1782} Hittinger, ‘Toward an Adequate Anthropology’.
\item \textsuperscript{1783} Francis, \textit{Lumen Fidei’}, 5, had the same perspective: ‘faith, as an encounter with the living God revealed in Christ’.
\item \textsuperscript{1784} Ratzinger, \textit{Introduction to Christianity}, 79.
\end{itemize}
the Christian faith because it is decisive in how a new horizon opens for a person. Further, it becomes the Christological basis of charity because there is a horizon that orientates the Christian to learn to look with fresh eyes; and where they act on what they see in giving themselves in love to their neighbour. In Part 1 of DCE, in contrast to the debate about love as agape or eros, Benedict identified the truth of God’s love and called the reader back to Christ.

Benedict argued that the only possibility for the human to be a giver of love to another comes from accepting the gift of love from ‘the original source, which is Jesus Christ, from whose pierced heart flows the Love of God’. Benedict restated that the truth of God’s Love comes from ‘contemplating the pierced side of Christ’. This Love is the source of communion between the person and Christ, and it is not held by people as theirs alone. People can only possess the gift of love when they are in communion with others and love is given as a gift is for others. For it is then that communion comes from where and in how to live the Shema. In living the Shema, the person finds Christ in the other as the ‘least of the brethren’. Using this emphasis on communion, Benedict did not exclude the reality of a personal relationship with Christ because Christ ‘makes us see and experience his love’—an experience of a ‘living relationship with Christ’—but that, without this relationship, people may fall into an ‘arrogant contempt for man’. From the nourishment of Love with Christ, a person expresses a love for the other they do not like because, in the relationship with Christ, the person learns to consider the other ‘from the perspective of Jesus Christ’ rather than from only their feelings or needs.
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In Part II of DCE, Benedict explored what this means for people in charitable work. Much of his attention has been directed at those in Church institutions; however, his concerns, with lessons and warnings, apply equally to anyone who seeks to live out the Shema working with the principles of the STCC. In this part of DCE, Benedict repeated, through many references, his call to all people to recognise the need for a relationship with Christ if they wish to come to the point of entering into a love of their neighbour as the centrality of the Christian life. This is not an abstract or intellectual relationship; rather, Benedict considered it a relationship with a purpose in which the person is moved ‘by Christ’s Love … whose hearts Christ has conquered with his love’ into a love of neighbour.

That is, there is a formation of the heart in a relationship with Christ. He argued that practical activity for the other is insufficient unless the heart ‘visibly expresses … a love nourished by an encounter with Christ’. Further, part of that nourishment comes in prayer that seeks ‘an encounter with the Father of Jesus Christ, asking God to be present with the consolation of the Spirit to him and his work’. Benedict’s teaching on the Shema is at the heart of DCE. Although a discussion about the Shema occurs in Chapter 2 of DCE, the discussion in this part explores the Shema as the operation of love underpinning the STCC, where the Shema is the Christological basis and transcendent direction of the STCC.

The Shema is the core of the set of operational principles for creating human flourishing. In his address to the Fifth General Conference of the Bishops of Latin American and The Caribbean in 2007 (Fifth CELAM), Benedict recalled how conversion and discipleship show that ‘faith in Christ implies a way of living based on the twofold command to love God and neighbour’ and that these express life’s social dimension. Benedict argued that the love of God and neighbour in Christ, ‘grounding the whole life of faith on this central precept … [,] cannot exist apart from Christ’. Thus, when a person is in ‘union with Christ [, there] is also union with all those to whom he gives himself … to become one body … [and] Love of God and love of
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neighbour are now truly united. Therefore, Benedict stated that the Shema is ‘the real core of the believer’s identity’, which enables a total gift of themselves.

The Shema (as the basis of the STCC) describes the double action of love, in which the Love coming from Christ is both informative and performative. Love is informative because that love is the offering of something which requires a response. As Benedict observed, the response is to seek to ascend to God by, ‘bowing down before our neighbour to wash her feet’. The Shema is performative because when the person loves in their self-gift those around them as the other, it confirms they are ‘a being in relationship’. God wants people to love in the order of self-gift through the relationality of their being, generating social structures of and for this love. The Shema is social action and constitutive of humans and the social order. It calls people to deepen the relational quality of their presence with others, starting with the family. The tools of self-giving come from the family, where the person receives an orientation to develop their meta-reflexivity in all relational dealings. This requires loving in the order that comes from God, where this serving of love creates an openness to the world as it is.

Benedict situated the Shema at the centre of the Christian life lived in the openness of a social and economic globalised community. DCE invited an engagement looking to extend the boundary of the Shema by renewing and re-creating culture, within which a more human social and economic reordering can emerge. Although an orientation to charity does not exclude giving support materially and spiritually, charity needs first to seek the human person in their relationality. DCE invited Christians and others of goodwill to accept that God, in writing ‘the command of love of neighbour in man’s very nature’, placed the Shema at the core of the human person’s relationality. Benedict identified this as the foundation of living in a postmodern, globalised world.
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through service to others.\textsuperscript{1811} DCE did not explore how this links to the STCC principles; however, Benedict discussed this in part in CIV.

The principles formulate a path through which human beings can give the love inherent in them. By following this path, people’s actions come to be understood as the proclamation of Christ’s Love. The principles proclaim that Christ’s Love is the necessary element for IHD, which accompanies a renewal of the social order.\textsuperscript{1812} Those who do not know about this gift of love or think it is untrue or irrelevant for their lives and, more particularly, their actions, will not fulfil the STCC. In a ‘General Audience’ in 2007, after visiting Brazil, Benedict recalled from his address at the Fifth CELAM that ‘the presence of God, [and] friendship with the Incarnate Son of God … are always fundamental conditions for the presence and efficacy of justice and love in our societies’.\textsuperscript{1813} A last note on this topic that supports the idea of the Shema as the basis of the STCC was the conclusion given by John Finnis in his contribution critiquing contemporary Catholic social thought, in Catholic Social Teaching: A Volume of Scholarly Essays, that ‘the basis of STCC is love (of neighbour as oneself, in the last analysis for love of God)’.\textsuperscript{1814} Thus, the program of orientation and action for a more human social order will only be conducted with and through Christ. This is the message in CIV.

\subsection*{4.2.3. Christ in the Social Order and Caritas in Veritate}

The Christological character of CIV differs from, though not displacing, the Christology of DCE, where Christ is a witness to charity in truth and in him it becomes the face of His Person and our vocation.\textsuperscript{1815} CIV proclaimed that ‘through the encounter with Jesus Christ and his saints, through the encounter with God, humanity’s “reserves” are replenished’.\textsuperscript{1816} Therefore, CIV reveals an architecture for envisioning the Shema on a local and global level. Thus, Benedict demonstrated that the task of the Shema is the vocation to love the other before everyone, in highlighting that it is only in and
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through Christ can the vocation to love arise.\textsuperscript{1817} Further, even when the other is the enemy, this remains the vocation because the truth of charity is the synthesis of the Law.\textsuperscript{1818} Christ’s plan for humankind is that through him all will come to know the love that God has for all.\textsuperscript{1819} This is because an encounter with Christ frees a person to enter into a transformation of self into a gift of self to become a funnel through which God’s Love moves in the weaving of NoCh and so to meet Benedict’s call in CIV. Thus, forming NoCh is an invitation to live a vocation of loving their brothers and sisters in and through the person of Christ.

The vertical limb of the flow of God’s Love (cháris) into the human person is provided in the Introduction and Conclusion of CIV and the active acceptance of this love acting horizontally is described in Chapters 1 to 6. By manifesting this love in the horizontal, the neighbour is all people in the world. In CIV 7, Benedict insisted that to love someone means to desire the common good for them. Thus, it is argued he extended the Shema into the heart of the STCC. This becomes the overarching framework for ‘adhering to the values of Christianity’ if we are to build a good society where there is true IHD.\textsuperscript{1820} The idea of IHD, encompassing all dimensions of the human person’s life, runs like a bright golden thread through CIV. This development is not limited to the more favourable social and economic structures, but it extends to ‘sexuality, marriage, family and social relations’, along with the migration of people and bioethics.\textsuperscript{1821} Forming movements, which stand against the domination of technology in the world and culture, requires a mind that understands technology and grasps the ‘fully human meaning of human activities’.\textsuperscript{1822}

For Benedict, authentic development will come as the fruit of our responsibilities exercised in solidarity rather than in reliance on structural changes.\textsuperscript{1823} Although Benedict does not oppose structural changes, he is conscious that original sin is ‘present in the structure of society’.\textsuperscript{1824} Moreover, although he has called for new structures for delivering justice and finance structures, he has insisted that this needs people with
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consciences that are ‘finely attuned … to the common good’.\textsuperscript{1825} There is a need for responsible freedom, without which no structure will guarantee justice or do otherwise.\textsuperscript{1826} Such a responsibility in freedom is a ‘response to a call of being’, starting with the person. This requires a humanism that is open to the absolute if there is to be real change—a renewal.

A humanism open to the absolute is the source of lasting change coming through a renewal of a culture based on love. Such a renewal is the fruit of communities of charity with an awareness of ‘God’s undying Love’ moving people beyond the limited and ephemeral.\textsuperscript{1827} Development only occurs within the horizon of the hope of eternal life with our all, which provides the breathing space in which people can live.\textsuperscript{1828} Above all, development requires Christ because he is our vocation in living our lives as members of the human family and God’s family.\textsuperscript{1829}

A ‘new vision and new energy’ of Christian humanism emerges with the Christian hope found in God’s family.\textsuperscript{1830} Christian humanism comes from where the Church is engaged, through its teaching, liturgies and diaconal charity, in promoting IHD.\textsuperscript{1831} Thus, for Christians, the action of the principles of STCC is not in standing alone or living entirely in the open, but being ‘for’, ‘from’ and ‘toward’ Christ in the world.\textsuperscript{1832} That is, every action for the other is Christological. To emphasise this, in Introduction to Christianity, Ratzinger argued that the ‘figure of Jesus Christ is to be always understood in the context of relationship—never as an isolated person. Christ is from the Father and for humanity’.\textsuperscript{1833} The Christological pattern of Christ being from the Father and for humanity gives a universal dimension to human society.\textsuperscript{1834} Benedict’s Christology in CIV has a praxis in NoCh because Christ is at the centre of all human development because he ‘is the principal driving force behind the authentic development of every person and of all humanity’.\textsuperscript{1835} CIV framed a challenge that where there is no entering into, or, more seriously, there is a failure to help others enter
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into, seeing God in the face of Christ, the person becomes someone who ‘does not build anything up but rather, wastes human activity in false, ideological dogmatism, and so ultimately only destroys’.\textsuperscript{1836} The centrality of Christ as the face of God means that it is only through an encounter with God that human beings can understand in the other something more than just another creature; they come to recognise the divine image in the other.\textsuperscript{1837}

The divine image is God’s Love understood in the dynamic relationality of the Persons of the Trinity. God’s Love, given to us through Christ, is our life of charity, which is the Christian animation of the common good and the basis of the STCC and its principles.\textsuperscript{1838} In a homily at Father Giussani’s funeral, Benedict addressed the Church’s need to read this teaching with a Christological perspective as a spiritual and moral teaching. He emphasised that without Christ at the centre of the work to build a society where the principles act as a guide, framework and anchor point, all reasonable efforts will fail no matter how good they seem initially.\textsuperscript{1839} Thus, CIV is not a program for restructuring society; instead, it is a call to all Christians and those of goodwill to build a cornerstone for a new civilisation in Christ.\textsuperscript{1840}

What Benedict commanded Christians to do through creating NoCh highlighted the need for people to centre their lives on Christ into a new form of living in communion.\textsuperscript{1841} These are the people who will constitute NoCh as structures for transcendence—people who desire to be in communion with Christ because Christ gives access to a God who can change the world.\textsuperscript{1842} In CIV Christ called us to live in a transcendent dimension because Christ is the first and only one who helps us see God, the origin and end of transcendence: ‘the social commitment of Christians derives necessarily from the manifestation of divine Love … For us Christians, social solidarity always has a prospect of eternity’.\textsuperscript{1843} By providing the groundwork for the themes of
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gift or gratuitousness, mercy and communion as forms of charity, Christ is the
dimension in which these themes work through the human person’s relationality.

Benedict claimed that Christ seeks an encounter with all human beings. Such an
encounter occurs in the Gospel, where there is a meeting with ‘the One who is the “Yes”
of God to man’. \(^{1844}\) In such an encounter, the human person ‘cannot fail to open himself
to the divine vocation to pursue his own development’. \(^{1845}\) As if to re- emphasise its
message, CIV began by placing the person of Christ, whose life, death and resurrection
is the witness to the truth in charity, as the driver of all human development. \(^{1846}\)
Benedict pressed further by identifying charity as the basis of a personal relationship with both
God and neighbour. \(^{1847}\) Moreover, charity in truth is essential for IHD, which is
understood as the human person’s fullness in all their dimensions, both spiritual and
material. \(^{1848}\) Finally, Benedict stated that the Logos is the Logos of Love, which is the
Christological message of charity for IHD.

IHD will not only come from a transformation of people and the patterns of
power, authority and practices in the society and the economy that deny both the
possibility of the transformation and the relationality of the human person. Development
occurs by not relying on privilege or positions of power or focusing only on structural
changes, but relying ‘only on Christ, to whom every authentic vocation to integral
human development must be directed’. \(^{1849}\) The Gospel, the good news of Christ, the
guide for a humanism open to the absolute is fundamental for development. \(^{1850}\) This
development is where there is a promotion and building of ‘forms of social and civic
life—structures, institutions, culture and ethos’. \(^{1851}\) As if to remind Christians, Benedict
closed CIV by discussing how development requires a ‘spiritual fellowship in Christ’,
which is ‘a reliance on God’s providence and mercy’. \(^{1852}\) Further, the fruits of this
fellowship are what enable a community of charity to emerge and grow and are
witnessed in signs of ‘love and forgiveness, self-denial, acceptance of others, justice,
and peace’. \(^{1853}\) The dissertation argues using these fruits, a community serves out the
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vocation to love the other, and through its actions of charity, it builds the other in their development.

It is suggested that regarding IHD as a vocation means recognising, on the one hand, that it derives from a transcendent call and, conversely, that it is incapable, within a merely secular horizon, of supplying its ultimate meaning on its own. Real and transformative human and social development is found neither in a utopian return to a primitive or ‘pristine’ culture nor in the false promise of technological fulfilment of a materialist end. Instead, true humanism is only possible with an openness to the absolute through Christ. In conclusion, the Christological basis of CIV comes to a finale in the reading from Saint Paul: ‘the world or life or death or the present or the future, all are yours; and you are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s … (1 Cor 3:22–23)’. The Christology sketched out above in relation to the social order invites questions such as: does Ratzinger / Benedict hold to a Christocentric theology that fails to engage with the world and which speaks in a language not understood by many particularly in the globalised ‘euro-anglosphere’? Has Benedict argued for a ‘high’ (‘Word’) Christology’, which theologically and in social praxis, holds to a Christ as the central shaper of the world even if seeming to displace the Holy Spirit? Is this a Christology insufficiently attentive to questions of cultural and religious diversity?

The discussion of this gains from focusing on Cahill’s claim that CIV gave evidence of Benedict moving from opposition to pressing for structural change, as he did in DCE and Jesus of Nazareth, towards turning in the direction of emphasising the need for structural change at a global level, though still insufficient. Cahill saw his earlier positions were due to his focus on Europe where Benedict’s view of Christ is ‘….. of a piece with his construal of a countercultural (European) Church with a supramundane orientation’. She recalled in contrast how for Jon Sobrino (Sobrino) it is ‘…the power of the incarnation, resurrection, and Spirit [which can] promote the kind of structural changes lately of interest to the pope’.

\[\text{Ibid., 16.} \]
\[\text{Ibid., 79.} \]
\[\text{Cahill, Benedict’s Global Reorientation.} \]
\[\text{Ibid., 292-296. ‘Benedict’s longstanding concern with the recovery of Christian religious faith in Europe [had led] him to accentuate the divinity of Christ, a Word Christology, and the availability to humans of transcendent communion with God. Yet Benedict’s emergent investment in reform of global social structures requires a Christology in which the incarnation, resurrection, and Pentecost offer the possibility of historical transformations modeled on Jesus’ eschatological ministry of the kingdom or reign of God.’} \]
\[\text{Ibid, 317.} \]
Before going further, it is necessary to recall how Benedict’s understanding of the Person of Jesus Christ was in accord with ‘the Council’s Christology’, Antonio Lopez (Lopez) recalled Lumen Gentium, which began with ‘Christ is the Light of nations’.\textsuperscript{1860} Lopez further recalled Lumen Gentium defining the relationship between Son and Spirit as: ‘When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that He might continually sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father.’\textsuperscript{1861} Vincent Anyama (Anyama), in agreement, noted the Council’s proclamation in Gaudium et Spes of Christ as ‘the key, the center, and the purpose of the whole of man’s history’.\textsuperscript{1862}

The charge made by Cahill against Benedict is that he holds to a ‘high’ or Word Christology; a Christology she argued which ‘aims to bolster the countercultural voice of the Catholic Church against modernizing trends’.\textsuperscript{1863} Thus she argued Benedict ‘…has yet theologically to clarify the relation of non-Christians to the “common good” in societies that are religiously pluralistic by virtue of longstanding demographics, changing national borders, recent conversions, or immigration’. Her view was that Benedict’s Christology is insufficient, not least because it unduly limits the ‘significance of the humanity of Jesus’. She contrasts the ‘high’ (Johannine) Christology with the Christology of the Synoptic Jesus.

She argued a Word Christology informs an understanding (here she referenced DCE) that: ‘The gift and call of the Church consist in being a countersign to modern society, not reinforcing and supplementing its better values’ And she quoted further the position of DCE that political work “for a just ordering of society” is appropriate for

\textsuperscript{1860} Second Vatican Council, Lumen Gentium .1.
\textsuperscript{1861} Antonio López , Vatican II’S Catholicity: A Christological Perspective on Truth, History and The Human Person, Communio 39 (Spring-Summer 2012), 83, 82-117. See in Lumen Gentium: ‘When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth (9) was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that He might continually sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father,(4).
\textsuperscript{1862} Vincent C. Anyama, Primacy of Christ, (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2021),1. Here Anyama uses a different translation of Gaudium et Spes from that on the Vatican website. The Vatican translation reads: ‘The Church firmly believes that Christ, who died and was raised up for all,(2) can through His Spirit offer man the light and the strength to measure up to his supreme destiny. Nor has any other name under the heaven been given to man by which it is fitting for him to be saved.(3) She likewise holds that in her most benign Lord and Master can be found the key, the focal point and the goal of man, as well as of all human history’, 10.
\textsuperscript{1863} Cahill, Benedict’s Global Reorientation, 291. She suggests that because Benedict wants to recover Christian faith he accentuates: ‘the divinity of Christ, a Word Christology, and the availability to humans of transcendent communion with God’.
“the lay faithful,” but not “the Church”’.\footnote{Ibid, 297.} She accused Benedict of suggesting: ‘The main point of acting charitably in the world is not to improve the lot of one’s fellow human beings, but to witness to the supernatural.’\footnote{Ibid.} Her condemnation of Word Christology is that it limits Jesus’ humanity.\footnote{Ibid, 299.} She argued a ‘Synoptic Jesus’ is a Jesus who expands the meaning of the neighbour to include the alien, outcast and the enemy. From there is the possibility of a relation with God that reconfigures not only people but social relations.\footnote{Ibid., 300.} And logically this leads to ‘countercultural practices and politics [which are] normative for any spirituality of the kingdom or reign of God preached in Jesus’ name.’\footnote{Ibid., 301.}

Cahill, however, regarded CIV as a move away from his Word Christology to advancing positions for social change. Though she considered more needed to be done, she limited her view of the conflict between Word Christology and synoptic Christology towards the end of her article. In that sense her criticism of Benedict as not engaging with the world becomes somewhat muted. The contrast between the Word and Synoptic Christology is a reflection of the debate between those who call Christians to life, with their eyes on Christ, in communities of faith that pour out charity in love of neighbour in its widest meaning, to those who look to a Jesus, of social action and justice, who can inspire a struggle to achieve truer change that can sweep away injustice. The contrast is not that the latter is a task that does not need to be addressed or can never be achieved. It is rather that the first create a new life in Christ which in the praxis of love is ongoing to the point of death. This sustains the sort of effort where because it is centred on Christ and his love, the cultural and social renewal can arise. This does not exclude those who look to the Jesus of justice are somehow exempt from martyrdom, but in generalisation, that often comes more from oppression than from dying in self-gift for others.

The history of the Church is too often read as if there is only a long series of institutional evils. In contrast to Ratzinger’s 1998 Address which sketched out a picture of a Church of the poor and for the poor, and how the Church had, despite all its failings, brought about in the contemporary world a way of acting and living in social and political life that is in marked contrast to the early days of the Roman Empire (even if,
arguably, certain elements of the contemporary era are returning humanity to a pre Christian era).

Benedict’s engagement with the world is through a ‘Word’ Christology, subsumes the ‘synoptic Christology’ because the Christ in the Word Christology, is the way forward for humanity. The Word is the inspiration for those who seek a radical change in their own heart to bring about radical change in the world. The exemplars discussed in Section 3.3 offer a clear example of this point. The Christology limited to a ‘synoptic Jesus’ will over time be dragged into factionalism and the resultant despair as politics fails, because what is often forgotten, is that politics is at best a temporary reality and provides no real long term hope or prospects of ongoing radical change.

The ‘high Christology’ of the Church, reaffirmed in the Second Vatican Council is the Christology that led to the emergence of religious orders and movements that have changed the world, and even overturned oppressive structures. Yet new oppressions continue and will always continue to emerge and grow. The high dreams of the French revolution died in the ashes of the Bolshevik coup d’état. In contemporary debates this is often forgotten, which makes Ratzinger’s 1998 address relevant help the Church remember the saints and what they did to create a Christian culture that is salvific of humankind in its material reality.

Finally, it should be noted that Ratzinger was fully aware of the danger of Christomonism from early on in his career. In 1967 he wrote a review of a book by Edward Schillebeeckx (Schillebeeckx) on the Eucharist. In this review Ratzinger observed how there is a danger for a ‘community [which] has completely turned into itself into Christ, so that only Christ remains lies in a christomonism.1869 Later in 2003 he wrote ‘even the concept of the Body of Christ needs clarification in today’s context lest it be misunderstood: It could easily be interpreted in the sense of a Christomonism, of an absorption of the Church, and thus of the believing creature, into the uniqueness of Christology.’1870 Thus Ratzinger Benedict was well aware of the danger of a christomonist framework creeping into a Christology, but there is no evidence to suggest this was ever his position, or that the label can be properly attached to his Christology.

1870 Joseph Ratzinger, Thoughts on the Place of Marian Doctrine and Piety in Faith and Theology as a Whole, Communio 30 (Spring 2003, 152-3, 147-160
4.2.4. Benedict XVI at PASS on the Social Teaching of the Catholic Church

Following CIV 5.7, with its call for NoCh, Benedict opened the following subparagraph in CIV 5, by linking NoCh to the STCC as the ‘truth of Christ’s Love in society’.\textsuperscript{1871} A Love, which is dynamic, coming down from the Father makes Christ present. The love of Christ for the person is a witness to how charity in human living ensures there is life. Benedict did not consider that there is any other way to justice and peace, securing the common good of all of us, except through Christ. Moreover, it is Christ who is at the heart of the STCC as the mission of truth so that Christians (and presumably, those people of goodwill seeking a better ordering of human affairs) share in the praxis. Here, Benedict understands this as a service to the truth, which sets us free. As already set out above in Section 4.1.3, the STCC identified the ‘New Man’. If there is any concern that this teaching conflicts with other activities or missions of the Church or that Christ is apportioned into particular aspects of the Church’s life, Benedict insisted otherwise. For Benedict, ‘testimony to Christ’s charity, through works of justice, peace and development is a part of “evangelisation” as well as being an “indispensable setting for formation in faith”’.\textsuperscript{1872} In CIV 5.8, Benedict recognised that the STCC proclaimed a truth that has the power ‘to liberate in the ever-changing events of history’. However, liberation only comes through a proclamation of love when there is a witness in word and deed as ‘lived and demonstrated’ in the lives of those who enter into living the Shema in NoCh.\textsuperscript{1873} To live and demonstrate the truth of love requires a community, demonstrating relationality, gift and love, which is why the logic of CIV 5.7, leads into CIV 5.8.

The intention here is not to explore Ratzinger’s thinking about the STCC before his papacy or work through his encyclicals where Benedict offered additional comments. The address he gave to PASS in 2008 provided sufficient material with which to consider what Benedict was attempting when defining the STCC as the
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proclamation of the Love of Christ. Although the analysis was short, it demonstrated how the three elements of relationality, gift and love reveal themselves as integral to the STCC and its principles. He took the opportunity to interpret how these fundamental principles interact. He began by asking: ‘how can solidarity and subsidiarity work together in the pursuit of the common good in a way that not only respects human dignity but allows it to flourish’. He explored a tentative answer in the address. He identified that the principles emerge from ‘the living contact between the Gospel and concrete social circumstances … [and] offer a framework for viewing and addressing the imperatives facing mankind at the dawn of the twenty-first century’. This approach grounds the principles in the Christian’s life, and thus, he did not separate social teaching and actions from the life of faith. Further, social action also needs faith. Benedict suggested that the principles are linked organically and, in their active orientation, are mutually supportive. He sketched out the meaning of the principles by placing them in a relationship with the other principles.

Benedict situated solidarity with subsidiarity, where solidarity is the ‘virtue’ that enables a sharing of society's material and spiritual goods. Conversely, he understands that subsidiarity is the coordinating principle for local communities in their social and internal lives. This focus differs from the presentation in ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ which read the principle of subsidiarity through a balancing power between the state and citizens. Benedict envisaged subsidiarity and solidarity as at opposing ends along a horizontal axis, where dignity is at the centre. He defined dignity as ‘the intrinsic value of a person created in the image and likeness of God’. From dignity at this central point, Benedict drew an upwards axis to the common good. He then defined the common good as the ‘totality of social conditions for people to achieve the goal of personal and social fulfilment’. He further argued that the four principles are
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1882 ‘Gaudium et Spes’, 26. ‘As a result the common good, that is, the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment, today takes on an increasingly universal complexion and consequently involves rights and duties with respect to the whole human race’.
enriched by the work of the Trinity and people seeing it as the way to create the ‘potential to place men and women on the path to discovering their definitive, supernatural destiny’. However, placing the Trinity at the centre of the four principles is not a common approach in the Catholic tradition when discussing the STCC.

Benedict reworked this initial schema to reconceptualise solidarity and subsidiarity as moving upwards towards the vertical through the Shema. For Benedict, solidarity is a vertical principle where a person willingly places their life ‘at the service of the other’. When people place their lives at the service of others, they enter into the self-gift of their lives. It is a gift that is totally for the other, where no one asks for money, and no one expects compensation for distributing the gift. Benedict proposed that the human family comes together through these gifts. Moreover, subsidiarity is the principle of how entities that are subsidiarist reinforce this unity. Benedict repositioned subsidiarity, orientating it into the vertical, where it points to the creator. He did this because he understood subsidiarity as the principle for encouraging people to enter into ‘life-giving relationships’. Further, as a principle, it grants the freedom for initiative and self-governance and, most importantly, leaves ‘space for love’. Using these concepts with the proposed alignment, Benedict proposed what he designated as a field for plotting the principles of the STCC. The way that the principles orientate towards God is fundamentally Christological. It is suggested that the STCC becomes an explication of the Resurrection as being for all who want to come to Christ.

Further, coming to Christ requires communities with a space for love as pilgrim communities of faith. When generated, a space of love must be from within to the social space around where love is both within and without if such communities are not to whither and decline. This is needed if Christians are to go beyond individualism, marking the contemporary ordering of the economy, politics and culture and if the common good is to emerge. Thus, to create ‘a just social order, attentive to the common good, it is necessary to live a spirituality that helps believers sanctify themselves through
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their work’. In this short address to PASS in 2008, Benedict highlighted that God, through the face of Christ, is at the centre of the STCC and that the dynamic of charity is at its core. This is a dynamic that both creates and comes from NoCh. Understanding the dynamic of God’s Love as the heart of the STCC is a challenge for those who read its principles as formulas for political and social change, and in so doing, tear the principles from their roots in faith. All future discussions and developments about the principles of the STCC need to start from Benedict’s 2008 address to PASS.

4.3. Paragraph 5 is a Call to the Vocation to Live Faith through the Praxis of NoCH.

In a ‘General Audience’ following his visit to Brazil in 2007, Benedict discussed how the early Church, with its local communities, had a universal openness. He observed there is the need ‘to recover everywhere the style of the first Christian community described in the Acts of the Apostles: assiduous in catechesis, the sacramental life and charitable works’. He described how the word ‘missionary’ expresses ‘the fruit of discipleship, the witness and the communication of the lived experience, of the truth and love as people know and assimilate it’. With these remarks, Benedict pointed to how Christians need to reorientate and live their lives in truth and love as Christians taking on the pattern of the early Church. He emphasised it was the visibility of ‘the life of the Christians and the community of the Church’ led to the conversion of the ancient world to Christianity. In the praxis of NoCh is where there will be the visibility of a life driven by faith and love.

NoCh incarnate new ways of social living in the social order, where Christianity is performative and where NoCh are a sacramental way of living. As Benedict noted, there are consequences from living in charity in a life incarnating the Word of God in solidarity where the face of Christ appears to others. Further, to live in that way needs a community that lives in an openness to the vertical dimension of God’s Love if there
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are to be fruits in shaping the horizontal into a deeper form of solidarity.\textsuperscript{1895} Understanding the life and work of NoCh as places where there is a practical form of social living of charity in the light of the truth of Christ enables one to understand these as ‘communities capable of bearing this witness of love, unity and joy.’\textsuperscript{1896} In \textit{Without Roots}, Ratzinger emphasised the need for a creative minority, which is more than a self-enclosed group but one that puts itself at the service of all humanity.\textsuperscript{1897} Giving signs of joy means the community is a place of joy because each person loves the other.\textsuperscript{1898} Joy is knowing ‘we have been loved by someone else’ and where the community comes to know it is good to exist.\textsuperscript{1899} However, such communities will always be a marginalised minority in the contemporary world much as they were in the early centuries of the Church’s life.

Benedict understood that the measure of the success of NoCh would not be their sizes, numbers or outward gains because he recognised that such communities would likely be ‘small [and] seemingly insignificant’.\textsuperscript{1900} Instead, it is God who ‘achieves his victories under the humble sign of the mustard seed’.\textsuperscript{1901} The mustard seed becomes a metaphor for the action of love at the heart of Christianity, which is and remains a love where ‘a person has been able to give meaning to an individual, to just one person, through his love, [and] his life has been infinitely worthwhile. And [it] will always be the case that men thrive when they encounter the sort of love that gives meaning’.\textsuperscript{1902} Thus, the formation of NoCh is the responsibility of the faithful, predominantly the laity, who can be ‘witnesses that there is another meaningful way to live’ and show how ‘justice and truth are possible if we open ourselves to the loving presence of God our Father, of Christ’.\textsuperscript{1903}

NoCh are to become centres of ‘love and forgiveness, self-denial, acceptance of others, justice and peace’.\textsuperscript{1904} Such communities are for cultivating ‘solidarity, fraternity and charity’ in and through ‘an exemplary way of living, an organic understanding that

\textsuperscript{1895} ‘Proclamation is not merely verbal. It is a gathering, and in this is the present action of God’. Heim, \textit{Joseph Ratzinger}, 349–51.
\textsuperscript{1896} Benedict, ‘Second World Congress’.
\textsuperscript{1897} Ratzinger and Pera, \textit{Without Roots}, 80.
\textsuperscript{1898} ‘Through their persuasive capacity and their joy, they reach other people’. Ibid., 121.
\textsuperscript{1899} Ratzinger, \textit{Principles of Catholic Theology}, 80.
\textsuperscript{1900} Ratzinger, \textit{Salt of the Earth}, 16.
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religion is not simply limited to particular roles or buildings. This indicates a community that, in its ‘way of acting and living, is de facto a “proof” that the things to come, the promise of Christ, are not only a reality that we await, but a real presence’. NoCh are to be communities where an ‘effective shift in mentality … leads to the adoption of new life-styles in which [there is] the quest for truth, beauty, goodness and communion with others’. Doing this can reveal how life within the contemporary order is lived. That is, these are places of holiness, where, as Benedict imaginatively explained, ‘we must all learn a kind of Copernican revolution in which to behave like brothers and sisters, joining all together with all the others in the round dance of love around the one centre that is God’. By behaving as if we are brothers and sisters, fraternity can emerge as an expression of the NoCh in its practices.

Practices of different NoCh will vary (as the analysis of ecclesial realities in Section 4.1 revealed how different are the practices of current ecclesial realities). The history, contexts, how the current ecclesial realities meet the pressing questions of the day and nature of the people constituting the community, including their engagement with God and others, indicate a lack of uniformity in the practices. This is only part of the complexity. There will be core practices and ways of thinking about what to do and how to do it, including recalling the faithfulness to the gift of transformation and how the call to pouring out is conceived in NoCH. There is a need to receive love and be in love in order to pour out love; otherwise, all that will come out are words and deeds that are neither truly creative nor genuinely giving. Faithfulness is in the gift of self to God and others.

Further, it is argued the NoCh structures will need to be open to all as a gift for the other, whether that gift comes through dialogue or communal activities, for there is only a limited relationality between human beings with a corresponding limitation on people’s constitutive creativity. In theological terms, NoCh are places where a person is fully human in Christ. They are spaces in which a person’s humanity is offered an opportunity to self-gift to create for others what is needed to express their humanity in Christ in social spaces of social love. Many years before his papacy, Benedict identified
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a need for ‘mutual faith, in praying, celebrating, rejoicing, suffering, and living together … in specific communities, substructures of various kinds … where a community … [can become] the place of spirit and life’.\textsuperscript{1909} He argued that such communities came from believers sharing a faith that displayed a ‘freshness of experience’ and that they became places ‘to access Jesus Christ’.\textsuperscript{1910} His attention was on the Church in the parish context; however, his remarks apply equally to NoCh.

In sociological terms, NoCh are entities into which people enter and make efforts to deepen their relationship with another, even where the other is hostile or where there is no act of overt charity, because entering into a relationship with another is the generation of social justice and social truth. The deeper and wider the relationalities connect each person to the other, the deeper the possibility of generating and building social structures with subsidiarity in their emergent power. A deepening of the natural solidarity all humans experience with the other comes through signs, such as empathy, where bonds of sociality develop in the community. Further, the community’s common good emerges from the bonds of sociality, which relate to the human person in open social structures and extends the solidarity between them.

For Benedict, NoCh are small communities of believers who make ‘others curious to seek the light which gives life in abundance’.\textsuperscript{1911} Thus, they are places where others can come, whether as seekers or believers, to contact these communities, and in this meeting, both secular people and believers can move towards one another with openness. The enthusiasm emanating from these communities will attract others to see the light they live by—God’s Love.\textsuperscript{1912} For as no one can love alone, so no one can believe alone, and therefore, NoCh are not centres of monadic living but communities of those who have gone through the fire of knowing God’s Loves for them and accepting and willing to enter into the heart of being an instrument of grace in the world. NoCh are to be places where person’ lives are enlarged by the other both in the community, and as importantly, by those in the world. This is because no one can be an instrument alone; communities must sustain the conversion, love and faith for this new life. Given that NoCh are imagined as small, as the Church will be small in the future, it is going to be their enthusiasm for God which spreads within society. In CIV 5, NoCh are not

\textsuperscript{1909} Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, 351.
\textsuperscript{1910} Ratzinger, Yes of Jesus Christ, 37.
\textsuperscript{1912} Ibid.
conceived as a mass movement. Instead, they are a ‘convinced creative minority which has discovered the “pearl” and live it in a manner that is also convincing to others’. This requires sharing with others the pearl of God’s Love for them. The NoCh are seen as communities of orthopraxis of the Shema and of love, mercy and charity, to build the social order as a civilisation of love. NoCh are communities of charity in self-gift for the other, and as Christian models of life, open the future for humanity and the Church. In summary, CIV 5 is a call for the praxis of holiness to be the source of renewal of the world.

**Conclusion**

The dissertation is a detailed explication of the call made by Benedict in his third encyclical *Caritas in Veritate.* In paragraph 5, and particularly sentences Civ 5.7 and CIV 5.8. Benedict sets out this call built on three relationships: God, in His ever Love of the human person; the human person through their relationality in relationships with other human beings and in so doing constituting communities; and thirdly the community of human persons in relationship with the world, through charity as self-gift.

Part 1 is a detailed study of *Caritas in Veritate* through a discussion on Benedict’s view of the centrality to the Christin life of the Great commandment, discussed here under the rubric of the Shema. The second aspect is the analysis of the conviction of Ratzinger, in his writings as Joseph Ratzinger and as pope Benedict, of the need to form communities of faith. This latter point provides the framework for the analysis of his welcome for ecclesial realities. From these two points the dissertation first provides a broad introduction to CIV, followed by a detailed consideration of a range of critiques of the encyclical, including the smaller group discussing CIV 5. The close reading of CIV 5, and then 5.7 in Part 1 is important. Not only does it offer an integrated view of Benedict’s reflections and observations on ecclesial realities. It situates the call in CIV for the formation of networks of charity in the broader context
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1914 ‘Anyone who has come across something true, beautiful and good in his life—the one true treasure, the pearl of great price—hastens to share it everywhere, in the family and at work, in the contexts of his life’. Ratzinger and Pera, *Without Roots,* 121.
of his theology and ecclesiology. The key feature of CIV is the promotion of the relational nature of the human being discussed in Part 2.

Part 2 explores this through three disciplines – theology, metaphysics, and relational sociology. The first section (2.1) undertakes a detailed examination of the Ratzinger / Benedict theological approach to the relationality of the human person, setting out what Walsh summarised as his ‘theological personalism’.

This was followed in 2.2 with a presentation of Clarke’s metaphysical / philosophical reworking of Thomism on the human being as a substantial and equally relational being. The third discussion in 2.3 drew on the theory of relational sociology propounded by Archer and Donati, to articulate the human person as the constituter of social entities. The unity of the three dimensions gives strong support to the claim for the relational nature of the human person; not only a being with a relational nature who can be both creator and sustainer of social institutions. This approach is unique in seeking to work through a dialogue between the three disciplines, even though more work is required for this to be accepted and adopted as the ground from which to approach issues, problems and crises. The work to date sets out the lines along which to challenge the insistence of modernity (and late modernity) on the centrality of the individualist character of the human person, with the consequence that the human person is not seen in all their dimensions, and certainly not as agents of social charity. Part 2 thus becomes an opening as a contribution to a deepening of the understanding of the relational nature of the human being.

Part 3 builds on this development of the relational nature of the person to explore under the headings of gift of self as part of and fruit of the relational nature of the person. Further the Part continues with a discussion of a meaning of charity leading to defining social charity in which friendship is an integral component. A significant aspect of Part 3.3 is the relatively detailed study of four ecclesial realities as exemplars of NoCh. The discussion is a concrete contribution to a wider and deeper understanding of the ecclesial realities where self-gift of persons comes from people living as ‘instruments of grace’.

Part 4 placed CIV 5.8 within the broader principles of STCC. At the start of Part 4, Caritas in Veritate 5.8 is discussed as the context for Part 4, and how it links to the earlier Parts extended discussion of formation of NoCh. Part 4 explores the logic in
CIV 5.8, in which Benedict closely links the formation of NoCh as the dynamic of charity to the principles STCC, understood as the ‘proclamation of Christ’s love in society’. This study in Part 4 focuses on two sets of contributions. 4.1 and 4.2 present the work of Archer and Donati regarding the four fundamental principles of STCC within the framework of their theory of relational sociology. The material applies the logic of the relational nature of the person to the principles of STCC: first those of Archer and Donati who develop creative and original readings of the principles of STCC; then the contribution of Benedict who gives a theological overview on the four principles and their interrelationship. Both contributions provide a set of counterpoints to discussion of STCC which frame STCC as guide for the actions of the State in addressing complex political problems. In contrast these contributions lack the moralism sometimes associated with discussion on STCC. In conclusion, Part 4 provides a set of theoretical guidelines for a reading of STCC within the horizon of the call of Benedict for people to live out the love of Christ for the world in a dynamic of charity.

Accepting Walsh’s argument that Benedict’s theological personalism is necessary for the Church in the twenty-first century, are the differences between Benedict and Francis real, with solid roots in competing theological and ecclesiological visions, or are these more apparent? Is it that the differences reflect the particular historical circumstances, including the ‘teologico-political’ development of each Pope? Benedict’s sudden resignation in 2013 and the election Francis saw some differences, certainly in style and mode of address between the two papacies. It is unclear as to what extent the drive by Benedict to renew the Church has been taken on board. The question is whether this is a substantial shift from the Benedict papacy, or is it only relatively minor in its scope. One key concept that could have been taken up by Francis is fraternity including friendship. Certainly, in Fratelli Tutti CIV and DCE are reference and / or quoted several times.1917 Francis, however, makes no reference to fraternity or friendship, in CIV. Further he does not adopt the idea of networks of charity, and even his use of ‘networks’ is on each occasion only with the meaning of connections between nodes. [See the discussion on the meaning of rete and networks

in Section 1.3.4]. And neither does Francis draw on CIV for a discussion of charity and social love. Though he does address the relationship of these concepts it is in a broad and at a somewhat high level terms – for example: ‘Our love for others, for who they are, moves us to seek the best for their lives. Only by cultivating this way of relating to one another will we make possible a social friendship that excludes no one and a fraternity that is open to all.”

**Some thoughts on future research**

The dissertation brings forward several ideas as well as questions where future research could assist in deepening an understanding of these questions and ideas. In the first instance, the tentative development of a taxonomy to assist in understanding ecclesial realities in the Church and even beyond, needs to be deepened both with more theoretical reflection, but also with practical or even field research into the lives of these new communities. Ratzinger’s 1998 Address to the First World congress provides an overarching historical perspective on the Church which can assist in the development of the taxonomy, more deeply informed by the history of the early movements in the Church. This work will contribute to the understanding and experience of the ecclesial movements, and more so in the light of commentaries which have an ideological or hagiographic character, obscuring a fuller picture.

In 2017 the CDF issued *Iuvenescit Ecclesia* regulating aspects of the relationships between ecclesial realities and the hierarchy of the Church. This also opens an important discussion on this aspect of the Catholic Church, which has yet to take place. If the Holy Spirit is at work in the exemplars, instancing the call for creating NoCH, then the future creativity of bodies such as ecclesial realities is undoubtedly not limited or confined to any prescribed roles. Understanding the origin, growth, work, success, and failures of these realities, despite how their failures receive more prominence than any of their successes, is an important task.

Furthermore, a detailed study of *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*, its origins, its intent, and its outcomes, invite a serious approach. In particular, its personalist dimensions could be explored. Walsh considers that ‘the intellectual achievement of his (Benedict) papacy has scarcely been noticed, let alone recognised’, referring in part to his

1918 Ibid, 94.
1919 CDF, *Iuvenescit Ecclesia*. 276
‘theological personalism’. In other words, Walsh’s is to be justified that Benedict’s theological personalism is of great significance for the Church in the twenty-first century, there is work still to be done, to gather all his reflections on the human person to develop a deeper understanding of the significance of his arguments. This work would undergird a more sustained reflection on Walsh’s argument.

Further research can also be done to investigate the continuous thread in focus and teaching between Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict, even as Benedict began to develop his own path. It is not certain there has been the same continuous line of thinking from Benedict to Francis. An examination of how Francis draws on the thinking and writing of his predecessors into his own teaching, including assessing his understanding of networks of charity and ecclesial realities, is an avenue of research.

Perhaps the dimension of work that this thesis has uncovered, which is the most worthy of more research, is the relational reading of STCC by both Archer and Donati. Though each argues for different lines of development in STCC, each requires further study to tease out their fuller contribution in this area. A critical part of any further study will be to explore further the implications of Donati’s reading of the centrality of the principle of subsidiarity for the better ordering of social life. Archer’s idea of social love also provides a paradigm with which to approach STCC as a structure of four fundamental principles for initiating and supporting growth of subsidiarist entities that seek to renew society through building solidarity.

Both Archer and Donati have set out the basis for a reorientation of many of the debates that arise under the umbrella of the broad and uncertain formulations such as CST or CSD. Debates that often operate from the viewpoint that the four fundamental principles and their interrelationship are an irrelevancy to making other apparently more concrete and necessarily political calls for action.

Important work will be achieved when future research gathers and analyses all of Ratzinger’s (Benedict’s) various, partial and scattered comments and observations on social ordering, whether in regards the doctrine of STCC and associated questions, or over politics, both domestic and global, or about economic ordering and about how human beings can best live their lives. Such work also must include his moral teachings on human
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