

Catholic Social Teaching and Globalization: A Theological Perspective

Michael Crosby, OFM^{Cap}.

On October 8, 2003, Bishop Gianpaolo Crepaldi, Secretary of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace said that the “global” view of the human being presented by the Church’s social doctrine makes it an indispensable tool to understand the phenomenon of globalization. Speaking at the official opening of the academic year of the Salesian University, Bishop Crepaldi stated: “On one hand, globalization is increasingly integrated in the social doctrine of the church;” while, “on the other, the social doctrine is increasingly globalized.”¹

Bishop Crepaldi noted that Catholic social teaching (CST) provides a helpful lens in understanding globalization because of something unique to CST and something unique about globalization. First of all, CST is uniquely based on the evangelical message. Secondly, globalization demands an “ethical and anthropological view” not found in the social sciences.²

This two-fold understanding of CST and globalization will provide the framework for my remarks herein. First of all, I will develop an evangelical grounding for CST; then, building on this foundation, I will show how this evangelical foundation has anthropological and ethical consequences both for CST and how we approach the phenomenon of globalization.

As we try to probe the “evangelical message” that must ground CST, we need to return to the evangelical message proclaimed by Jesus in the world which all thought was quite globalized for that time.

Michael Crosby, OFM^{Cap}. is a member of the Midwest Province of the Capuchin Franciscans and a nationally-known speaker and writer.

¹ Bishop Gianpaolo Crepaldi, Address at the Opening of the School Year, Salesian University, in Zenit news service, October 8, 2003.

² *Ibid.*

The Contrast of Matthew's Gospel with the Prevailing "Gospel" of Globalization

After his baptism and temptation in the wilderness, Matthew's Gospel has Jesus appear announcing the "good news" or gospel (*euaggélion*) of God's reign, also called the "kingdom of heaven" (4:17). In the world of that time, "kingdom" had definite political, economic and religious overtones. Given that the word for kingdom (*basileía*) is also "empire," Jesus' way of using the phrase, combined with his preaching the "good news" (*euaggélion*) of another kingdom in the midst of the Roman empire was clearly subversive.³ Since this *basileía* involved another God than those identified with Rome Matthew's Jesus was saying the very religious underpinnings of the political economy needed to be transformed, not just individual and communal lives.

This subversive understanding of "gospel" must be re-grasped, especially for people like us who think of it as quite religious in meaning. However, the word *euaggélion* appears only one time in all of the Septuagint (2 Sam. 4:10). Consequently the reference to "good news" did not come from Israel's tradition but was "one *expropriated from the Roman Empire*."⁴ In that imperial reality, the proclamation of the "gospel" was a technical term identified with the expansion of the empire in space and time. Consequently, when people heard "good news" it had to do with a new territory being conquered, the birth of a new emperor or some kind of *dóγμα* or decree of an existing emperor. In this imperial context any other "*euaggélion*" would be perceived as a direct challenge to the system.

For Jesus to "proclaim the good news of the kingdom" (4:23; 9:35), especially in a way that resulted in the spread of *his* honor, rather than Caesar's, was tantamount to treason. The subversive nature of his message was reinforced when Matthew portrays Jesus as showing that discipleship in God's empire involves living according to a moral code that stood against that of the ever-globalizing imperium. This invited another kind of loyalty; it also indicated that Jesus' gospel of God's reign, rather than the empire's, offered a way life that was worthy of honor. Since Jesus' proclamation of the gospel of God's reign stood in resistance to the abusive dynamics of the kingdom defined by empire,

³ For more on the subversive nature/notion of "the reign of God," see Paul J. Wadell, "The Subversive Ethics of the Kingdom of God," *The Bible Today* 41 (2003), 11-16.

⁴ See Wes Howard-Brooke, *The Church before Christianity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2001), 125.

those individuals and households who embraced the new “gospel” could expect trouble for coming under another authority than Rome’s and its religious surrogates among the Jewish leaders. Given the worldview of that time, Jesus’ proclamation of another “kingdom” (or “empire”) was subversive, but, in inviting his audience to change their loyalties it was treasonous.

However, as Jesus said, the kingdom he proclaimed had nothing directly to do with Rome’s. Today, as we understand categories of space and time different from that of the empire, how might we understand what Jesus’ proclamation of the gospel of the “reign of God”? I suggest that we need to understand how we have come to understand both “kingdom” as “reign” and “God” as “Trinity.”

The Reign of God = the reality of God = the being of God = the way of God = the truth of God = the life of God = the existence of God = the rule of God = the truth of God = the love of God = the mercy of God = the forgiveness of God = the compassion of God = the justice of God = the mercy of God = the understanding of God = the power of God = the authority of God = the energy of God = the dynasty of God = the dynamic of God = the force of God = the essence or the way God is God.

We know that the way that God has been revealed in our Christian tradition is as a Trinitarian commonwealth wherein three persons, each unique, relates to the others in a way that all the resources that enable the one to say “I AM” the fullness of the Godhead are the others’ as well. This is called the “economic trinity.” The notion “economic” is based on the notion of economics constituted the “ordering (*nómos*) of the house (*oikía*)” or *oikonomía*. At the time of Jesus the house was the assumed primary metaphor for the political economy of the imperium involving persons, relationships and resources. The ordering of this triad began in the house, was nurtured in the house and, as house, grounded everything in the empire. The gods of the empire’s religion sustained this political economy.

From the perspective of God’s reign being the reality of the economic trinity or trinitarian commonwealth, we find three persons, unique in their “I Ams,” in a relationship of total solidarity wherein all resources are fully and totally shared in common with no exclusivity. Thus, Jesus’ proclamation of the *euaggélion* of God’s reign was, we have come to see through the decades and centuries since his death/resurrection, a declaration that the trinity must be acknowledged by everyone as the heart of all reality: the political economy as well as religion. Since we believe

that humankind must reflect its maker, we now move to the area of Catholic Anthropology.

Theological Anthropology, grounded in Trinitarian (Household) Theology is the attempt to create on earth a vision in human relationships of the reign of God's Trinitarian relationships. At the heart of a Trinitarian-grounded Catholic anthropology that must ground everything in creation, including globalization, we find three incontrovertible principles: 1) the dignity of every person that must be realized in freedom; 2) the right of every person to have fundamental equity in the ordering of resources to make sure there are no basic needs among them; and 3) the need for relationships among those persons vis-à-vis their resource sharing which will create maximal participation in a way that proximates the Trinitarian "reign" of God.

Consider that in the context of another kind of globalization that had made Israel and Judah exiles, the priestly writers of Genesis 1:26-28 envisioned a world where all persons would be free precisely because God made them male and female in the divine image. Then, in one of the greatest manifestations of solidarity with these creatures, God "blessed them" or entered into a relationship of empowerment with them. This enabled these exiles to believe that this God did not want them to be destroyed but to "increase," to be multiplied rather than divided and conquered, to fill the earth instead of being subjugated to others' control in an alien land and to have dominion rather than being dominated.

Far from being an expression of God's plan for creation "in the beginning," we need to see Genesis 1:26-28 primarily as God's promise for creation that demands a "new beginning" *every time* humanity fails to image itself and its relationships at any level of life in any way that denies the Trinitarian dynamic that must undergird what Catholic anthropology insists is the vision for authentic life in community.

Building on this Catholic anthropology that must gird globalization, we now can move more specifically to the Catholic social teaching that offers an evangelically-grounded vision of what globalization must be if it is to reflect the reign of God rather than the prevailing imperium. Here we find three core principles that guide all CST. In one way or another, all address how we deal with persons, relations and the ordering of resources among all persons in a way that will maximize the freedom of the most, the solidarity of the whole and an allocation of resources that brings about the greatest common good. Stated negatively we find three parallel principles: 1) the individualism (or "isms") of the few persons cannot be ordered in a way that denies the freedom of the whole/the many; 2) the wants of the few cannot be structured in

a way that undermines meeting the basic needs of the whole/the many; and, finally, the control of the few cannot function in a way that denies the fullest participation of the many, for the good of the whole.

With our Trinitarian-grounded anthropological view and its ethical implications in CST established, we now return to another statement of Bishop Crepaldi made in his remarks at the opening of the academic year of the Salesian University in October, 2003. He stated: "The social doctrine of the Church, which is based on the evangelical message, has a unifying drive for the whole of mankind."⁵

As I read his statement I see two things that need to be ascertained in ways that concretize Jesus' message about the reign of God: what specifically is the evangelical message that must be proclaimed in a way that will impact society's globalization and, secondly, how is this vision to serve as "a unifying drive for the whole" of humanity and, indeed, the whole household we call "*oikologia*," the integrity of creation itself?

First, let us examine the specific way one of the gospels shows Jesus canonizing as the way we are called to order our resources in the *oikonomia*. We find this in Matthew's gospel, chapter 26, verses 6-13. At the end of the story of the woman who pours on the oil on Jesus, we hear Jesus proclaiming something that must resound even to this age: "wherever this good news (*euaggelion*) is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in remembrance of her" (Mt. 26:13). The text states:

Now while Jesus was at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, a woman came to him with an alabaster jar of very costly ointment, and she poured it on his head as he sat at the table. But when the disciples saw it, they were angry and said, "Why this waste? For this ointment could have been sold for a large sum, and the money given to the poor." But Jesus, aware of this, said to them, "Why do you trouble the woman? She has performed a good service for me. For you always have the poor with you, but you will not always have me. By pouring this ointment on my body she has prepared me for burial. Truly I tell you, wherever this good news is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in remembrance of her" (Mt. 26:6-13).

The setting for the story is a house, recalling that the house, as the *oikia*, was the basic unit of the imperial reality. As such it involved persons, their relationships and their resources. The owner of the house, Simon the leper appears to be absent. The two persons around

⁵ Crepaldi, *Ibid.*

whom the story constellates are Jesus and the unnamed woman. So we begin with the first of the three dynamics that make up the ordering of the house or the *oikonomía*: Jesus and the anonymous woman. We are told that she enters the second dimension of relating to him when the passage says she "came to him." She entered into relationship with him at that most critical point of solidarity in households of that time: "as he sat at the table." The woman came to Jesus at the table with her resource: an alabaster jar of very costly ointment. The stage is set. Does she show it off, proclaiming her wealth? No, indeed. Instead we are told, "She poured it on his head." She reordered this image of wealth in a way that spelt generosity, largess rather than stinginess and niggardliness.

When the disciples witness this they became angry at what they see as a waste, proclaiming that the "ointment could have sold for a large sum, and the money given to the poor." In response to their question, Jesus retorts with his own: "Why do you trouble the woman? She has performed a good service for me." The word "good service" in our English translation does not render well the meaning the author is trying to portray. In Greek the words used of what the woman did are *kalón érgon*, a good deed.

Anyone familiar with the Hebrew scriptures would immediately recall what happened when God finished the work of creation in bringing about a new *oikonomía* for everything in creation when God made persons male and female, entered into relationship with and among them and then empowered them to increase, multiply, fill the earth and have dominion (Gen. 1:26-28). When God had reached this apogee of creation, God's ordering of the household was completed and, we are told, God said it was *kalón érgon*, "indeed, it was very good" (Gen. 1:31). In other words, by using the same words of God's reordering from the chaos a new cosmic order, a new *oikonomía*, Matthew was saying to the readers that "what she did" was at the heart of God's work in creation.

At this point Matthew's Jesus tells the disciples that they too must learn from this woman. Indeed, as long as the poor will be with them, they must "do what she did" not only in memory of Jesus but also in imitation of Jesus. The woman becomes the model of discipleship for all time in the way she shared her resources with Jesus in light of his projected poverty, his need for anointing at his upcoming death.

How, we can ask, was "what she did" an example of the proclamation of the gospel of God's reign? In the context of the house:

- 1) an outsider comes to Jesus at table (person-to-person)
- 2) with an alabaster jar of very expensive ointment (resource sharing)
- 3) which is generously shared with him in light of his projected need (relationship).

What she did was “good” because it created a new economic in that household: an economy defined by generosity rather than greed.

In Matthew’s gospel, her “doing good” not only makes this female a true “*imago Dei*,” her *doing good* becomes the model of one who *bears fruit*, produces a *rich harvest*, is *just* insofar as she reorders her resources toward another person in need and, as a result, reveals her to be one who does *the Father’s will*. Only in Matthew, as I have shown elsewhere, do these five notions parallel ideas that characterize what it means to live the gospel. The woman, in that part of the world at that time in history, does her part in bringing about the kind of *oikonomia* envisioned by its creator since the beginning of time.

What was it that she did in that house, in that *oikia*? Clearly, from the words of Matthew’s Jesus, this woman with her alabaster jar of very costly ointment, concretized the evangelically canonized way of sharing resources with those in need that must be manifest globally or “wherever” in the world the gospel is proclaimed.

The notion of “what she did” being proclaimed “wherever in the word” the gospel is proclaimed invites us to return to the notion of globalization.

We began this paper by quoting Bishop Crepaldi. He noted that globalization demands an “ethical and anthropological view” not found in the social sciences. I believe the anthropological view is found in our understanding of all human life needing to be modeled on that of the economic trinity wherein persons can be free, relationships bring about solidarity and resources are allocated to realize that the basic needs of all are met. From this anthropological underpinning the house of justice can be established in a way that ensures the ethical realization of the three main points of CST: 1) the individualism (or “isms”) of the few persons cannot be ordered in a way that denies the freedom of the whole/the many; 2) the wants of the few cannot be structured in a way that undermines meeting the basic needs of the whole/the many; and, finally, 3) the control of the few cannot function in a way that denies the fullest participation of the many, for the good of the whole.

In summary, this demands that:

- 1) building on our theological understanding of God's Trinitarian reign that must undergird everything in creation
- 2) as well as the kind of *oikía*, *oikonomía*, *oikouménē* and *oikología* this entails,

we promote a certain way of understanding how human persons are called to relate to one another (anthropology) as well as an ordering of relationships among those persons and their resources characterized by the common good or justice (ethics) in a way that reflects God's reign/*oikonomía* if the "whole world" (globalization) will reflect its original purpose as defined by its maker/orderer.

This is the vision. Our task now is to ask if the vision is being realized or, globally, if people are perishing for want of the vision being implemented. We have a right to ask this question since CST serves a critique whether globalization is grounded in authentic anthropology and solid ethical principles that will ensure the ordering of the universe envisioned in the scriptures by our God.

It is clear that there are different definitions of the term globalization. These can be summarized as reflecting a stance that can be called the 1) neoliberal model, 2) the development model, 3) the ecological sustainable model, and 4) the postcolonial model.⁶

No matter how we define it, there are few that will honestly be able to say it has been an unmitigated blessing or curse. Indeed it has been both a blessing and a stumbling block, as objective data about the disparity between rich and poor peoples at the micro levels of countries and macro level of continents continue to reveal. If the ideal of CST for all models of globalization continually insists on greater freedom for persons, greater equity in resource allocation and fuller participation for more and more, this must be the criteria by which all models must be critiqued. And, from this critique, structural change in the existing dynamics of globalization must take place. This demands conversion of the whole *oikonomía*.

⁶ For further expansion on the four ways of understanding globalization see Rebecca Todd Peters, "The Future of Globalization: Seeking Pathways of Transformation," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 24 (2004), 105-33.

Before we get too defensive about preserving our “way of life” that makes us beneficiaries of the existing patterns of globalization, let me recall the theme of this volume and this paper: Catholic Social Teaching and Globalization. In other words, we must continually look at globalization from the lens of CST; as such our vision demands correction of the existing *oikonomía*. This brings me back to the proclamation of Jesus’ gospel of God’s reign in the midst of his ever-globalizing imperium with its religious underpinnings in Rome and in the colonies called Judea, Galilee and Perea.

In response to Jesus’ “gospel” the leaders of the empire and the entrenched religion colluded to “save” their system. This led to the “cross,” the instrument society used to kill those it considered subversive. If we are to take up this cross today, I believe we must embrace the call to prophetic discipleship in a way that might be called discipleship *oikonomía*. This demands a total reordering of our individual, communal and collective hearts on behalf of the poor who “are always with us” so that the gospel might be proclaimed and that we might preserve the integrity of creation itself. In other words, because of the gospel itself (especially revealed in the story of the woman), we must restructure everything in our individual *oikías*, our communal *oikonomías*, and our collective *oikouménés* in order that we might have justice throughout the *oikología*.

Since God’s creative globalizing activity was revealed when God “did good,” it also must be the task of all creatures, especially in the way we bring light out of darkness, order from disorder, shalom from chaos and create a home or “house” for those experiencing exile. It demands a way of bringing into the household those without resources and those who have been marginalized. We must “do good” within the house so that people can see us reflecting the creative reign of God. This demands conversion.

When we consider the woman with the alabaster jar we see someone “in the house” who related to Jesus in a way that found her reordering her resource in light of his projected need. Her “good deed” serves as an exemplar *par excellence* of what it means to witness to the gospel; it stands in sharp contrast to the story of the rich, young man who came to Jesus and asked what “good” he must “do” if he would enter everlasting life. After Jesus told him it was sufficient to keep the commandments, he declared that he had been faithful to their observance and wanted to “go further.” At this Jesus articulated a vision of the reign of God that went further into the way of God’s reign insofar as it demanded a reordering of his life/household on behalf of the poor (Mt.

19:21). However, we are told that when “the young man heard this word, he went away grieving, for he had many possessions” (Mt. 19:22). “Then Jesus said to his disciples, “Truly I tell you, it will be hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven” (Mt. 19:23).

Oftentimes, when I am giving a retreat conference and am referring to this passage I ask: “How many of you think conversion is easy?” I almost always get people rolling their eyes or protesting that it is not. However, I then show that it all depends on what the object of our conversion may be. I invite people to tell me how they decided to buy something significant in their lives. The process begins with seeking just the right good or service, finding a price that is right, the willingness to sell a certain amount of money in exchange for what has been found, consummated with the buying of that product. I note that this is the way of the market economy; I also note that the whole market economy is based on the dynamic of seeking, finding, selling and buying.

At that point I go to the heart of the process of entering God’s reign as told in the parables taught by Matthew’s Jesus: “the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant in *search* of fine pearls, on *finding* one pearl of great value, he went and *sold* all that he had and *bought* it” (Mt. 13:45). In other words, I show, the same process of entering the reign of God is the same process as going shopping for something we desire: both involve the process of seeking, finding, selling and buying.

If the process is the same, why do we go through the one in a way that is “easy” and dread the other? I believe it all depends on the object of our desires. Going shopping is about something material that is tangible and palpable; entering the reign of God is something spiritual that is not tangible and never accomplished.

I suggest the rich, young man who is identified with his “possessions” is unable to go through a conversion because they are more important than what he has “found” in Jesus. On the contrary, Peter represents one who has gone through the conversion process.

Both the rich, young man and Peter went through a process that brought them into an encounter with Jesus; they had found him as significant in their lives. Yet, what the rich, young man did not find in Jesus was someone that would enable him to reorder his life/household on behalf of the poor. Peter, for his part declared he was able to do so: “Look, we have left everything and followed you” (Mt. 19:27).

Why was Peter able to “sell” while the rich, young man was not willing to “sell?” It seems to me the gospel gets it wrong when it declares that it was because “he had many possessions” (19:22). History is replete with stories of people who gave up many things for something or someone they found more important—all the way from Clare of Assisi to King George V. The issue with him and others with great wealth in the form of power, possessions and prestige is not that they had the wealth; it was that the wealth had become absolute; nothing could be found that was better. Only when we find someone or something better that wealth in its various forms will we be willing to “sell what we have.” Thus Matthew’s Jesus, after admonishing the disciples to stop running after things that will be eaten, drunk or worn (6:25, 31) says that we must seek “first the kingdom of God and his righteousness (which involves living a life on behalf of those without resources and those marginated form society) “and all these things will be given to you as well” (6:33). The woman with the alabaster jar found the pearl of great price; the rich, young man did not. Peter was able to be different than the rich, young man because there was something about this Jesus (“Emmanuel”) that enabled him to come under his power, thus fulfilling what Jesus said about the difficulty of evangelical conversion: “For mortals it is impossible, but for God all things are possible” (Mt. 19:26). The reign of God is the power that makes religious conversion even more powerful than economic conversion.

As we consider the story of the woman with the alabaster jar who poured it on Jesus’ head as he was “at table,” I believe we can begin to find a contemporary application in the image of the “table” found in the 2003 document of the U.S. Bishops regarding the way we should have approached the 2004 elections. They talked about the need for Catholics to consider the common good (the goal of CST) around the concern of finding a “place at the table.”⁷

In the same document the Bishops talk about the increasing numbers of Catholics living in our ever-globalizing economy as not being “at home” in this system. In my mind this image of exile demands the creation of alternative prophetic communities of resistance who will find another form of economic discipleship based on the woman with the alabaster jar rather than the rich, young man who could not accept the gospel Jesus proclaimed that demanded a sharing with those in need. This economic discipleship is grounded in a religious discipleship that

⁷ United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, “Faithful Citizenship: A Catholic Call to Political Responsibility,” 2, 15.

finds us in our households continually seeking, finding (the higher power), selling (because, with God all things are possible) and buying into or entering more fully into the “reign of God” and its justice. This becomes “gospel” of the “faith that does justice” (see Rom. 1:16-17).

Given our reflection on the inability of the rich, young man to enter more deeply into the reign of God because of his inability/unwillingness to “sell,” we can ask of us Catholics in the United States: what keeps us from developing the critical mass that will bring about conversion of our political economy, of our collective household, through the anthropology and ethics of Catholic social teaching? What keeps us from converting, even though our social analysis of the underside of globalization can be seen in the disparity between rich and poor and, even more, heard in the increasing cry of the poor for justice? Consider these obstacles that keep us from conversion:

1. A sense of the inevitability of the present economic processes and structures. This is even more so since the “fall” of the communist model dominated by the former Soviet system.
2. A delusion that the processes that characterize the U.S.-style of capitalism are “ordained” by God. This is reinforced by the civil religion on the nation that sees ours as the “city built on the hill,” the model for others.
3. A denial that keeps us from seeing the consequences of our structures and systems on other people and the planet.
4. A sense that, if we have problems and if there is an underside to the present economic model dominated by the U.S., we will be able to solve it through our technology.
5. A kind of “economic docetism.” As Tom Beaudoin explains it, it represents the identification of our lives with the economic endeavor rather than the goal of justice. This involves “separating a brand from its production, the finished product from the human makers and material processes of its creation, the idea of a product from the human, bodily, earthly locations of the product’s production.”⁸

⁸ Tom Beaudoin, Ph.D., “The Cost of Economic Disciples: U.S. Christians and Global Capitalism,” Santa Clara Lecture, 8, 1 (Santa Clara, CA: Santa Clara University, 2001), 10.

6. A kind of consumerism that has become the new imperialism that is offered all on this globe. It involves a kind of colonizing of the mind that represents addictive dynamics that infect all in the family/household.
7. A desire to get the best for the least without considering who/what may be exploited in the process. This "Wal-Martization" of the economy finds all being seduced by its power. Only those willing to make a sacrifice of their resources for the sake of their brothers and sisters will be strong enough to be free of such seduction.
8. A sense of "entitlement." This attitude makes us think we have a right to whatever we want, from the perspective that we deserve it because we can pay for it, because our technology has enabled us to get it, or because our armaments will ensure that we can maintain it.
9. A fear that, if we do not control unlimited access to the resources we desire/need our survival and/or our security will be at stake. This fear is something advertisers and politicians play upon to the benefit of their markets and parties.
10. Psychic numbing. Returning to the gospel stories we find the one passage from the Hebrew scriptures that finds a place in all four gospels: the rational as to why Jesus' world would not convert: they have eyes to see and will not see and ears to hear but will not hear lest they understand in their hearts and turn and "I would heal them." Again, the material reality is more important than the "I" that is the "I am" represented in Jesus, the Christ.

The cooptation of the ethos of the United States by the branding "names" of globalizing forces has been discussed at some length;⁹ however the consequences on the inability of people of faith to understand how this invites them to personal and communal, much less collective and national conversion, has been less discussed.¹⁰ Nevertheless

⁹ Douglas Atkin, *The Culting of Brands: When Customers Become True Believers* (New York: Portfolio, 2004); Stephen L. Carter, *The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1993); James B. Twitchell, *Lead Us into Temptation: The Triumph of American Materialism* (New York: Columbia University, 1999).

¹⁰ I have discussed the difficulty of economic conversion from the lens of addiction theory in *The Dysfunctional Church: Addiction and Codependency in the Family of*

this is at the heart of the topic of "globalization and Catholic social teaching."

Only when people seek and find something more important (or, more clearly, *someone* more important), will they be willing to sell and buy another way of addressing the justice issues involved from the perspective of faith.

Catholicism (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria, 1991), 53-63 and *Spirituality of the Beatitudes: Matthew's Challenge to First World Christians* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1981), 62-73. A totally revised edition of this book will be available in 2005.