

**CSAN *Caritas in Veritate* Study Day 24<sup>th</sup> February 2010**  
**'The Human Person and the Meaning of Development'**  
**Rev. Dr. James Hanvey SJ**

I want to begin this exploration of what might be called the Christian anthropology that runs through the encyclical and by inviting you to undertake a mental exercise.

Exercise:

I'm sure everyone here will have come from working with people or groups or some particular situation. I want to invite you to think about that person, group or situation. Just try to think through the different elements of the problems that they face.

It may be about poverty in its multiple forms. It may involve some elements or degrees of deprivation: social or personal. Often connected with these things there is an element of isolation and despair. Very often there are levels of alienation. When individuals and groups face particular problems they will also experience that the social relationships that nourish and support them are weak or destroyed.

Where there is poverty or marginalisation, there is also powerlessness and diminishment: psychological as much as social. Along with this goes the loss of a social status and, perhaps, an erasure of public memory – our culture or society no longer sees or remembers them.

In the area where I live, in the centre of London, every day I see a surprising number of people who live or squat in the entrances to shops surrounded by sleeping bags or the few basic and useless things that they feel are still worth holding on to. Though I see them everyday, I am always amazed at how quickly I begin not to see them. Though aware of them as shadows I become oblivious to them as people. I refuse their claim upon me.

I think even in our social policies we can have a systematic erasure: we don't really begin to see these people; we see the problems, but not the people that are involved in them.

So, when you have that image of that person or that group in your mind, what begins to emerge? Their face or form becomes the text in which we can

read the multiple deprivations of poverty, alienation, deprivation or marginalisation. There's a loss of the sense of self and value. A loss of capacity: capacity to exercise freedom, capacity to build a life, capacity to play a role in society; a loss of freedom, of worth and of dignity.

All of these things will be familiar to you. It's important to hold that vision of that person or that group in your mind because it is a good prelude to reading the encyclical *Caritas in Veritate*. In a sense, I think the encyclical does this too. It has a vision of that person, carrying the burden of poverty embedded in it. It then holds up to us an alternative way of seeing that person and it is this alternative that I wish to explore.

### **The Mirror test: The Image of the Human Person.**

What it is to be human and the vision of the human person that that runs through the encyclical is my theme. This is not simply an exercise in utopian thinking. It is a profound challenge because it exposes our way of erasing or distorting the person either through poverty or the way in which we understand it. But the encyclical is not just a critical analysis of poverty and its consequences. These are already well explored and documented in so many different sources. More radically, it holds up for us a vision of the systems – social, financial, global – that can be created to nourish that human flourishing. In other words, it gives us no idealised and practically unattainable alternative, nor does it offer us an escape into the spiritual, but it sets an attainable task that can be accomplished now if we have the vision, passion and moral energy to do so.

Development in the encyclical means the capacities and the conditions for human flourishing. *Caritas in Veritate* can seem very complex, theoretical and perhaps abstract in many of its arguments – especially about the economy. I suspect this is because that aspect is often a little bit beyond our normal experience. Although, clearly, with the economic crisis of the last two years, we've become much more literate in the question of our economy. (Who among us knew about 'Quantitative Easing' before the crisis let alone understood it?) Yet, if we keep that image of the person or persons that we work for and those situations that we know well, in our minds, then we have the context that we need.

What I would like you to do you is to have that person or that group in your mind, and then see what image gradually emerges from our study of the encyclical. It's what I would call 'the mirror test'. As I have suggested, I believe that *Caritas in Veritate* hold a mirror up to us, and it's the mirror of

truth and love: the truth of its analysis, of the problems and deprivations that face societies. The truth that also exposes the false arguments and the deceptive, exploitative hopes that run round our culture. But it holds up a very positive mirror image as well. It's not just 'who we are' or the way in which, if you like, the image of the human person is eroded or defaced; it's also who we are in the light of God's truth and therefore 'who we can become' and the ways in which we're called, personally and socially, to help each other to become that person.

So, when we hold that mirror up, it ceases to be a condemnation – it becomes a liberation. It offers a new narrative of what it is to be human which is not a fairy story that will ultimately doom us all to disillusionment, but it is actually a picture or an image of the work that has to be done, the tasks that we have to undertake, one that we receive - whether we're Christian or not. It's a task that belongs to what is properly human.

### **Key Themes in The Encyclical:**

Let's just quickly look at the three big, dynamic themes that run through the encyclical in this regard. The first thing is, I think, that the encyclical presents us with a dynamic picture: it's not static, it sees us all in the process of becoming and it sees our cultures in the process of becoming. This is not like so many contemporary philosophies that argue the human person is self-made without any reference to God or to the significance of what is given – not just genetically but culturally. Rather it is about resisting a reductionist or a materialist interpretation of the human person and of human culture. It also about trying to map out that delicate but essential interplay of human freedom within the given of our existence. The way in which it does that is to develop a discourse about the 'gift of transcendence'. Ultimately, of course, that transcendence is our relationship to God, but it also has just a very deeply human expression. It's the recognition that we are all *more*; we're not just limited by our circumstances, our history, our economies – whatever those may be or whatever conditions they may impose upon us. Within all these determinants we are actually *more* than we are at any given moment. Often, we see this in terms of capacity or potential. But these are not just programmes within us with which we respond to variant in our circumstances. They are genuine modes of freedom – the way in which they come to be realised, shaping our lives and responses, shaping our histories and our cultures, are authentic expressions of our human decisions, visions, desires and choices. In this sense, the human person is always in the process of becoming and always has the capacity for surprise, for that which does not

follow directly the pattern of cause and effect. In some sense, too, it also entails unfolding of our being – physically and spiritually – and in this respect, they reveal an understanding of what it is to be human. Indeed, so much of the deep and critical cultural struggle of our time is precisely about what it means to be human. Whoever commands that question commands the exercise of our freedom and sets the conditions, possibilities and the limitations for its exercise.

That idea of transcendence introduces us to a particularly positive dynamic which also has a moral character to it, because it's not, if you like, a directionless 'more': it has a purpose and it has an end, so that we live by our histories but that we're not determined only by our biologies or our circumstances. When we begin to grasp these things then we can see that no matter how limited our situations are, no matter how constrained, we actually have a capacity for action – for becoming – within them. We are agents, even when severely restricted and our agency is also our power to claim our identity and place. In so much of our struggle against the deadening burden of poverty which can be a weight on the soul as well as the body, is helping people discover their own agency again. That is part of the transcendence, and it becomes very practical. It has consequences within the structures of our lives.

One of the great phrases that is used in this encyclical, which was also used in *Populorum Progressio*, is that we are 'artisans of our own destiny'. That gives us an enormous sense of our freedom but it gives a corresponding sense of our responsibility. The sort of society that we create is ours. Therefore, it is not only individuals that have moral choices to make; it is societies as well, about where the good lies, about what the good is in any given circumstance and deciding about the proper means for attaining it.

If, our societies and our cultures are things we create out of our own decisions. That means there is a really genuine future, and one of the really interesting features of this whole encyclical is, if you like, the orientation that it gives to human life, as not just something that is locked within a closed history, nor does it give us a sense of a future that is an empty future; it's a future that we are called to make. The future is there both as hope and as creative possibility which involves all our moral decisions. There is within the Encyclical, what I would call a 'realistic optimism' that runs through it. That's because our freedom – our capacity – is always ordered in truth and in love.

Entailed in all these themes, their inter-relatedness around the question of what it is to be human and what sort of culture gives it expression and

facilitates human flourishing, there are a number of ancillary arguments. For example, the link between truth and freedom is a major argument that runs through the teaching of John Paul II and is also part of the Magisterium of Benedict XVI. Contemporary culture does not naturally make this connection and it is part of the argument that the Church is having with our culture and its assumptions. It is one of the unstated beliefs of modern secular culture that freedom is absolute in such way that it is not bound by truth. The assumption, here, is that freedom to be genuine must be completely unrestricted. So, what *I* mean by freedom is to *do* what ever I want, *whenever* I want, *however* I want. Indeed, truth in so far as it is an expression, not a condition, of my freedom – becomes ‘my’ truth. (This is why relativism looks like a condition for freedom). Now that's an extreme characterisation, but you can find versions of it running through our culture, and that's what is often meant by 'autonomy', the prize of a late modern culture.

The Church also upholds freedom because unless we human beings are free we cannot be properly moral agents; nor can we have a proper relationship to God or to each other. But that freedom is not an unstructured or unordered freedom. It's a freedom that is always ordered to truth and that means that freedom is always recognised as an intersubjective reality; that my freedom isn't just a stand-alone thing. If it is only that, then the world, the environment and other people simply become instruments through which *I* achieve *my* freedom. The exercise of such freedom effectively instrumentalises others and the created world with all its resources. If freedom is genuinely ordered to the truth, then I have to accept that my freedom has a legitimate limitation. This truth is not diminished to my self-expression, but is something which has an objective character in that its not dependent or determined solely by me. It is a truth in which I am invited to participate and express but it is not one of which I am the inventor. With this truth, I also recognise that other people can claim it and, indeed, claim to have a deeper knowledge and understanding of it than I may have. The ‘objective’ quality of this truth is also the condition of its accessibility – it is an open truth and in sense is the possibility of genuine democracy of truth. It's accessibility is also the way in which it can create and carry community. Hence I am limited and shaped by the truth, and, not just my truth, but the borne by other people with whom I live and whom I need. So freedom is always a relational reality.

Now very often our culture doesn't see that and that's why, for instance, Cardinal Ratzinger in an article or in an essay on freedom and truth, will analyse this notion of freedom as *freedom from* and *freedom for*. So it's a liberation, but it's a liberation for a purpose with responsibilities. And he'll

push that a little bit further to embed it properly in a Christian anthropology; so we're made in the image and likeness of God - we know from our Christian revelation that God is Trinity, so we must in some sense embody in ourselves and in our relationships that image, that Trinitarian image of God. The way in which Cardinal Ratzinger will see this is that the Father is the Being *for*, the Son is the Being *from* and the Spirit is the Being *with*. Those are all modalities and dimensions of our freedom.

Our freedom *for* is whatever needs to be done for others. Our freedom *from* - not just in the negative sense of freedom from that which restricts us - but a *freedom from* which means a freedom that we *receive from others*. This is a very important element: I don't create my own freedom; I live the freedom that I have been given by others, a freedom that has been created for me; a freedom that I have been given in, through and for society. And that's not just in terms of the rules and regulations and the laws, and the space that I am given: it's the way in which I am formed morally and through that, the way in which I learn about who I am. All of that is embedded in my culture so I *receive* from others this gift of freedom.

The third dimension of that freedom is *freedom to be with*: the freedom to accompany others in their freedoms; the freedom to work for them. This is a real social freedom which not only builds personal relationships. It is the basis of a civil society and relationships within it which are not solely about utility.

We have here a very rich understanding of freedom which I think is very critical for the sort of debates that we are having at the moment in our own culture: what I would call a 'situated freedom'. It is, as Cardinal Ratzinger would say, 'ordered as a coexistence of liberties' in justice, rights and responsibilities. So I respect other people's freedoms and liberties, but there's also a necessary and legitimate constraint that I, therefore, enter into because I am a genuinely social person. That means that I acquire rights and also responsibilities. These derive not only from the fundamental obligations that I have to myself i.e. the preservation of life but also from my social nature which is also intrinsic to my being. That acquiring of responsibilities means that I am a genuinely social person and that's, if you like, my *pass* into society: taking responsibility for what I do but also for others as well. That links profoundly with love, because love orders us to the truth but also places us in relationship. Love is the maximising of our freedom because love allows us to go beyond the self to seek the good of the other. This means that love is a creative 'We'; it's the creative element of building a family, a relationship, a society, a culture - whatever that is. That creative 'We' involves the greatest

freedom of all, from our Christian perspective, which is the freedom of self-gift. So rather than the freedom to take, it's the freedom to give. (It may be that when this freedom is realised that we are at our most fulfilled. Thus happiness is not secured in taking but in giving.) If we're genuinely involved in creating a culture of freedom then we must also form people and give them the opportunities for that self-giving.

I think this may be a way into one of the key themes of the Encyclical, namely, gratuity. It may be that the reality of gratuity has been underestimated in our culture: it's that ability to people to give *beyond* what is asked. Now that works very personally because we do it all the time in our relationships and our families. You know, however, that none of your organisations would work properly if people only worked strictly by the clock and by the contract. Because we are in relationships and because we care about what we do, we give *more*. Our society, if you like, only works because of that gratuity and it needs to be honoured and recognised.

Society itself requires it. If we all simply lived in our houses watching our DVDs and confined ourselves purely to the net, what a deprived society we would be! We would be a society of monads; in complete isolation. In other words, our humanity would be impoverished and diminished. As I've observed, gratuity becomes a structural reality in civil society and that's why consistently in its social teaching - right from the very beginning - the Church has always focused on the need to protect and to nourish civil society.

And where is civil society to be found? Primarily in the family and in the free association of peoples in the service of others: particularly religious freedom. So, that's why, when we look at the anthropology in this encyclical, it's always related to truth and to love because those are the dimensions of transcendence in which we are called to live. They map out for us the moral and ethical dimensions of our human life. In this context we can begin to see how it might be that every person has, what we could call, a *vocation*, a purpose. That means that we have a task which is more than simply the work that we do. Once we have understood that society is not simply a utilitarian contract between individuals, but is a necessary part of what it means to be human and the context and condition for human fulfilment and flourishing, then 'task' takes on a deeper meaning. It must entail building a culture and a future for others. That links, I think, to the intergenerational justice that the Encyclical speaks about in relation to the environment. But that intergenerational justice isn't just about the environment; it's about the sort of society that we build for the future for our children.

So that's the second dynamic element. The third flows from the insight that we are constituted as persons in our social capacity – our capacity for others. That is that we are human in relation to others. We are made as social beings. The 'I' is only possible because of a 'We' and we only flourish when we create and sustain this relationality. This isn't just a Christian insight, this is a very ancient insight. When Aristotle - in his *Politics* - talks about relationality he actually says that having relationships, having friendships, is not just a nice 'add-on' to being human. It is part of the essence of who we are. So our relationality, our sociality - society itself – is part of what we need to fulfil our own essence as human beings. This isn't just purely a utilitarian pragmatism which you find in various social contract theories of society: I'm not just entering into this relationship with you because I need your goods or I need you to protect me. I *actually* need you. So it's much deeper than that.

Again we see the Church in these Encyclicals - not just *Caritas in Veritate*, but in all the previous Encyclicals – developing quite a strong critique of a limited and diminished understanding of what society is in these relationships. If, therefore, to be fully human we need others while it must include the family it must also go beyond it. Part of the 'task' is creating a society which recognises this significant reality of what it is to be human. Insofar as we need others, therefore, we are back to the theme of responsibility for others again, and that works not just personally but also institutionally. Our institutions must also embody this sense of responsibility. When we come to look at the person, we always see that person in relation. It's the fracture of these relationships, or the ways in which they are obstructed, that will impoverish and diminish us, and diminish our culture. So, the purpose of society and the decisions that we make - the 'goods' that we seek in society – has to be the right ordering of our institutions and of our laws – in justice and in truth – for the good of those relationships.

You can see what happens when we reverse this. If we have bad laws, if the economy is there only to serve profit, you can see what happens in to society. It may be a very affluent culture in the end, but, actually, we all lose out in some way. Today there's the whole debate about the loss of social capital. But this is much deeper debate than it appears, because it is also to do with the loss what it is to be genuinely human.

If we have begun to understand the essentially social nature of the human person then the other essential dimension is the spiritual. The reason for that is not, you know, '*Oh well he's the Pope – he would say that wouldn't he*', it's

actually a recognition that no state, no culture can take over the human person. Again the human person is always more than any state or metaphysical theory can actually articulate or allow him or her to be. This 'resistance' is rooted in the spiritual nature that belongs to every human being. The emphasis on the spiritual is not just a religious one ; what it's doing is again part of a defence against a reductivism which holds that the human person is only a collection of biological matter. Once we begin to do that then we begin to lose our essential freedoms because, if that's all that we are, then any culture can take that away from us, and what a culture will do then is to instrumentalise the human person. So the emphasis on the spiritual here is, in fact, a profound way of resisting any instrumentalisation of the person, judging of them purely by their economic status, their physical or intellectual capacity or their particular value, at any given moment, to a situation or to a culture.

This is a resistance to what I would call a 'vampirism', which we see in all our systems, which uses and traps people and takes their life away in some ways. So part of what we're engaged in, by insisting that there's this spiritual dimension to the person, is a fundamental act of resistance. It simply means that the human person doesn't live by bread alone but is somehow always related and receives the gift of themselves and the gift of their life from God - whether they recognise it or not. This is important because this is actually a critical reason why the Church has to be involved in the public space and can't be simply marginalised to the purely private realm. The Church is there precisely to *uphold* that value of the human person, and to defend us all - whether we have faith or not - against this reductivism. That's the Church's understanding of what is at stake. In all the recent social Encyclicals there have been various analyses of communism and capitalism. Again, these represent a sort of vampirism underpinned by a reductivist, utilitarian understanding of the human person. Often these ideologies try to advance their cause by an appeal to freedom which they hold that they represent and secure. That's why under John Paul II, religious freedom is so important. He would recognise the right to religious freedom as one of *the* principle core rights precisely because it recognises the spiritual constitution of the human person and protects both what it is to be human and the conditions for realising it.

If we wanted an example we might look at the first commandment - 'You shall have no other god's but me.' This looks like a restriction on freedom, but it is not a commandment of servitude as others might see it. It's the

relationship of truth to love that Israel, and *every* person in Israel, has; it's a right of election, covenant and mission. The first commandment that there is only one God is a liberation from all false gods that bind us. That we should love God alone, is our adherence to the most fundamental and sovereign truth; it is the great charter of our human freedom. It is only God who can ultimately guarantee our humanity; he's the one that has made us in His image and constituted us in relationship to himself. It's therefore God who guarantees our dignity and our future. So, in this sense too, the Incarnation is, if you like, the great guarantee, not only of what it is to be human, but of what it is to be *free and human*.

Here, the truth of revelation is not some obscure, incomprehensible myth, but the only truth that we can rely on. Governments can change policies, new philosophies will come and go, but because we're given this in revelation, we have a fixed point which can't be eroded. This is the truth, then, that grants all others, and without it, I would argue, the person is victim to any image. Not only is there a basic instability about the securing of rights, states and cultures can choose to create us in their own image and for their own purpose. If we give to any state or culture the power to tell us who we are then, of course, they can shape us, take away those rights, take away *that* image, and therefore we all become vulnerable. Therefore, the *imago dei* in every the human person is the ground of all rights: it's the one way in which Christianity can offer to secure the rights and the dignity of all peoples. Because it carries this truth, can genuinely call our cultures, as well as individuals, to that responsibility to honour that image wherever we find it.

So, those are the three great dynamics that I think run through the Encyclical. You'll see, then, that there is a relational structure.

When you take that image of the human person and then you trace the way in which all the relationships inform that. We have to see them in a dynamic way: all these relationships which are both personal and social and structural. So, for instance, we look at the great systems of our culture - the economy, the law, the welfare state systems - we have to see that when we come to judge them and when we come to judge decisions about them, and to shape them the Encyclical invites us to judge from the impact that these structures have the human. In what way do they set up, nourish, support or damage that life-giving and life-creating nexus of relationships which are critical to human flourishing.

The Encyclical invites us to start looking in a holistic way not in a dissected way. We know that when we refuse to do that - when we refuse to try and get a sense of the whole - then what happens is, even though our decisions may be good, they become partial answers and solutions which often don't work but distort. The key theme here is that each relationship must serve what is a genuine human good and it is, if you like, a *value reversal* that we're invited to in our decision making. You'll see this in all the chapters that run through the Encyclical: what is it that really marks out a proper economic system? It's a system which serves human beings and human society rather than the reverse. The governing principle asserted in the Encyclical is that the human person is never a means to an end but a genuine end in his or herself. It's the human good that becomes the clear criteria.

This principle is well grounded theologically and philosophically. It runs from *Gaudium et Spes*, through *Populorum Progressio* and through other Encyclicals prior to *Caritas in Veritate*, especially *Sollitudo Rei Solitariae* by John Paul II. This whole idea of integral human development is also rooted in the thought of some key French thinkers: Jacques Maritain in particular, and Emmanuel Mounier. They developed this idea of an 'integral humanism' in the thirties because they were convinced that there is a profound crisis in our civilisation. They felt there was a real need to develop a response to that - to develop a robust Christian humanism. And that's the thought that is drawn upon by *Populorum Progressio* and still runs through in *Caritas in Veritate*.

Love of persons and a willingness to sacrifice oneself for the good of the other is a key principle that they are arguing for. In the words of Maritain, if we are only focused on man, without this idea of transcendence, then what is produced is an 'inhuman humanism'. You'll see that phrase used in *Populorum Progressio* and it's repeated again in *Caritas in Veritate*. "A humanism closed off from the other realities becomes inhuman" (§78). Maritain develops a framework for a new humanistic economics and society and politics. He wanted to give sufficient strength to the state to curb the anarchism of capitalism, but he wanted it to be balanced by the defence of a private life, especially the family, for these support the genuine domains of freedom: what *Caritas in Veritate* calls 'civil society'. You can see that this image of a pluralist democracy is also, I think, embedded in the papal teaching because it's a way of recognising the diversity and the richness of our human society and culture.

The great themes of Catholic social teaching are also related to this: the common good, solidarity and subsidiarity. What we're given here is a vision of what it is to be human in a very dynamic, creative and responsive way. But

it's also a vision of a dynamic society. Yet, it is not prescriptive or utopian. Society is a project that we are engaged upon. We don't know the final shape it will take, but we can work with principles of moral behaviour which allow us to shape the goods that we want to seek. At the heart, is a vision of the human person in his or her completeness. All the dimensions of human flourishing are recognised and attended to, but there's also a vision that our intersubjectivity is a gift and not a burden, so that the relationships *I* have are in fact enrichments that *I* can take on; they are not things than limit me or diminish me.

There are key principles set out and I'll just quickly run through the seven of them that I would recognise - remembering that human development is about human flourishing in all its dimensions . So what would be the key principles?

First of all the respect for life. Life is not something we create; it's the gift that we receive and it's cherishing that gift at all its different levels and at all its different stages.

Second, there's the basic conditions that we need for living: the conditions of food and natural resources; and it's part and parcel of our culture to see that there's a just and equitable distribution of them. This becomes more important as we look at the big demographic shifts that are going on. If you look at the size of populations, we're shifting now to India, to Asia, to China – that's a huge demographic shift and that will have an impact upon us, not just economically, but socially and culturally as well. There's also a huge movement into cities, so we need to consider very deeply how our cities function and how resources are used within our cities.

Third, the key question that we're all concerned about is the ageing of our populations, and how that impacts upon resources. So this vision of the human person- this holistic vision of the human person – I think becomes very pressing when we come to figure out these challenges.

Fourth, another question that arises is human knowledge: none of us can grow or flourish unless we have access to knowledge and I think that the Encyclical has a key insight in recognising that and speaking about it.

Fifth, are basic rights which are always tied to our responsibilities. I think that Catholic social teaching offers a very balanced understanding of rights

and responsibilities which calls us to be genuine citizens that build a society – not just claiming rights, but also taking our responsibilities. Then the focus is there too on the need to nourish a genuine civic society: those realms of our real personal life which have to be respected by the state.

Sixth, which Mary (Colwell) will take up, the relation that we have to the environment, because, without this world we wouldn't exist. From a theological point of view, the Incarnation presupposes creation: God never instrumentalises his creation.

And the seventh element is the need to construct ethical cultures within these respective systems. So I think from that one perspective of trying to see the whole person we begin to tease out in all these dimensions how that vision applies and how it can be worked out.

To conclude, I want to return to the image with which I started - the image you have of that person or that group. I want you to think, 'Ok that's how I saw them in their difficulties - in their diminished relationships'. Now look at the image that we have to present. We begin to see that our Catholic teaching is not, if you like, an oppressive element of our lives. It's a liberating vision. And more than that – it's not simply a naïve utopianism, it's a real call to say: 'We can help people to realise this flourishing and this wholeness. We recognise that it's not the Kingdom - *that* belongs purely and solely to God in his time. But if we can work for this; if we can maximise people's capacities; if we can see them in this wholeness; if we can give them back that genuine sense of freedom and of being a real agent within society and in their own lives, then surely the Kingdom *is* already present. It's already present and changing us because it's giving us the power to do what we thought we couldn't do'. In other words, that person is present to us and that person becomes Christ to us.

The Encyclical ends of a tremendous note of hope and of encouragement because all of this is a task that we are called to do – it's a vocation that we have. So I'll finish on that. This is from the last section of *Caritas in Veritate*:

“Awareness of God's undying love sustains us in our laborious and stimulating work for justice and the development of peoples amid successes and failures. In the ceaseless pursuit of a just ordering of human affairs, God's love calls us to move beyond the limited and the ephemeral. It gives us the courage to continue seeking and working for the benefit of all. Even if this

cannot be achieved immediately and if what we are able to achieve, alongside political authorities and those working in the field of economics, is always less than we would wish it to be, God gives us the strength to fight and to suffer for love of the common good because he is our All, he is our greatest hope”.

James Hanvey SJ