

Structures of Grace: Catholic Nongovernmental Organizations and the Mission of the Church

Author: Kevin Joachim Ahern

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104378>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2013

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Boston College

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

Department of Theology

STRUCTURES OF GRACE:
CATHOLIC NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
AND THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

A Dissertation

by

KEVIN J. AHERN

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2013

© copyright by KEVIN J. AHERN

2013

Structures of Grace: Catholic Nongovernmental Organizations and the Mission of the Church

By Kevin J. Ahern

Director: David Hollenbach, SJ

Abstract

Transnational Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are among the most active agents in the promotion of the global common good as they seek to overcome the structures of sin that divide the human family. This dissertation investigates the theological and ethical significance of Catholic NGOs by developing a critical framework that uncovers the relationship between these organizations and the church's mission. Part One considers the global context and theoretical foundations of Catholic NGO action by examining social scientific literature (Chapter One) and modern Catholic teaching on the relationship between mission and justice (Chapter Two). Part Two places the theoretical foundations into dialogue with two case studies—the International Movement of Catholic Students-Pax Romana (Chapter Three) and the Jesuit Refugee Service (Chapter Four).

This critical investigation of both theory and praxis illuminates several missiological, pneumatological, and ethical conclusions that are addressed in the final part (Chapter Five). This dissertation asserts three conclusions regarding the theological significance of Catholic NGOs. First, in contrast to some interpretations of the role of the church in the world, the actions of Catholic NGOs for the global common good are an integral part of the church's mission. Second, these organizations can be described as structures of grace as they embody charity and charism in their efforts to overcome the divisive effects of structural sin. Finally, a more robust awareness of the theological dimensions of their work can aid these and other organizations respond more effectively and ethically to the demands of the global common good today.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	p. iv
Frequently Used Acronyms.....	p. v
Introduction.....	p. 1
I. Catholic Organizations and the Global Common Good	p. 1
II. Argument and Chapter Outline.....	p. 4
A. Part One: Context, Resistance, and Theological Foundations.....	p. 4
B. Part Two: Case Studies.....	p. 6
C. Part Three: Constructive Conclusions	p. 8

Part One Context, Resistance, and Theological Foundations

Chapter One: Catholic Political Action in a Globalized World.....	p. 11
I. NGOs and the Erosion of Absolute State Sovereignty.....	p. 12
A. Non-State Actors in the Context of Globalization.....	p. 13
B. Transnational Nongovernmental Organizations.....	p. 16
C. The Historical Emergence of Transnational NGOs	p. 18
D. Formal Status for NGOs in the Intergovernmental System	p. 21
E. Four Primary Functions of Transnational NGOs.....	p. 26
F. Analytical Frameworks to Understand the Role of NGOs	p. 32
II. Catholic NGOs in the Global Public Square	p. 39
A. Transnational Religious Actors.....	p. 43
B. The Catholic Church as a Transnational Actor for the Global Common Good.....	p. 44
C. The Catholic Church and Global Governance	p. 45
D. The Holy See.....	p. 47
E. Catholic Nongovernmental Organizations	p. 50
F. Diversity with the Catholic NGO Community.....	p. 53
III. Resistance to the Public Engagement of Catholic NGOs.....	p. 57
Conclusion.....	p. 62

Chapter Two: Modern Roman Catholic Foundations for Socio-Political

Action.....	p. 66
I. The Second Vatican Council and the Renewal of Mission.....	p. 71
A. The Church in History	p. 71
B. The Church as a Sign and Instrument	p. 77
C. The Church as the People of God	p. 80
D. Renewed Vision of Religious Life.....	p. 85
E. Autonomy of the Political.....	p. 89

F.	A Holistic Vision of Mission	p. 93
II.	Postconciliar Social Teaching on Mission and Justice.....	p. 94
A.	Pope Paul VI and the 1971 Synod of Bishops	p. 97
B.	Pope John Paul II	p. 107
C.	Pope Benedict XVI	p. 115
III.	Reclaiming the Council’s Integral Vision of Mission.....	p. 127
	Conclusion	p. 130

Part Two: Case Studies

Chapter Three: The International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana) p. 135

I.	The Mission of the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana).....	p. 138
A.	Catholic Action and the Christendom Model (1880s-1930s)	p. 140
B.	A New Christendom Approach (1930s-1950s)	p. 146
C.	Distinction of Planes (1950s-1960s)	p. 153
D.	Integral Liberation (1965-Present).....	p. 156
E.	The Mission of IMCS Today and its Underlying Theology	p. 162
II.	IMCS as a Transnational NGO.....	p. 166
A.	IMCS and International Advocacy	p. 167
B.	IMCS and Global Formation	p. 179
III.	IMCS and the Mission of the Church	p. 184
	Conclusion	p. 191

Chapter Four: Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)..... p. 194

I.	The Mission of Jesuit Refugee Service.....	p. 196
A.	The Society of Jesus After the Second Vatican Council	p. 197
B.	Pedro Arrupe and the Foundation of Jesuit Refugee Service.....	p. 207
C.	The Development of JRS	p. 212
D.	A Threefold Mission	p. 216
II.	Jesuit Refugee Service as a Transnational NGO	p. 228
A.	Operational Program Implementation	p. 228
B.	Analysis and Research.....	p. 235
C.	Advocacy on Behalf of Refugees	p. 237
D.	Justice and the Work of JRS.....	p. 244
III.	Jesuit Refugee Service and the Mission of the Church	p. 249
A.	Areas of Resistance to JRS Action for Justice	p. 250
B.	JRS and the Church’s Mission With Migrants	p. 255
C.	JRS’s Work for Justice as Rooted in the JRS Jesuit Mission and Ignatian Charism (GC 35)	p. 261
	Conclusion	p. 265

Part Three: Conclusions

Chapter Five: The Theological Significance of Catholic NGOs p. 269

- I. Catholic NGOs and the Mission of the Church..... p. 271
- II. Structures of Grace p. 277
 - A. Structures of Grace in Actions Against Structural Sin..... p. 278
 - B. Structures of Solidarity and Charity p. 285
 - C. Structural Embodiments of Charisms p. 288
 - D. Toward a Theology of Social Grace..... p. 292
- III. Criteria for Ethical Discernment p. 295
 - A. Mission and Institution..... p. 296
 - B. Unity and Uniformity p. 299
 - C. Cooperation and Competition p. 301
 - D. Horizontalism and Verticalism p. 304
- IV. Bold Humility in Mission p. 306

**Appendix: List of Transnational Catholic NGOs in Relationship with the
United Nations and Other Intergovernmental Organizations..... p. 309**

Bibliography..... p. 314

Acknowledgements

As with most works in theological ethics, this project is a result of many hours of conversation and exploration in a community of learning. I am profoundly grateful to all those who have supported and guided me in this process. I owe a great debt to my director, David Hollenbach and to my readers Lisa Sowle Cahill and Thomas Massaro. Not only have they generously supported me in this project, but they also model for me what it means to be a theological ethicist. I want to also thank the other students and faculty members who have given valuable input on my work in the Boston College ethics seminar over the years including, Kenneth Himes, James Keenan, Maryanne Loughry, Stephen Pope, Andrea Vicini, Grégoire Catta, Michael Jaycox, Megan McCabe, René Micallef, Jill O'Brien, and Gonzalo Villagrán. Thank you also to John Barker, Benjamin Durham, Bradford Hinze, Elizabeth Johnson, Mark Massa, David Turnbloom, Daniel Villanueva, Katherine Greiner and all those whose wisdom has enriched my work. I am grateful to all the supportive staff at Boston College, especially Gail Rider.

My scholarship and research would not have been possible without the support of many wonderful friends and communities. I particularly would like to express my deepest gratitude Beth Glauber Ahern for her constant encouragement and inspiration. Thank you also to my parents, John and Clare Ahern and my siblings, Shawn and Zoe, for the many years of support and care.

I am also deeply grateful to all those in the Newman House for many hours of conversation, community and baked goods including Christopher Conway, John Edwards, Erika Meyer, Stephen Okey, Rob Brodrick, and Nicole Reibe. I have been privileged to study alongside and live in community with two of my oldest friends and dialogue partners Meghan Clark and Nichole Flores Henry. Amanda Osheim deserves special recognition for the many hours of conversation on the relationship between ecclesiology and ethics.

I am grateful to the support from my friends in social action movements, including Michelle Sardone, Zobel Behalal, Mike Deeb, Margareta Lemon, Chris Malano, Luis Maria Goicoechea, and Javier Iguiniz. Bishop Peter Rosazza remains a source of inspiration to me as I reflect on the role of justice in the church's mission.

Thank you also to the members of my faith sharing community, those who participated in the Murray Circle, the staff of the Church in the 21st Century Center and the students and faculty at Blessed John XXIII National Seminary and the BC School of Theology and Ministry.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to all those involved in working for social transformation through Catholic NGOs. I would particularly like to thank the women and men involved in the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana) and the Jesuit Refugee Service. Their transformative witness to the gospel is the inspiration for this project.

Frequently Used Acronyms

CELAM	Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano
CIC	<i>Codex Iuris Canonici</i> (1983 Code of Canon Law)
CICO	Conference of International Catholic Organizations
DPI	UN Department of Public Information
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
GC	General Congregation of the Society of Jesus
ICO	International Catholic Organization
ICMICA	International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs (Pax Romana)
ICMYO	International Coordination Meeting of Youth Organizations
IGO	Intergovernmental organizations
ILO	International Labor Organization
IMCS	International Movement of Catholic Students (Pax Romana)
IYCS	International Young Catholic Students
JECI	Jeunesse Etudiante Catholique Internationale
JRS	Jesuit Refugee Service
MIEC	Mouvement International d'Etudiants Catholiques (Pax Romana)
MIIC	Mouvement International des Intellectuels Catholiques (Pax Romana)
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WSCF	World Student Christian Federation
YCW	Young Christian Workers
YEN	Youth Employment Network

Introduction

I. CATHOLIC ORGANIZATIONS AND THE GLOBAL COMMON GOOD

Fifty years ago, Blessed John XXIII called attention to moral dimensions of global interdependence in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*. Taking note of the growing interdependence of the world, the text called upon all people of good will, and Roman Catholics in particular, to “take an active part in public life and to contribute toward the attainment of the common good of the entire human family.”¹

In the five decades since Pope John issued this call in *Pacem in Terris*, the church has responded to the demands of the universal common good through several modes of action. The personal and often heroic witness of individual Catholics such as Dorothy Day, Oscar Romero, Julius Kambarage Nyerere, and Mother Teresa of Calcutta often capture popular imagination. In the Roman Catholic tradition, social engagement is not something limited to a small group of extraordinary and saintly individuals. All Catholics are called to contribute to the common good and respond to the social demands of the gospel as “faithful citizens” throughout their lives.²

The social and public engagement of the church, however, does not stop at the individual level alone. The Catholic tradition has long recognized the collective and institutional role of the church in society, which takes different forms in different contexts. John Coleman constructively identifies the strengths and limits of two forms of

¹ John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris, Peace on Earth* (1963), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), no. 146.

² See United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Forming Consciences for Faithful Citizenship: A Call to Political Responsibility from the Catholic Bishops of the United States*. (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2007) and David Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

public ecclesial engagement; both of which are necessary in the context of globalization. One form of response that often gets the most attention by scholars and activists is the formal and institutional efforts by church officials. These include official Catholic social teaching, high level diplomatic interventions by the Holy See at the United Nations, and advocacy campaigns by national and regional episcopal conferences.

While important, the formal institutional actions of the church, as Coleman writes, “will not be sufficient to fulfill the Gospel mandate for justice.” The institutional action on the part of the church and the personal action of Christians must also be accompanied by an additional form of social engagement, what Coleman describes as:

para-ecclesial groups. The nomenclature is meant to stress that they do not represent the institutional Church. Nevertheless, they are a full part of the ecclesial reality and mission of the Church. For the Church has never failed to engender in its midst voluntary associations of committed Christians and community groups who are moved to join directly the concrete struggle of people at the neighborhood, urban, regional, national, and international level.³

Coleman has certainly not been alone in his efforts to draw more attention to these “para-ecclesial” actors. Jonathan Boswell, for example, laments the “relegation” of the insights of these groups to the “margins, in terms of both historical understanding and continuing roles, as compared with the official teaching of the *magisterium*.”⁴ In response, he calls for greater power sharing within the church through the recognition of social groups as “Catholic non-official social teaching (CNOST).” In a similar tone, Gordon Zahn has highlighted the role played by Catholic social movements as

³ John A. Coleman, *An American Strategic Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 31–32.

⁴ Jonathan Boswell, “Solidarity, Justice and Power Sharing: Patterns and Policies,” in *Catholic Social Thought: Twilight or Renaissance?*, ed. Francis P. McHugh, Johan Verstraeten, and Jonathan Boswell, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 157 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 95.

embodiments of “Catholic social thought from below.”⁵ Kristen Heyer’s critical analysis of the theology behind the social engagement of three different national Catholic organizations in the United States also helps to shed light on the role of such Catholic organizations in shaping the common good.⁶

Despite these recent efforts to draw attention to the role played by non-hierarchical organizations and structures, the contribution of such organizations to the global common good is still not yet fully appreciated, including by some inside the organizations themselves, as a vital part of the church’s mission in the world. A more robust theological analysis of those organizations that occupy intermediary roles between the individual believer and the formal institutional/episcopal structures of the church is needed. This dissertation seeks to develop a framework to better understand the theological significance of non-magisterial Catholic organizations and social movements by focusing on the specific contributions of transnational Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).⁷

In the context of globalization, non-state actors are playing an increasingly important role in public life. Among these actors, Catholic NGOs are some of the most active agents in promoting the global common good as they seek to overcome the structures of sin that divide the human family. At present, there are more than 120 Catholic organizations formally accredited to intergovernmental institutions. While often operating behind the scenes, these and other groups are shaping public discourse on key

⁵ Gordon C. Zahn, “Social Movements and Catholic Social Thought,” in *One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Thought: Celebration and Challenge*, ed. John A. Coleman (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 53.

⁶ Kristin E. Heyer, *Prophetic & Public: The Social Witness of U.S. Catholicism*, Moral Traditions Series (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006).

⁷ For many of these organizations there are striking parallels between how they function as non-hierarchical structures within the church and their role as non-governmental organizations within civil society.

issues from humanitarian relief and development aid to labor standards and human rights law. In light of this experience, what is the relationship between the collective action for justice of NGOs and the mission of the church? Put in another way, do non-magisterial Christian organizations act as church in their public engagement for the global common good? If yes, then how should this awareness of ecclesial identity impact their discernment of how best to pursue that mission?

II. ARGUMENT AND CHAPTER OUTLINE

In response to this question, this dissertation argues that the public work of transnational Catholic NGOs for the global common good is an integral part of the church's mission in the world. To this end, this project develops a critical framework that uncovers the relationship between Catholic NGOs and the church's mission by placing the experiences of organizations in the present global context into a critical dialogue with both the modern Catholic tradition and social scientific literature on the role of NGOs and religious actors in international public life. This project does this in three principle steps.

A. Part One: Context, Resistance, and Theological Foundations

The dissertation begins by surveying the present global context in which transnational Catholic NGOs are operative. Chapter One explores how the actions of these and other faith-based organizations on the world stage are challenging two fundamental tenets of modern international relations.

On the one hand, NGOs along with other non-state actors are testing notions of absolute state sovereignty in their roles of advocacy, analysis, formation, and operational

program implementation. Drawing particularly on the work of Anne-Marie Slaughter, Thomas Weiss, John Paul Lederach and Margaret Keck, the first chapter situates the role of NGOs in the developing web of institutional and political relationships that define the world today.

On the other hand, Catholic NGOs and other faith-based groups are challenging a second dimension of modern international relations, the notion that religion should be relegated to private sphere. In dialogue with the work of Cynthia Sampson, Eva Bellin, José Casanova and R. Scott Appleby, the second half of Chapter One critically considers the public role of religious organizations, and transnational Catholic NGOs in particular.

After examining the broad context of religious actors within civil society, Chapter Two identifies the modern theological foundations that motivate and frame the actions of these organizations for the global common good. Detailing the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and its postconciliar reception, this chapter examines the different and somewhat conflicting visions of the relationship between justice and mission. The understanding of mission that is present throughout the texts of Vatican II is complex and multifaceted. Taken as a whole, Vatican II offers an integral or holistic vision of mission, which includes, but is not limited to, collective action for justice.

A close reading of postconciliar Catholic social and missiological teaching reveals different responses and approaches to the question posed by this dissertation. While some magisterial texts situate the collective action for justice of Christian organizations within the mission of the church, others downplay this aspect by emphasizing that it is not the role of the church to work directly for social transformation.

After a critical analysis of these magisterial texts, Chapter Two examines the framework of mission proposed by Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder. Drawing heavily from Vatican II and the teachings of Paul VI and John Paul II, this model constructively situates the collective action for justice on the part of Christian communities within the mission of the church. At the same time, this approach to mission helps to remind Catholic NGOs that they must be attentive to the dangers of reducing mission only to social transformation.

B. Part Two: Case Studies

After considering the broad context and theological foundations of Catholic NGO action, the second part of this dissertation positions the political and theological theories outlined above in constructive dialogue with praxis and experience in two different case studies. The study of two distinct organizations, the International Movement of Catholic Students (Chapter Three) and Jesuit Refugee Service (Chapter Four) illuminates experiences shared by other transnational Catholic NGOs. Each chapter examines the specific mission of the organization; the expression of that mission in promotion of the global common good; and the relationship between the organization and the wider mission of the church.

Founded as a student peace confederation after World War I, the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana) is one of the oldest transnational Catholic NGOs to officially engage global political institutions.⁸ Although IMCS had been formally accredited to international institutions since the 1920s, the teachings of the

⁸ In the interest of full disclosure, I served as a member of the IMCS International Team from 2003 to 2007.

Second Vatican Council and the understanding of mission taught by the 1971 World Synod of Bishops inspired the organization to adopt a more theological understanding of its international advocacy work and the values of justice, integral education, and youth participation.

More recently, IMCS has been a leading voice in the development of global youth policy and has been asked by the United Nations and other agencies to spearhead efforts on youth employment and intercultural dialogue. In addition to its work with the international institutions, IMCS works to empower and support its national member associations to work for justice and peace in their own contexts. While its proactive efforts aimed at social transformation have not been welcome by all in the church, IMCS understands its social commitments to be an integral part of its mission of evangelization within the university world.

With a different structure, spirituality and focus, the second case study shares many of the same concerns as the first. Like IMCS and other lay NGOs, the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) understands its work of accompaniment, advocacy and service with the forcibly displaced to be part of its mission as an apostolic body. As with IMCS, the Society of Jesus as a whole redefined its own specific mission following Vatican II to include a strong concern for justice. The 32nd General Congregation of the Jesuits in 1974-75 famously defined this mission as “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement.”⁹

⁹ General Congregation 32, *Decree 4: Our Mission Today: The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), 298–316.

Soon after articulating this understanding of mission, JRS was created as an apostolic response to the growing reality of refugees around the world. Unlike other humanitarian agencies that claim to abide by a strict policy of neutrality, JRS follows the Jesuit commitment to justice in its advocacy, service, and accompaniment. For JRS, its work cannot stop at providing important educational and humanitarian assistance to refugees. It must also act to address the root causes of forced displacement and speak out on behalf of the forcibly displaced within the international institutions.

Like IMCS, the Jesuit commitment to justice was not welcome by all in the community. Some Jesuits shared Pope John Paul II's concerns that the commitments to justice within the Society would move it away from its more authentic spiritual and educational mission. Despite the resistance to their efforts at social transformation, both organizations highlighted in this section insist that their actions for justice are integral to their missions as apostolic church organizations.

C. Part Three: Constructive Conclusions

Building upon the critical dialogue between the experiences of NGOs today and core theological concepts, the final section of this project identifies three constructive conclusions. First, in their collective action for justice and social transformation, Catholic NGOs participate in the mission of the church. While some magisterial teachings in recent years may question the ecclesiological and missiological nature of their collective action for justice, a holistic reception of Vatican II situates the work of Catholic NGOs within the church's mission. This conclusion is also evident in the ways in which the

organizations understand their public presence, social action and identity as apostolic church organizations.

Second, as participants in the mission of the church Catholic NGOs should be considered “structures of grace” in the ways they reflect specific charisms, embody solidarity and charity, and work to overcome what the tradition describes as structures of sin. This, to be sure, is not to suggest that these structures have moral agency; nor is it to say that they are perfect. Rather, the language of structural or social grace can help NGOs better understand their work theologically as actions of the church as such, as they recognize the presence of God in their good work.

The third and final conclusion of this project highlights the ethical obligations that ought to flow from a deeper theological reading of Catholic social organizations. If transnational Catholic NGOs share in the church’s mission and reflect God’s grace, then certain ethical values should be reflected in their work. More specifically, this chapter identifies ethical questions surrounding four sets of tensions that can help Christian communities discern and navigate dangers and excesses in their social engagement.

With these conclusions this project aims to offer scholars and activists resources to better understand the theological value of socially involved Christian structures. Developing a more robust theological framework of Catholic NGOs can go a long way in helping these and other organizations more effectively respond to the demands of the global common good.

Part One
Context, Resistance, and Theological Foundations

Chapter One: Catholic Political Action in a Globalized World

The dynamic process of globalization continues to shape our world in a number of profound ways presenting both new opportunities and threats to the global common good. Within this context, Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other non-state actors are exerting a notable impact on international politics as they seek to address the challenges facing the human family. While transnational Catholic NGOs have maintained a formalized presence in global public life for over ninety years, the presence and effectiveness of these diverse groups in shaping global governance has intensified since the late 1990s. The actions of these and other NGOs on the world stage are calling into question two dominant presuppositions of modern international relations: the sovereign state as the sole actor in global politics and the privatization of religion.¹

This chapter will draw from relevant research in these areas to offer a descriptive analysis of the present global context in which Catholic NGOs are operative in three parts. This will help to frame the more detailed exploration of the work of Catholic NGOs and their relationship to the church's mission in the following chapters. The first part of this chapter will offer an overview of the transformative role of non-state actors in global politics today, with a particular focus on those NGOs which are in formal relationship with intergovernmental organizations, and how these actors are challenging traditional notions of state sovereignty. The second part will look more specifically at the role of the Catholic Church, Catholic NGOs and other religious actors in this context and how their work for the global common good challenges some of the core beliefs of the

¹ For J. Bryan Hehir the concept of absolute state sovereignty and the belief that religion should be privatized constitutes the “double legacy” of the Peace of Westphalia (1648). J. Bryan Hehir, “Overview,” in *Religion in World Affairs* (DACOR Bacon House Foundation, 1995), 13.

secularization thesis. The case studies in chapters three and four will explore the specific contribution of Catholic NGOs in more detail. In the third and final part, this chapter will show the need for a deeper theological and ethical framework to understand the mission of Catholic NGOs by briefly presenting three areas of resistance that these organizations face in their engagement for the global common good.

I. NGOS AND THE EROSION OF ABSOLUTE STATE SOVEREIGNTY

A. Non-State Actors in the Context of Globalization

For over three-hundred years the modern political system has been grounded on the doctrine of absolute state sovereignty which emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries after the work of the French political philosopher Jean Bodin (1576).² In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia formalized the concept in international relations in seeking a peaceful resolution to the destructive wars of religion. Over the past few decades this fundamental political concept of has been challenged both positively and negatively by new elements and actors. Within the context of globalization, states are no longer the only players on the world stage. Perhaps the most striking illustration of this reality took place on September 11, 2001. Few events in recent history have had such a profound impact on foreign policy as the events of that day. Unlike the more localized violent and extremist actions of terrorist groups in the twentieth century, the global nature of these attacks have deeply challenged the realist belief that state power and sovereignty can guarantee security.

² See Jean Bodin, *Les six livres de la République* (Aalen, France: Scientia, 1961).

The dynamics of the globalization process have also called into question the “billiard ball” model of independent sovereign states in international relations in other, less destructive ways. In their book, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*, Margaret Karns and Karen Mingst identify six legitimate (i.e., non-violent and non-criminal) actors currently engaged in shaping global governance. In addition to the 196 sovereign states in the world today, Karns and Mingst outline the role played by five sets of actors: intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), nongovernmental organizations; influential experts; global policy networks; and transnational corporations.³

Until fairly recently, when considering global governance, the focus of both scholars and politicians has centered largely on the role of the state in establishing and directing the more than 230 state-sponsored IGOs.⁴ Since the 1990s, the role and influence of these organizations established by states has increased significantly in light of the growing dangers posed by cross-border challenges, such as climate change, pandemic diseases, and the global economic downturn. In response to these transnational threats, the secretariats and specialized offices of leading IGOs, such as the European Union and United Nations (UN), have taken more proactive roles on the world stage.

Beyond these established intergovernmental structures, governments and parts of governments are creating new forms of networks that move past the traditional and often

³ Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004), 16–19. This number includes the 193 member states of the United Nations as well as the Holy See, Taiwan, and Kosovo.

⁴ According to Karns and Mingst, an IGO is any organization “whose members include at least three states, that have activities in several states, and whose members are held together by a formal intergovernmental agreement. In 2003/04, the *Yearbook of International Organizations* identified 238 IGOs. These organizations range in size from three members (North American Free Trade Agreement) to more than 190 members (Universal Postal Union).” *Ibid.*, 7.

slow-moving forms of intergovernmental cooperation. These new networks, which according to Anne-Marie Slaughter often exist alongside traditional structures, can either be vertical or horizontal.⁵ Horizontal networks, such as those cross-border networks created by judges, lawyers, parliamentarians, and finance ministers accomplish several tasks by: linking national governmental officials across borders to share information; facilitating enforcement of agreed upon norms; and working toward the harmonization of practices and procedures.⁶ The Group of Twenty (G-20) Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors is a leading example of this type of emerging network.

With similar aims, vertical networks link “national government officials and their supranational counterparts” in ways that differ from the standard model of states being represented by their official diplomatic corps.⁷ This type of network is most clearly visible in the emerging international court system. In both forms of these networks, parts of governments directly connect with their counterparts in other states and/or with a higher specialized body such as the International Criminal Court. The emergence of these two forms of networks signals what Slaughter calls the “disaggregation” of the state, where “national government institutors rather than unitary states are the primary actors.”⁸

Notions of absolute state sovereignty are also challenged by the rapid growth of the private sector and the increasingly interconnected global economy. Transnational corporations (TNCs) from Microsoft to Citigroup have accumulated a level of wealth and

⁵ Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 18.

⁶ See *ibid.*, 51–61.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 167. One potential downside to this new “disaggregated world order” is an absence of formal procedures to enable civil society participation in and monitoring of the work of these networks. While Slaughter argues that these networks should interact with NGOs and corporations, she emphasizes that governments and government institutions alone possess accountability. (See *ibid.*, 9-11, 28-29, and 262-63).

power that easily rivals and often exceeds that of many governments around the world. TNCs have a tremendous amount of cultural and political influence that has been the object of attack by many “anti-globalization” activists. Furthermore, new forms of media, technology and social networking are also transforming the present political situation in ways that would have been unimaginable even a decade ago.

Thankfully, however, these are not the only actors at work in shaping the global political landscape today. Among scholars of international relations and political science, greater attention is being given to the contribution and potentially transformative role of global civil society, and in particular the wide variety of internationally active NGOs. While often overlooked by political realists in the past, the positive potential and influence of NGOs and other civil society actors cannot be ignored today. NGOs, in the words of Weiss, “have now become an integral part of the process of setting agendas for cooperation and in carrying the results not only to governments but to other NGOs and individuals.”⁹

Since the late 1990s, the concept of a “global civil society” has emerged in order to describe the complex set of cultural and institutional linkages that are increasingly uniting people and communities across political borders. In the words of John Keane, global civil society can be defined as:

a dynamic non-governmental system of interconnected socio-economic institutions that straddle the whole earth... It is an unfinished project that consists of sometimes thick, sometimes thinly, stretched networks, pyramids, and hub-and-

⁹ Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimensions,” in *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, Emerging Global Issues Series (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), 18. “The norm that states enjoy international autonomy and cannot be subjected to external authority has been the bedrock of the Westphalian state system that has persisted from 1648 to the present. Some theorists focus on the erosion of state sovereignty, suggesting that it may at one time have been absolute... Others see state sovereignty as always having been contested...” Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 25.

*spoke clusters of socio-economic institutions and actors who organize themselves across borders, with the deliberate aim of drawing the world together in new ways.*¹⁰

B. Transnational Nongovernmental Organizations

Within this emerging global civil society, transnational nongovernmental organizations and national organizations with a transnational focus are recognized as playing a critical role. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to offer a precise definition of what truly constitutes a nongovernmental organization. This difficulty is largely due to the wide variations in the size and structure of these organizations operating within global civil society. For example, whereas some NGOs, especially those operating more locally, are formed by individual citizens, others are formed when likeminded organizations come together to create what Thomas Weiss calls “meta-organizations” (e.g., international federations, associations, networks).¹¹ This difficulty in defining an NGO also arises as a result of the different legal cultures in which these organizations operate. Not all countries, for instance, encourage and support the formation of NGOs through legal recognition and tax exemption.

In seeking to define what a NGO is and does, scholars often begin with negative definitions. Both Peter Willetts and Anton Vedder offer four negative dimensions of what

¹⁰ John Keane, “A World for All? Thoughts on Global Civil Society,” in *A World for All?: Global Civil Society in Political Theory and Trinitarian Theology*, ed. William Storrar, Peter J. Casarella, and Paul Louis Metzger (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2011), 19–20. Peter Berger, Kimberly Hutchings, and others warn against having an overly positive value-laden concept of civil society that ignores the inherent power dynamics and shortcomings of various actors. For Hutchings, it is especially problematic to establish binaries where global civil society and the practices of NGOs are unquestioned as good and the state is assumed to be “bad.” See Kimberly Hutchings, “Can Global Civil Society Civilize the International? Some Reflections,” in *A World for All?: Global Civil Society in Political Theory and Trinitarian Theology*, ed. William Storrar, Peter J. Bernardi, and Paul Louis Metzger (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2011), 40–58; Peter L. Berger, “Religion and Global Civil Society,” in *Religion in Global Civil Society*, ed. Mark Juergensmeyer (New York: Oxford University, 2005), 11–22. See also David Hollenbach, “Civil Society: Beyond the Public-Private Dichotomy,” *Responsive Community* 5, no. 1 (1995): 15–23.

¹¹ Weiss and Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance,” 18.

constitutes legitimate NGO. First and most obviously, an NGO is nongovernmental; it cannot be run or organized by a government, nor can it, as Willetts points out, be a group that actively seeks to “replace existing governments.”¹² While international networks of political parties, such as Liberal International, are considered legitimate NGOs, other groups with direct ties to governments are pejoratively referred to as “GONGOs” (government-operated NGOs).

Second, legitimate NGOs are defined as being non-commercial, or non-profit. While some NGOs, according to Vedder, may closely resemble for-profit corporations in their efforts to display ever greater professionalism and effectiveness, NGOs should receive the majority of their funds from their members or from voluntary donations.¹³ As with GONGOs, those NGOs set up by corporations and businesses with the purpose of advancing their for-profit interests (“BINGOs”) are generally seen as lacking legitimacy.

Third, NGOs should be non-violent. Unlike terrorist groups or violent criminal networks, these organizations should not resort to violence to achieve their ends or work closely with those who do. Finally, as Vedder points out, an NGO is not an ad hoc group of activists. In contrast to more informal or temporary networks, NGOs should have a minimal organizational structure with clearly defined guidelines and leadership.¹⁴ Here, it is useful to distinguish between a transnational NGO and what Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink define as a “transnational advocacy network.” While national and

¹² Peter Willetts, “Introduction,” in *The “Conscience of the World”: The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, ed. Peter Willetts (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996), 4; See also Anton Vedder, “Questioning the Legitimacy of Non-Governmental Organizations,” in *NGO Involvement in International Governance and Policy: Sources of Legitimacy*, ed. Anton Vedder (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2007), 1-20.

¹³ Vedder, “Questioning the Legitimacy of Non-Governmental Organizations,” 3. As Vedder points out, the International Chamber of Commerce and other non-profit organizations created to represent industry groups can be considered a legitimate NGO since their primary aim is not profit.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

transnational NGOs may play a key role in the formation and direction of these networks, the authors stress that the two categories are not synonymous. Successful transnational advocacy networks are broader than any one organization as they bring together a diversity of actors including NGOs, social movements, media outlets, foundations, parts of IGOs, and even occasionally parts of governments.¹⁵

With these four criteria, we can thus define an NGO as an active non-profit, non-violent, organized group of citizens or smaller organizations that is independent of government control or influence. While they lack the coercive power of states, NGOs wield what Joseph Nye has identified as “soft power,” as they challenge traditional notions of sovereignty in their increasing presence in global politics.¹⁶

C. The Historical Emergence of Transnational NGOs

While the present influence and role of NGOs in the context of globalization is unparalleled in history, it is not an entirely new phenomenon. In the West, for example, there is a long history of civic, fraternal, and religious organizations engaging the public sphere in a diversity of informal ways. Even in the medieval period, some of these groups, especially religious congregations and orders, developed impressive transnational structures and identities that were often threatening to local political leaders.

Advances in travel and communication in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries enabled the creation of the first modern international organizations and networks for both

¹⁵ Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 6, 9.

¹⁶ See Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).

governments and civil society.¹⁷ Early on in the nineteenth century, non-state actors joined together to mobilize around pressing social issues. In their study, Keck and Sikkink highlight the successful efforts of these actors in the campaigns to abolish slavery in the United States (1833-1865); for women's suffrage (1888-1928); and to eradicate foot binding and female circumcision (1874-1911).

By the late nineteenth century, several dozen international NGOs and a handful of intergovernmental organizations had been created. In 1910, representatives of these nongovernmental and governmental organizations convened the World Congress of International Associations in Brussels. At the event, the 132 organizations and thirteen governments present formed the Union of International Associations.¹⁸ When the League of Nations was created a decade later, several NGOs developed informal relations with the League, especially the Red Cross societies and other organizations involved in health and humanitarian concerns.¹⁹ On occasion, some NGOs were allowed to participate more actively as "assessors" or "correspondent members" on League committees. The League published a *Handbook of International Organisations* in 1921 and 1938 as well as a *Quarterly Bulletin of Information on the Work of International Organisations* which detailed the activities of the four hundred or so NGOs active at the time.²⁰ Bill Seary estimates that by 1939, on the eve of the Second World War, the number of international NGOs grew to around seven hundred.²¹

¹⁷ See Bill Seary, "The Early History: From the Congress of Vienna to the San Francisco Conference," in *The "Conscience of the World": The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, ed. Peter Willetts (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996), 15–30.

¹⁸ Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 225.

¹⁹ Seary, "The Early History," 22.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

During World War II, the activities of many international NGOs were suspended or redirected to address the urgent humanitarian crises. As the conflict began to wind down and governments looked towards post-war reconstruction and the creation of a new set of intergovernmental institutions, several NGOs sought a voice in the process. At the San Francisco Conference on International Organization (25 April - 26 June 1945) representatives of 1,200 national and international voluntary organizations, many of them from the United States, were present as governments deliberated on the formation of the UN.²²

At the Conference, the participating organizations launched a strong and relatively effective campaign to have their voices heard in the drafting of the UN Charter. Working together, NGOs pushed for several changes to the document and succeeded in two significant ways. First, they succeeded in gaining a specific provision to allow for official NGO relations with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). In the first drafts of the Charter, there was no mention or thought of including NGOs in any formal way in the future work of the organization. While they failed in their efforts to secure a formal status with the more “political” General Assembly and Security Council, they succeeded in attaining Article 71, a groundbreaking clause that secured formal NGO involvement in the work of the ECOSOC and ultimately the UN system as a whole.²³

²² Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 225–226.

²³ Peter Willetts, “Consultative Status for NGOs at the United Nations,” in *The “Conscience of the World”: The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, ed. Peter Willetts (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996), 31. Article 71 reads: “The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.”

The second major success of NGOs at San Francisco came with two advances in the field of human rights. Following the horrors of the war, many organizations, especially Jewish NGOs, were moved by a great sense of urgency to develop an international framework to promote and protect human rights. As part of this effort, NGOs strongly lobbied for the creation of a specific body of the new institution to take up the question of human rights explicitly and for the drafting of an international bill of human rights.²⁴ Thanks in large part to the lobbying efforts of these organizations, the ECOSOC Commission on Human Rights was created, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was drafted; and human rights became “one of the four purposes of the United Nations set forth in the Charter.”²⁵ In the creation of this commission under ECOSOC, the NGOs further guaranteed their right of participation in accordance with Article 71.

D. Formal Status for NGOs in the Intergovernmental System

Article 71 of the UN Charter has served as the foundational clause for NGO involvement within the UN system. While the provision was initially intended only to regulate the relationship between NGOs, ECOSOC, and its subsidiary bodies, it has subsequently served as a model for other UN agencies and IGOs. With the inclusion of Article 71 into the Charter, one of the first tasks of the Economic and Social Council was

²⁴ See Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: Random House, 2002), 17.

²⁵ Felice D. Gaer, “Reality Check: Human Rights NGOs Confront Governments at the UN,” in *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, Emerging Global Issues Series (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), 52.

to create an NGO Committee to establish the rules of procedure and criteria to grant consultative status to eligible organizations.

Despite the fact that the early deliberations of the Committee often became a cold war battleground over the applications of specific NGOs, the Committee established procedures which would influence civil society participation in UN and other IGOs for decades to follow.²⁶ In 1996, the ECOSOC, with its resolution 1996/31 updated its criteria for NGO accreditation first established in the 1940s. The website of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs summarizes the new criteria as follows:

To be eligible for consultative status, an NGO must have been in existence (officially registered with the appropriate government authorities as an NGO/non-profit) for at least two years, must have an established headquarters, a democratically adopted constitution, authority to speak for its members, a representative structure, appropriate mechanisms of accountability and democratic and transparent decision-making processes. The basic resources of the organization must be derived in the main part from contributions of the national affiliates or other components or from individual members.²⁷

Since the beginning, NGOs in Consultative Status were divided into three categories, which today are known as general, special and roster. Each category carries with it specific rights and responsibilities. For example, the NGOs that fall under the general and special categories have the right to offer oral interventions in ECOSOC Commissions and present written statements. In return, NGOs in both categories are expected to present reports of their activities with the UN to the NGO Committee every

²⁶ In this period, some NGOs were caught up in the ideological battles between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both sides accused specific NGOs of being unduly influenced by the other power and sought to deny status to such organizations. See Willetts, "Consultative Status for NGOs at the United Nations," 34–35; and Pei-heng Chiang, *Non-Governmental Organizations at the United Nations: Identity, Role, and Function* (New York: Praeger, 1981), 19–57.

²⁷ NGO Branch of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, "Introduction to ECOSOC Consultative Status", <http://csonet.org/index.php?menu=30>. (accessed August 4, 2011).

four years.²⁸ However, only the NGOs with general status, those that tend to be larger and featuring a broad range of competency, can offer longer oral and written interventions, and only these NGOs can propose items for consideration on the ECOSOC agenda. As Peter Willetts points out, such provisions, especially the right to propose items for consideration on the agenda of ECOSOC, are groundbreaking, when one considers that none of the major parliaments of the world make such a provision for civil society participation in this way.²⁹

During the later half of the twentieth century, the number of international NGOs has grown significantly. For example, according to the *Yearbook of International Organizations* published by the Union of International Associations, the number of *active* international NGOs (including religious orders and internationally focused national organizations) grew from 832 in 1951 to 12,130 in 1983.³⁰ After a period of rapid growth in the 1990s and 2000s, the number of internationally active NGOs has grown to 23,905.³¹

This growth is also reflected in the number of organizations formally engaged with the intergovernmental system. While not all NGOs seek or desire official status with the United Nations, status with ECOSOC serves as an important mark of credibility and legitimacy for those organizations seeking a voice in the global public debate. In 1948,

²⁸ Peter van den Bossche, "Perceptions of the Legitimacy of International NGOs," in *NGO Involvement in International Governance and Policy: Sources of Legitimacy*, ed. Anton Vedder (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2007), 160.

²⁹ Willetts, "Consultative Status for NGOs at the United Nations," 41.

³⁰ Union of International Associations, *Yearbook of International Organizations 1997/98*, vol. 1, 34th ed. (Brussels: Union of International Associations, 1997), 1763.

³¹ Union of International Associations, *Yearbook of International Organizations 2011 - 2012*, 48th ed. (Brussels: Union of International Associations, 2011), ix. These numbers do not include those organizations characterized in the *Yearbook* as being inactive; recently reported bodies; national organizations without an international orientation; subsidiary bodies; and autonomous conference series. With these organizations, the number of NGOs considered would be over 56,000.

thirty-nine NGOs held general or special consultative status with ECOSOC. By 1991, that number had risen steadily to 395.³² Throughout the 1990s and 2000s, as the number of NGOs operating internationally grew exponentially, the number of NGOs with ECOSOC status also grew. Today, there are over 3,000 national and international organizations accredited with ECOSOC, with thousands more actively seeking status.

Margaret Karns and Karen Mingst identify four reasons for this accelerated growth in NGOs since the early 1990s: (1) the growing awareness of the need for transnational solutions to address transnational problems; (2) the organization of several high profile international conferences in which NGOs not accredited with ECOSOC, including national NGOs from the “global south,” were encouraged to apply to participate; (3) the revolution in information and communication technologies; and (4) finally, the end of the cold war and the spread of democratic cultures in which NGOs could more easily flourish.³³ In addition to these reasons, Weiss points to the growing availability of financial resources for NGOs in the 1990s and 2000s which have been critical to funding the humanitarian and advocacy work of many organizations.³⁴

A similar growth and intensification of NGO involvement occurred with other regional and global IGOs. Today, most, if not all, of the UN specialized agencies and other regional and global IGOs have developed some form of mechanism to engage and involve NGOs in their work. In his article, “Perceptions of the Legitimacy of International NGOs,” Peter van den Bossche outlines the wide range of procedures and legal mechanisms set up by these different agencies and IGOs. As he outlines, some

³² Weiss and Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance,” 23.

³³ Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 228.

³⁴ Weiss and Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance,” 25.

agencies, such as UNESCO, not only followed the ECOSOC model but have also developed ways for NGOs to participate in more active ways in its work. Other IGOs, by contrast, such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, have minimal and more informal relations with NGOs, which van den Bossche argues is problematic and can lead to abuse and the exclusion of those NGOs with a more critical position of the policies of powerful states and intergovernmental agencies.³⁵

An additional influential avenue for NGO involvement in the life of the intergovernmental system occurs at and alongside the major global conferences organized by the United Nations. In 1972, the UN Conference on the Human Environment marked an important “turning point” by supporting the participation not only of ECOSOC accredited organizations but also of those relevant NGOs without formal status.³⁶ In the 1990s, the United Nations convened a number of high profile global conferences and summits on a wide range of topics.³⁷ These events and their different preparatory and follow-up meetings saw a significant increase in the qualitative and quantitative participation of NGOs, including many national and international NGOs without official consultative status. At the 1992 Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, for example, over 1,400 NGOs formally participated and more than 17,000

³⁵ van den Bossche, “Perceptions of the Legitimacy of International NGOs,” 155.

³⁶ Willetts, “Consultative Status for NGOs at the United Nations,” 54.

³⁷ The major UN sponsored conferences of the 1990s and early 2000s which attracted much attention from NGOs addressed the following themes: Children (1990); Education for All (1990, 2000); Least Developed Countries (1990, 2001); Drugs (1990, 1998); Food Security (1992, 1996); Sustainable Development (1992, 2002); Human Rights (1993, 2001); Population and Development (1994); Small Island Developing States (1994, 2005); Natural Disaster Reduction (1994, 2005); Advancement of Women (1995, 2005); Social Development (1995); Human Settlements (1996, 2001); Youth (1998, 2005); Millennium Summit (2000, 2005); HIV/AIDS (2001); Financing for Development (2002); Ageing (2002); Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries (2003); and Information Society (2003, 2005). Office of the President of the Millennium Assembly, “Reference Document on Civil Society Participation in United Nations Conferences and Special Sessions of the General Assembly During the 1990s,” August 2001, <http://www.un.org/ga/president/55/speech/civilsociety1.htm>.

NGOs joined a parallel forum—a significant increase from the less than 300 NGOs involved in the 1972 Conference.³⁸

Similarly, the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 drew over 3,000 NGOs as formal participants, with another 32,000 NGOs participating in the side events to the conference in Beijing.³⁹ Much like the contribution of NGOs to ECOSOC commissions, NGO participation in these high-profile events and their preparatory commissions often includes oral and written interventions, roundtable discussions with governmental delegations, and parallel events for civil society.

E. Four Primary Functions of Transnational NGOs

The contribution and engagement of NGOs and other civil society actors in global public life has come a long way since the early days of the modern intergovernmental system when a few select NGOs were relegated to the “non-political” work of ECOSOC. Today, as Roger Coate observes, NGOs are operative within virtually “every aspect of global policy processes in the UN system, including agenda setting, advocacy, rule making, standard setting, promotion, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.”⁴⁰

But the formal work of NGOs within the UN system is only part of the story of how they are reshaping international relations. Through their active engagement in global public discourse, both in the field and in the halls of IGOs, NGOs are challenging the

³⁸ See Thomas G. Weiss, Tatiana Carayannis, and Richard Jolly, “The ‘Third’ United Nations,” *Global Governance* 15 (2009): 129; and Antonio Donini, “The Bureaucracy and the Free Spirits: Stagnation and Innovation in the Relationship Between the UN and NGOs,” in *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, Emerging Global Issues Series (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), 84.

³⁹ See Martha Alter Chen, “Engendering World Conferences: The International Women’s Movement and the United Nations,” *Third World Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1995): 477–93.

⁴⁰ Roger A. Coate, “The John W. Holmes Lecture: Growing the ‘Third UN’ for People-centered Development--The United Nations, Civil Society, and Beyond,” *Global Governance* 15 (2009): 155.

very notion of state sovereignty in several distinctive ways. As Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink point out, this reality in which states change their position or sign onto an agreement as a result of the activities of NGOs and other advocacy networks “reconstitutes the relationship between the state, its citizens and international actors.”⁴¹ While scholars enumerate different ways in which NGOs are presently reshaping public policy, four overlapping roles are worth considering.

i. Advocacy

The first and most obvious ways in which NGOs and other civil society networks are reshaping the model of absolute state sovereignty is through formal and informal advocacy and lobbying with regional and global intergovernmental institutions. Keck and Sikkink define advocacy as pleading or defending specific causes or ideas that often “cannot be easily linked to rationalist understandings of their ‘interests.’”⁴²

One of the main dimensions of advocacy is to bring the concerns and experiences of underrepresented groups to global attention. This has proven to be important when individual states involved fail to respond to the needs of their citizens. Keck and Sikkink point to this as the “boomerang pattern of influence” where local “NGOs bypass their state and directly search out international allies to try to bring pressure on their states from the outside.”⁴³

In this way, NGOs serve “as alternative sources of information,” bringing the perspective of people to global public attention.⁴⁴ This role has been especially powerful around questions of human rights where NGOs have brought worldwide attention to

⁴¹ Keck and Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders*, 37.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

specific violations committed by or with the support of a state. As Weiss points out, repressive governments which do not want to draw attention to their poor human rights record especially dislike this “naming and shaming” function.⁴⁵ As a result, several governments have sought to publicly delegitimize specific NGOs or have sought to limit the ability of all NGOs to participate and observe certain meetings.⁴⁶

Global campaigning is another key dimension of this advocacy role. The mobilization of thousands of people from different countries on a specific issues, as Keck and Sikkink illustrate in their study, has resulted in a number of important successes over the past two hundred years from the Anglo-American campaign to end slavery to the international campaign to ban land mines.⁴⁷ Transnational NGOs play a key role in the development and success of such campaigns today. For example, with both the Jubilee Debt Campaign in 2000 and the Make Poverty History Campaign in 2005, NGOs were critical in coordinating both grassroots mobilization and targeted lobbying efforts with governmental officials.

NGO campaigning and advocacy on human rights issues have been critical to the drafting and adoption of several major international human rights treaties. In the words of Felice Gaer, they have been “the engine of virtually every advance made by the United Nations in the field of human rights since its founding.”⁴⁸ The Convention on the Rights of the Child, for example, is largely a result of the vision of NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights itself owes much to their campaigning and lobbying.

⁴⁵ See Weiss and Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance,” 31.

⁴⁶ Gaer, “Reality Check,” 51–54.

⁴⁷ John Sankey, “Conclusions,” in *The “Conscience of the World”: The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, ed. Peter Willetts (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996), 274–75.

⁴⁸ Gaer, “Reality Check,” 51.

Charles Malik, one of the lead drafters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights commented on the impact of NGOs on the UDHR:

They [the NGOs] were profoundly concerned, especially the religious among them, whether Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, in the fate and dignity of man in the modern world; they kept in close touch with us, and we received them and adopted many a sound counsel from them, and you can trace in the text of the Declaration a word here, a clause there, or a whole article, back to their inspiration.⁴⁹

NGOs are also largely responsible for the creation of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights following the Vienna World Conference in 1993. Leading up to the World Conference, NGOs launched a campaign for the creation of this post to help coordinate and advance human rights within the UN System.

ii. Analysis and Monitoring

A second way in which NGOs are redefining sovereignty is through policy analysis and research. Often in concert with academic institutions and media outlets, NGOs and their networks can play the role of “think tanks” in analyzing and publically presenting sensitive data that may contradict the narratives offered by some governments.⁵⁰ This function has proven to be especially critical in relation to cases where states have failed to live up to international agreements. In this role, NGOs are often engaged in what Keck and Sikkink call “accountability politics,” where they seek

⁴⁹ William Korey, *NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: A Curious Grapevine* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 45. See also Irwin Cotler, “Jewish NGOs and Religious Human Rights: A Case-Study,” in *Religious Human Rights in Global Perspective: Religious Perspectives*, ed. Johan D. van der Vyver and John Witte (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1996), 235–94; and Joseph Samuel Rossi, *Uncharted Territory: The American Catholic Church at the United Nations, 1946-1972* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), 81.

⁵⁰ Peter Uvin, “Scaling Up the Grassroots and Scaling Down the Summit: The Relations Between Third World NGOs and the UN,” in *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, Emerging Global Issues Series (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), 168.

“to expose the distance between discourse and practice.”⁵¹ Since the truth can often be a source of embarrassment to governments, the research and analysis by NGOs can spur changes in official policy.

iii. Formation and Solidarity

Outside the intergovernmental system, NGOs are challenging notions of state sovereignty through the creation of “a new kind of global public,” which no longer perceives the world according to the realist billiard ball model.⁵² For many international organizations, a core dimension to their work and identity is the creation of solidarity and dialogue across borders. In addition to changing concrete policy, international campaigns can play an important role in engendering solidarity among individuals. Transnational NGOs are helping people to realize that they are part “of worldwide webs of interdependence, whose complexity is riddled with opportunity, as well as danger.”⁵³

Recognizing the importance of a globally minded public, the United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI) established a formal status for NGOs to help disseminate information about the work of the UN. Today, over 1,500 NGOs have DPI status. This enables them to have security passes to the UN grounds, access some support services, and the privilege to attend some meetings as observers.⁵⁴ As Weiss and Gordenker point out, a more educated global public will help to strengthen the overall system of global governance.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Keck and Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders*, 24.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 14.

⁵³ Keane, “A World for All?,” 25.

⁵⁴ While this status is formally distinct from the ECOSOC Consultative status, the DPI status has enabled some NGOs to participate more actively in UN meetings than had been originally intended. For example, NGOs accredited with DPI participate in NGO advocacy committees and often sign onto and help to draft statements presented by ECOSOC accredited NGOs.

⁵⁵ Weiss and Gordenker, “Pluralizing Global Governance,” 38.

iv. Operational Program Implementation

A final way in which NGOs are challenging the traditional state-centered model generally takes place on the ground, far away from the main centers of intergovernmental power. Operational NGOs have become essential partners in the successful delivery and management of international aid, humanitarian assistance, and peacebuilding activities. Governments and inter-governmental agencies are increasingly dependent upon NGOs, particularly the “eight major families or federations of international NGOs,” for their work in field operations.⁵⁶

In addition to seeking out NGO partners on the ground, governments and inter-governmental agencies also seek NGO input in the design and development of program strategies. In many cases this adds legitimacy to the program.

Through advocacy, formation, analysis, and operational management, NGOs are challenging the notion of absolute state sovereignty in a variety of ways. While some have chosen to exercise these roles formally within the system, others operate without any formal recognition. Few NGOs are fully engaged in all four roles; most specialize in only one or two. For some NGOs, the engagement in one role has led to another. For example, several high profile NGOs engaged in humanitarian activities, such as Médecins Sans Frontières and Catholic Relief Services, have seen the need not only to address the symptoms of a crisis through operational aid, but have also sought to address the root causes of the problem through advocacy and formation.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Donini, “The Bureaucracy and the Free Spirits,” 92. These eight families of development NGOs (CARE, World Vision, Oxfam, MSF, Save the Children, CIDSE, APDOVE, and Eurostep) control, according to Donini, almost half of the \$8 billion aid market.

⁵⁷ Following the poor response of the humanitarian community to the Biafra secession crisis in West Africa (1971), a small group of French doctors and journalists founded MSF with the aims of both delivering aid

F. Analytical Frameworks to Understand the Role of NGOs

While NGOs have been playing an active role in shaping intergovernmental politics for over a century, their role in shaping political life is often overlooked and underappreciated. Despite the important challenge to the state-centered model by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in the 1970s⁵⁸ and the increased attention paid to transnational terrorist and criminal networks in the decade following the September 11 attacks, the potentially transformative role of NGOs, religious groups, and other non-state actors continues to be “neglected” by many international relations specialists.⁵⁹ In order to understand these actors and demonstrate their potential, several analytical frameworks have been offered from a variety of scholarly and practical perspectives.

i. Multi-Track Diplomacy

One of the first such frameworks was developed in the 1980s by the American diplomat Joseph Montville who described what he called “two track diplomacy.” From his experiences in working with NGOs, academics and other members of civil society during the cold war, Montville argued that in order to be effective, diplomacy needed to go beyond the traditional state-centered model. To this end, Montville distinguished between “*track I*,” the high-level and official diplomatic efforts of sovereign states, and “*track II*,” the unofficial diplomacy of non-state actors.⁶⁰

and speaking publically to raise awareness of neglected crises. Following the Rwandan Genocide, CRS adopted a “justice lens” which seeks to evaluate humanitarian crises and the response offered by CRS through the perspective of social justice.

⁵⁸ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977).

⁵⁹ Weiss, Carayannis, and Jolly, “The ‘Third’ United Nations,” 124.

⁶⁰ M.J. Zuckerman, “Track II Diplomacy: Can ‘Unofficial’ Talks Avert Disaster,” *Carnegie Reporter* 3, no. 3 (2005), <http://carnegie.org/publications/carnegie-reporter/single/view/article/item/136/>.

Building upon of Montville, others have sought to expand the two-track model. Believing that the second track was too broad a category for the wide range of non-state actors operative within civil society, the retired American Ambassador John W. McDonald articulated a five-track model and founded the Washington-based Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy in 1992.⁶¹ In 1996, McDonald and Louise Diamond expanded on the five-track concept by proposing a nine-track “systems approach” which encompasses a diversity of political engagement at multiple levels of society.⁶² These nine tracks include: 1) official government diplomacy; 2) professional non-governmental conflict resolution; 3) business and private sector peacemaking efforts; 4) personal/citizen involvement; 5) research, training and education; 6) activism and advocacy; 7) religion and faith actions for peace; 8) philanthropic and funding support for peace initiatives; and 9) communications, media, and peace.⁶³

While countless examples exist of non-state actors being engaged in conflict transformation and diplomacy in various ways, an oft-cited example is the contribution of the Community of Sant'Egidio to the peace and reconciliation process which ended the brutal Mozambican Civil War (1977-1992)—a war in which almost a million people were killed and five million displaced.⁶⁴ In the midst of this brutal conflict, Archbishop Jaime Gonçalves of Mozambique sought help from Sant'Egidio, an international Roman Catholic ecclesial movement founded in Italy in 1968. With the support of its contacts

⁶¹ See John McDonald, “Further Exploration of Track Two Diplomacy,” in *Timing the De-Escalation of International Conflicts*, ed. Louis Kriesberg and Stuart J. Thorson (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 201–20.

⁶² Diamond, Louise and John McDonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace* (Hartford, CT: Kumarian, 1996), 9.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 4–5.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 365. Andrea Bartoli, “Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Mozambique Peace Process,” in *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy, and Conflict Transformation*, ed. Raymond G. Helmick and Rodney L. Petersen (Philadelphia: Templeton, 2001), 364.

within the Italian government, Sant'Egidio hosted eleven meetings at its headquarters in Rome with representatives of the two main factions over a twenty-seven month period. To the surprise of many, the result of these talks was the signing of peace accords in October 1992.⁶⁵

Despite its strong focus on peacebuilding and reconciliation, the multi-track diplomacy framework constructively shows the multiple types of actors at play in politics today, including the roles played by NGOs. However, the multiple tracks in the system developed by McDonald and Diamond may render the framework overly complex and there may be a temptation to pigeonhole actors into specific tracks.

ii. Three-Tiered Pyramid

In the 1990s, the Mennonite scholar John Paul Lederach offered a different model to draw attention to the important role played by non-state actors in political transformation. As with the multi-track diplomacy model, Lederach seeks to demonstrate the value of involving and empowering people and communities in the political process. In his book, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, Lederach identifies three levels of leadership within a population divided by conflict: top level, middle range, and grassroots.

In order to illustrate his framework, Lederach arranges the three levels into a three-tiered pyramid, with the grassroots level serving as the base and the top-level as its apex. The image of the pyramid shows how the grassroots level “encompasses the largest number of people,” while the top-level leadership may consist of only a small number

⁶⁵ Andrea, Régis Ladous Riccardi and Jean-Dominique Durand, *Sant'Egidio: Rome and the World* (Maynooth: St. Paul's Press, 1999); Bartoli, “Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Mozambique Peace Process”; Monica Duffy Toft, Daniel Philpott, and Timothy Samuel Shah, *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011), 174–77.

of leaders.⁶⁶ Given their different characteristics, each level calls for a different strategy of political engagement, or more specifically for Lederach's focus, a different approach to peacebuilding.

For Lederach, the top-level leadership includes the highly visible military, political, and religious leadership. By their very nature, such leaders, he argues, are often "locked into" the public positions that they have taken and, as a result, it is difficult for them to compromise.⁶⁷ At this level, the approach to peacebuilding generally takes the form of "track I" diplomacy where leaders take part in official high-profile diplomatic negotiations aimed at achieving measurable goals, such as a cease-fire.

At the base of the pyramid, the grassroots leadership level is characterized by those involved in local communities, including local NGOs and community leaders. By virtue of their position, these leaders are often most directly impacted by the top-level political decisions. At this level, the peacebuilding strategy involves setting up local peace commissions; organizing grassroots training; working with victims and perpetrators to address physiological trauma; and working to meet the basic needs of members in the communities.

Occupying the central place in his pyramid, the middle-range leadership plays a crucial role in conflict transformation. For Lederach, this level includes highly respected individuals as well as important networks and NGOs, especially those with the capacity to link relevant actors within society. Unlike the top-level leadership, this middle-range is more easily able to compromise and find creative solutions to the crisis. This level is

⁶⁶ John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1997), 38.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 40.

more directly connected to the local population than the top tier, but this level often has greater resources and contacts than the local level. According to Lederach, “the middle range contains a set of leaders with a determinant *location* in the conflict who, if integrated properly, might provide the key to creating an *infrastructure* for achieving and sustaining peace.”⁶⁸ At this critical middle-level, the political approach would involve problem-solving workshops; conflict resolution trainings for key leaders; and peace commissions. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, established in 1995, is a strong national example of how middle-range leaders working together can effect change at the top while also empowering and engaging individuals at the grassroots level.

For the purposes of looking at the role and impact of international NGOs, this framework is limited in that Lederach is primarily concerned with facilitating peace in post-conflict societies. Nevertheless, his model can be expanded to examine the role played by NGOs at the global level. Many international advocacy NGOs function precisely as middle-range actors as they seek to serve as creative “bridges” between local communities and the high-level political decision made at the inter-governmental centers.⁶⁹

iii. The “Third” UN

More recently, the political scientist Thomas Weiss, together with Tatiana Carayannis and Richard Jolly, has put forth the concept of the “third UN” as a way to understand the contribution of NGOs and other independent civil society actors in the

⁶⁸ Ibid., 46.

⁶⁹ Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, “NGO Participation in the International Policy Process,” in *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker, Emerging Global Issues Series (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996), 211.

work of intergovernmental organizations. In a 2009 article in *Global Governance*, the authors develop and expand the classic twofold distinction put forth by Inis Claude in the 1950s.⁷⁰ Claude's framework identifies two UNs at work in shaping global governance.

The "first UN" consists of the sovereign member states, long recognized as the primary actors in shaping world organization. It was this set of actors who formally and legally established the UN and other IGOs. Even in the present globalized context, states remain in control of the budget and overall direction of the United Nations and other inter-governmental bodies. With very few exceptions, states alone hold the right to vote and formally shape the agenda.

The "second UN" consists of those international civil servants who are charged with carrying out the mandates given to them by the first UN. While they are expected to be in the service of the member states, this second UN is not a simple passive actor in the global community. In their pledge of support to the broader goals and mission of the UN as enshrined in the Charter and other key international agreements, the 70,000 women and men who work for the UN secretariat and specialized agencies have a responsibility in the service of a "larger collective good."⁷¹

Building upon of this classic twofold division, Weiss, Carayannis, and Jolly propose the concept of the "third UN" to take into account a set of actors omitted from Claude's framework. For these three authors, this third UN consists of "nongovernmental organizations; academics and expert consultants; and independent commissions of

⁷⁰ Inis L. Claude, *Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*, 2d ed., revised and enlarged. (New York: Random House, 1959); Inis L. Claude, "Peace and Security: Prospective Roles for the Two United Nations," *Global Governance* 2, no. 3 (1996): 289–98.

⁷¹ Weiss, Carayannis, and Jolly, "The 'Third' United Nations," 126.

eminent persons.”⁷² In their definition they explicitly rule out the eligibility of for-profit corporations part of the third UN, because “The primary focus of business is not on any larger community of interests, but on financial bottom lines.”⁷³

As we have already seen, the presence of this “third UN” is not completely new. However, the present level of engagement and sheer number of NGOs involved in the UN system today is a new reality. The diverse types of agents within the third UN work closely with actors from the other two UNs in both field operations and in the halls of intergovernmental headquarters as they engage in advocacy, policy analysis, global formation, and program implementation.

The third UN functions in many ways like Lederach’s middle-range. Unlike the first and second UN, the third UN is generally more capable than the other two of being flexible and creative in finding solutions to the problems facing the global community. As independent actors, with on-the-ground experience, members of the third UN can serve as a bridge between the local reality and the work of secretariat. At times, governments and the UN secretariat may even convene a commission or panel of experts on a specific theme or topic and draw from NGOs for membership of the commission. Other actors in this third sector, especially advocacy NGOs, serve to challenge and call to task the other two UNs for their actions and inactions.

While generally helpful in understanding the work of NGOs, this framework is limited in that it makes the UN, a state-directed institution, the center of NGO public engagement. This narrow view can eclipse the role and influence of those civil society actors that do not have an official status with the UN system or who cannot afford

⁷² Ibid., 128.

⁷³ Ibid.

fulltime representatives in New York and Geneva. As the other two models illustrate, the public engagement of NGOs and other non-state actors is much larger than the UN alone. Taken together, these three frameworks illustrate the different ways in which NGOs and other non-state actors are reshaping global civil society, including those “official” areas traditionally reserved only for “sovereign states.”

II: CATHOLIC NGOs IN THE GLOBAL PUBLIC SPHERE

As we have already seen, both diplomats and academics have largely overlooked the potentially constructive role of non-state actors. This has been particularly the case for religions and religious organizations who, in addition to challenging notions of state sovereignty, are also challenging a second core legacy of the post-Westphalian modern political system: the belief that religions should and will eventually be marginalized from political discourse, also known as the secularization thesis. Despite the increased attention given to religion in global capitals and universities since September 11, 2001, a serious consideration of the multidimensional public role of religious actors is lacking. Religion remains, in the words of Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson, a “missing dimension of statecraft.”⁷⁴

This “notable lacunae,” as Eva Bellin notes in a 2008 essay, is a result of several factors. First, scholars of comparative politics, who owe much to the intellectual legacy of Max Weber, Émile Durkheim, and Karl Marx, tended to follow the assumption that

⁷⁴ Douglas M Johnston and Cynthia Sampson, eds., *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

religion is a “premodern relic, destined to fade with the advance of industrialization.”⁷⁵ Second, scholars of international relations, she argues, overlook religion because of the Westphalian legacy, which sought to remove any influence of religion on the sovereign state. Finally, Bellin points to the temptation of realists to overlook religious actors in favor of those actors with “hard” military and economic power.

Despite the dire predictions offered by proponents of the secularization thesis, religious actors have not faded away, nor have they accepted a role only limited to the private sphere. Since the 1980s, religious actors have surprised many observers in their continued attempts to “go public” with their faith. In his book *Public Religions in the Modern World*, sociologist José Casanova offers several case studies to show some of the diverse ways in which religion has had an impact in public life since the 1970s, from the Islamic Revolution in Iran to the rise of the “moral majority” in the United States.

In his study, Casanova critically examines three possible interpretations of the secularization thesis that emerged in the work of several Western intellectuals from Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau to Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Sigmund Freud.⁷⁶ One interpretation of secularization argues that religion, in the face of modernity, is “declining and would likely continue to decline until its eventual disappearance.”⁷⁷ For proponents of this interpretation, modernity offered a double attack on religion. On the one side, advances in historical and scientific research especially around evolution, astronomy, and archeology would deliver fatal blows to religious “superstitions,”

⁷⁵ Eva Bellin, “Faith in Politics: New Trends in the Study of Religion and Politics,” *World Politics* 60, no. 2 (January 2008): 317.

⁷⁶ R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 3.

⁷⁷ Toft, Philpott, and Shah, *God’s Century*, 25.

narratives, and worldviews. On the other side, the vast social changes accompanying democracy and industrialization would result in the liberation of individuals from the oppressive forms of social control associated with religions. Empirically however, this thesis has proven false; today most people in the world, seventy-nine percent, believe in God.⁷⁸ With the exception of only a few places in Western Europe and North America, religion continues to play an active role in the daily lives of the vast majority of women and men around the globe.

A second interpretation of secularization seeks to limit religion only to the private subjective sphere. In so doing, religious faith, ideas, and institutions thus become “irrelevant to the institutional functioning of modern society.”⁷⁹ Religion, it is argued, is an individual preference that should have no bearing on social and public life, especially within the modern democratic state. Such an argument is problematic for several reasons. First, as with the thesis of religious decline, the thesis of privatization has proven false. Religions and religious actors have resisted relegation to the private sphere. Indeed, a core thesis of Casanova’s book is that religions are becoming “deprivatized,” even in Western democratic societies such as the United States.

The thesis of privatization is also problematic in that it can lead people to adopt “a minimalist attitude toward religion’s possible roles vis-à-vis the state.”⁸⁰ The polarization of public and private spheres, with religion limited to the latter overlooks the important

⁷⁸ Ibid., 2.

⁷⁹ David Hollenbach, *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003), 4.

⁸⁰ Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred*, 1.

role played by civil society and its potential to offer a “counterweight to this pressure from the state and the market.”⁸¹

A third possible interpretation of secularization according to Casanova focuses on the functional differentiation of the “the secular spheres—primarily the state, the economy, and science—from the religious sphere.”⁸² While the other two interpretations of secularization have proven false, this thesis according to Casanova “remains valid.”⁸³ Indeed, this differentiation between the state and religion remains one of the defining characteristics of the modern political system. In many cases, especially where religious freedom is valued, it is precisely this differentiation that enables religion to have a more effective public role. No longer unduly tied to the political establishment, religious actors are more fully able to criticize the state and propose creative solutions to problems affecting the common good.

Admittedly, however, the public engagement of religion over the past several decades has not been purely constructive. In his book, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred*, R. Scott Appleby explores the varied ways in which religions and religious believers seek to understand and respond to the sacred in public. Using vivid examples, Appleby shows how the public response of religion to the sacred through such things as religious militancy is neither inherently destructive nor purely constructive.

⁸¹ Hollenbach, *The Global Face of Public Faith*, 151.

⁸² José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 2.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 6.

A. Transnational Religious Actors

Despite the possibility that religion may serve as a source of conflict, religion and religious actors possess several specific resources “that give them the potential to act as constructive forces for peace and conflict transformation.”⁸⁴ For J. Bryan Hehir, transnational religious actors offer three major resources to global politics.⁸⁵ First, religions offer ideas and ethical visions that inspire and move people in both public and private ways. Such ideas must be taken seriously, since they often manifest themselves publicly.

Second, most religions, as Hehir also points out, generate “institutions which have social significance.”⁸⁶ At the local level, religious schools and health care institutions play important roles in the social fabric of society. These institutions often differ from those established by international humanitarian NGOs or IGOs in that they are “long term players.”⁸⁷ Unlike some other actors, religious institutions often have deep ties to local communities and cultures. Internationally, religiously inspired institutions, as we will see in this project, are transforming global governance as they seek to connect these local experiences with global decision makers.

Finally, according to Hehir, religions form communities that often transcend the boundaries of the nation state. These communities are a tremendous source of energy and creativity in addressing the problems facing the world. While religions have often been manipulated by political figures in the past, the differentiation of religion from the state,

⁸⁴ Cynthia Sampson, “Religion and Peacebuilding,” in *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, ed. I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1997), 275.

⁸⁵ Hehir, “Overview,” 15.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁸⁷ Sampson, “Religion and Peacebuilding,” 275.

together with globalization and the emergence of new communication technologies, will continue to bolster the role of religious communities in offering alternatives to the state-centered narratives.⁸⁸

B. The Catholic Church as Transnational Actor for the Global Common Good

Among those religious actors currently engaged in the public sphere, the Roman Catholic Church is especially noteworthy. As “arguably the oldest global institution,” the Catholic Church has a long and sometimes tragic history of public engagement.⁸⁹ For much of its history, the predominant approach advocated by the Catholic Church was a established-church model, in which the church sought to assert religious, economic, and civil power through close ties or control of the state. Without question, this approach led to a number of excesses and abuses of power throughout history.

As the next chapter will explore more deeply, changes at and around the Second Vatican Council dramatically transformed Catholic engagement in the public sphere. By endorsing the idea of religious freedom, the council accepted the “voluntary disestablishment” of the church from the state and opened up the possibility for new forms of Catholic engagement in the public sphere.⁹⁰ This dramatic change in the official position of the church vis-à-vis the state, as Casanova reflects, shifted “the public locus of the church” from the state to the broader context of “civil society.”⁹¹ With this move, the church adopted a stance in favor of democracy and public participation that would have been unimaginable in the nineteenth century.

⁸⁸ Toft, Philpott, and Shah, *God's Century*, 209.

⁸⁹ Berger, “Religion and Global Civil Society,” 19.

⁹⁰ Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World*, 62.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 63.

In their book *God's Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics*, Monica Duffy Toft, Daniel Philpott, and Timothy Samuel Shah explore some of the effects of this monumental shift. Building on Samuel Huntington's work on the "third wave of democracy," the authors analyze the role of religion in the promotion of democracy over the past forty years.⁹² Like Huntington, the three authors identify the Catholic Church as playing a major role in the promotion of democracy and human rights, from the struggle against oppressive communism in Poland to the promotion of democracy and liberation in Brazil. While they affirm the presence of prodemocratic forces in most religions, they particularly highlight the transformative role of national Catholic churches and national Catholic organizations in the emergence of democratic governments over the past four decades:

the fact is that religious actors from the Catholic tradition accounted for an overwhelming proportion of religious activism on behalf of democracy between 1972 and 2009. In three-quarters of the cases where religious actors played a role in democratization—36 of 48 countries—at least one of the prodemocratic religious actors was Catholic. In 18 of 48 cases, the *only* religious actors that played a leading or supporting democratizing role were Catholic actors.⁹³

C. The Catholic Church and Global Governance

The present public engagement of the Roman Catholic Church, however, is not limited to national efforts supporting democracy. For centuries, Catholic actors have maintained an active engagement in shaping international relations both positively and negatively. Throughout history, even as popes governed specific regions of Italy, the Catholic tradition has been supportive of the creation of transnational political structures,

⁹² See Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

⁹³ Toft, Philpott, and Shah, *God's Century*, 101.

often with the purpose to “unite all humankind in a universal family under the fatherhood of God.”⁹⁴ While clearly self-serving at times, especially in the period of Christendom, this universal vision inherent within Roman Catholicism has also encouraged some of the first proposals for the creation and support of a structured community of nations.

Following the collapse of Christendom in the sixteenth century, several notable Catholic scholars sought to reshape the international political order in light of this universal vision. For example, the French monks Emeric Crucé (1590–1648) and Charles-Irenée Castel de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743) crafted some of the first proposals for the creation of a confederation of states (including non-Christian states).⁹⁵ In the same period, scholars in Spain such as Francisco de Vitoria (1480-1546) and Francisco Suárez (1548-1617) were attempting to rethink international law and sovereignty in light of Spain’s brutal colonization of the Americas. In the twentieth century, Catholic intellectuals and political leaders, such as Robert Schuman (1886-1963), Alcide De Gasperi (1881-1954), and Jacques Maritain (1882-1973), made significant contributions to the formation of the European Union and UN.

Today, the Catholic community formally engages the global political community in two primary ways. First, through the representation of the “Holy See,” the church engages top-level political leadership in what could be called a “track I” approach. Second, the Catholic Church works for the global common good less officially through a diverse collection of Catholic NGOs, which resembles Montville’s “track II” and Lederach’s “middle range” approach.

⁹⁴ Robert John Araujo and John A Lucal, *Papal Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace: The Vatican and International Organization From the Early Years to the League of Nations* (Ann Arbor, MI: Sapientia Press, 2004), 17.

⁹⁵ See Ronald G. Musto, *The Catholic Peace Tradition* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986), 166–167.

D. The Holy See

Under the personality of the Holy See, the Catholic community has a unique quasi-governmental status in international law. Distinct from the Vatican City State (which only came into being in the 1920s and has its own personality under international law), the Holy See refers to the broader jurisdiction and government of the Roman Church with the pope as its head. While representatives of popes have been sent to Christian provinces and to the major courts of kings and emperors since the time of Pope Damasus I (366-380), the modern form of the Holy See's legal status emerged in the late nineteenth century.⁹⁶ With the loss of the Papal States to Italy in 1870, the status of the Holy See as a sovereign international personality came into question ("the Roman question"). This loss of territory, however, as Pio Ciprotti points out, did not result in the loss of recognition of the Holy See as an international entity.⁹⁷ Even without territory in this period, the Holy See maintained active diplomatic relations with several states.

Support for this special status for the Holy See as a sovereign international personality, according to Roman Melnyk, is based on three factors: its "autonomy, power of self-organization and capacity to enter into and act upon international juridical acts."⁹⁸ While it does not meet the criteria of having a defined territory as outlined by the 1933 Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, these three factors enable it to be recognized in the words of Archbishop Hyginus Eugene Cardinale, as "an *atypical*

⁹⁶ See Hyginus Eugene Cardinale, *The Holy See and the International Order* (Gerrards Cross, UK: Colin Smythe, 1976), 59–63.

⁹⁷ Pio Ciprotti, "The Holy See: Its Function, Form, and Status in International Law," *Concilium* 8, no. 63 (1970): 63–73. In this period, for example, the Holy See continued to maintain diplomatic relations with other states as protected by the Congress of Vienna in 1815; it upheld the international concordats and agreements to which it was a party; and it continued to engage in the mediation of disputes between states.

⁹⁸ Roman A. Melnyk, *Vatican Diplomacy at the United Nations: A History of Catholic Global Engagement* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2009), 56; See also Araujo and Lucal, *Papal Diplomacy*, chap. 1.

organism...analogous to, but not identical with, that of a national State. As a consequence, certain characteristics traditionally considered proper to statehood cannot be found inherent in her structure.”⁹⁹

Even with its status in question in the period between 1870 and 1929, the Holy See maintained an active presence in international affairs. During the First World War, Pope Benedict XV attempted a number of unsuccessful mediation efforts and devoted a considerable amount of resources to aid people affected by the hostilities.¹⁰⁰ At the end of the conflict, he publicly endorsed the idea of the League of Nations in his new year’s message to America in 1919 and his encyclical *Pacem Dei Munus Pulcherrimum* the following year.¹⁰¹ Despite this support, hostilities towards the Holy See from the Italian state prevented it from joining the Paris Peace Talks in 1919 and ultimately prevented it from being invited to join the League of Nations.

At the end of the Second World War, the creation of the United Nations and UN specialized agencies presented a new opportunity for official Catholic engagement in the intergovernmental institution. Without directly participating, the Holy See followed the events in San Francisco closely through the National Catholic Welfare Conference of American bishops, who continued to track the events in New York in the 1950s.¹⁰²

In 1948, a major development occurred when the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), one of the first specialized agencies of the UN, invited the Holy See

⁹⁹ Cardinale, *The Holy See and the International Order*, 80–81.

¹⁰⁰ Araujo and Lucal, *Papal Diplomacy*, 92.

¹⁰¹ See Benedict XV, *Pacem Dei Munus Pulcherrimum* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1920), nos. 17–19, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xv_enc_23051920_pacem-dei-munus-pulcherrimum_en.html; and Araujo and Lucal, *Papal Diplomacy*, 114–115.

¹⁰² See Jean Gartlan, *At the United Nations: The Story of the NCWC/USCC Office for United Nations Affairs (1946-1972)* (Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, 1998); and Joseph Samuel Rossi, *American Catholics and the Formation of the United Nations* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993).

to participate as a “permanent observer.” A similar recognition was soon accorded by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

In the early 1960s, the Holy See strengthened its position vis-à-vis the international community in two ways. First, the Holy See participated in and signed two international conventions that guaranteed its position within diplomatic relations.¹⁰³

Second, Pope John XXIII, himself a former representative to UNESCO, issued *Pacem in Terris* in 1963. In the encyclical, Pope John offered a strong endorsement of the United Nations and its promise of preventing future wars.

The following year, Pope Paul VI accepted the invitation of the United Nations Secretary General, U Thant, to participate in the overall work of the UN as a “permanent observer state,” a status held by Monaco, Switzerland and other states at the time. In 2002, when Switzerland officially joined the United Nations, the Holy See became the only entity with this status and new questions emerged about the legitimacy of this status. Several NGOs opposed to the Catholic Church’s “pro-life” stance, for example, fiercely campaigned to limit the voice of the Holy See or to have its status changed to an NGO.¹⁰⁴ To support and clarify the position of the Holy See, the 2004 United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution A/RES/58/314 on the “Participation of the Holy See in the Work of the United Nations.” The resolution affirmed the status of the Holy See as a permanent observer state and guaranteed it the full rights of participation in the General Assembly and subsidiary bodies except for the right to vote.

¹⁰³ The 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the 1963 *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations*.

¹⁰⁴ For example, the NGO Catholics for Choice has launched a campaign “See Change” to lobby the United Nations to downgrade the status of the Holy See from a permanent observer state to an NGO. See Catholics for Choice, “CFC See Change Campaign,” 2008, <http://www.seechange.org/>; and Jane W. Muthumbi, *Participation, Representation, and Global Civil Society: Christian and Islamic Fundamentalist Anti-Abortion Networks and United Nations Conferences* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010), 95–96.

Today, the Holy See maintains formal diplomatic relations with 178 states, which recognize its sovereignty, as well as the European Union and the Knights of Malta. It is formally a voting member of nine intergovernmental organizations (e.g., the International Atomic Energy Agency) and is a permanent observer or guest in twenty-two other IGOs and programs with official diplomatic missions in New York, Geneva, Paris, Vienna, and other cities where international institutions are headquartered.¹⁰⁵

E. Catholic Nongovernmental Organizations

In addition to this top-level engagement directed by the Holy See, the Catholic community is actively engaged in local, national, regional, and global politics through hundreds of transnational organizations and communities. These NGOs engage political questions in various ways depending on the organization's unique charism and self-understanding of mission.

While the role of the Holy See in the promotion of the global common good has been the subject of several studies, the contribution and theological motivation of Catholic NGOs has not yet been adequately explored.¹⁰⁶ Generally, the “bottom-up” approach of these organizations has two advantages over the more formal engagement of the Holy See. First, as suggested by Lederach, Weiss, and the proponents of multi-track

¹⁰⁵ “Bilateral and Multilateral Relations of the Holy See,” *Vatican Website*, October 22, 2009, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_20010123_holy-see-relations_en.html. The Vatican City State, a distinct entity, is itself a member of seven additional organizations including as the International Telecommunication Union.

¹⁰⁶ While some projects have explored issues around specific organizations, little serious attention has been given to the role played by these organizations more broadly. In his recent doctoral dissertation, Emeka Christian Obiezu offers a constructive analysis of the different forms of interaction by Catholic actors in the work of the United Nations system, including Catholic NGOs through the lens of participation. More sustained research, however, is needed to understand the theological meaning of collective action for the global common good. See Emeka Christian Obiezu, “A Theological Interpretation and Assessment of the Participation of the Roman Catholic Church and Roman Catholic Church-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the United Nations” (Doctor of Philosophy, University of St. Michael's College, 2010).

diplomacy, Catholic NGOs tend to be more flexible and creative than the top level.¹⁰⁷ Second, they are often more directly connected with the grassroots reality—something that helps them to both advocate on behalf of people at that level and to educate local leaders on global issues. Addressing NGOs on his first visit to the United Nations in 1979, Pope John Paul II points to the importance of this connection to the grassroots:

No organization, however, not even the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies, can alone solve the global problems which are constantly brought to its attention, if its concerns are not shared by all the people. It is then the privileged task of the non-governmental organizations to help bring these concerns into the communities and the homes of the people, and to bring back to the established agencies the priorities and aspirations of the people, so that all the solutions and projects which are envisaged may be truly geared to the needs of the human person.¹⁰⁸

The international public engagement of Catholic NGOs dates back to the beginnings of the modern inter-governmental system, making them among the first voices of global civil society. In the 1920s, a dozen Catholic NGOs were among the small number of international organizations to develop working relationships with the League of Nations. In 1927, the L'Union catholique d'études internationales invited the presidents of nine international Catholic organizations for a meeting.¹⁰⁹ Together, the organizations founded the “Conference of Presidents” of international Catholic

¹⁰⁷ Writing in the 1970s, Cardinale points to the international Catholic organizations as being “among the most efficacious and flexible instruments” that the church uses in its public engagement. Cardinale, *The Holy See and the International Order*, 266.

¹⁰⁸ John Paul II, “Address of His Holiness John Paul II to the Representatives of Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations” (New York, October 2, 1979), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1979/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19791002_usa-ngo_en.html.

¹⁰⁹ The organizations present included International Catholic Society for Girls; International Association of Catholic Youth; Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul; International Federation of Catholic Boy Scouts; Opera Ferrari; Pax Romana; International Catholic Union for Social Service; International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues; International Union of Catholic Charities. See François Blin, *Repères pour l'histoire de la Conférence des organisations internationales catholiques (1927-2008)* (Paris: Editions Eclectica, 2008), 6–7.

organizations to support their work with the League of Nations. In a 1947 note for Giovanni Battista Montini—the future Paul VI—Vittorino Veronese described how the meetings of the Conference of Presidents and their work with the League “were barely tolerated by the Roman Authorities, who mistrusted the laicism of certain international groups.”¹¹⁰ By 1939, over twenty-five organizations were participating in the Conference with little to no support from the Catholic hierarchy for their political engagement.

Following the Second World War, the Conference of Presidents resumed its activities, changed its name to the Conference of International Catholic Organizations, and many of its members sought relationships with the United Nations and UN Agencies. In 1947 the NGO Committee of ECOSOC granted consultative status to two international Catholic organizations (ICOs) (the Catholic International Union for Social Service and the International Union of Catholic Women’s Leagues) and delayed consideration of a third (Pax Romana) until the following year. Under Pope John XXIII and Paul VI (both trained diplomats with close ties to the ICOs), greater support, including some financial support, was given to these groups and their activities with the United Nations. After a period of steady growth, a sharp increase in the quantity and quality of Catholic NGO involvement in global civil society was seen in the 1990s and 2000s.

Presently, over one hundred such organizations maintain a formal relationship with the United Nations and other intergovernmental bodies.¹¹¹ From their specific charisms, missions, and experiences, these transnational organizations are engaged in a

¹¹⁰ This text is included in Rosemary Goldie, *From a Roman Window: Five Decades of the World, the Church and the Laity* (Melbourne: HarperCollins Melbourne, 1998), 47. Veronese (1910-1986), a close collaborator of Montini, served as the international vice-president for Pax Romana-ICMICA and the head of the Italian Catholic Action in the 1940s. From 1958 to 1961, he served as the Director General of UNESCO.

¹¹¹ A list of these organizations can be found in the Appendix.

variety of social actions including advocacy, policy analysis, formation, and program implementation. A few Catholic NGOs, for example, are among the most active organizations in bringing reports of human rights violations to the UN Human Rights Council. Through their work, these organizations have shaped and strengthened the UN human rights system in ways that have led to the greater protection of human rights on the ground. Other Catholic NGOs have developed formal relationships with UN Agencies to cooperate in their local programs. For instance, Caritas Internationalis and UNAIDS have signed a cooperation agreement to work together in specific areas at local and national levels. Further, others have used their relationship with structures of global governance as a way to empower and engage their members, especially those whose voices are often excluded from decision-making.

In addition to their formal engagement with intergovernmental institutions, Catholic NGOs are actively responding to transnational challenges in creative transnational ways. They mobilize their members through various solidarity campaigns and have helped to create and lead alternative civil society networks notably the World Social Forum, the annual alternative gathering to the World Economic Forum. They have also played a key role in developing thematic and issue-based organizational networks to address pressing global issues such as trafficking of women, youth, and development.

F. Diversity Within the Catholic NGO Community

While these NGOs share a number of common concerns stemming from a shared Catholic-Christian identity, there is a great diversity among them and between the Catholic NGOs and the Holy See in terms of style, structure, and advocacy priorities.

Broadly, it is possible to identify four categories or types of international Catholic NGOs active in global civil society today. The first and the oldest grouping is that of the *international Catholic organizations*, the large meta-organizations (e.g., federations, unions) of national lay organizations and movements such as the International Federation of Catholic Universities and the Young Catholic Workers.

These organizations created and participated in the Conference of International Catholic Organizations (1927-2008). As a grouping, they established several international Catholic centers to assist the work of ICOs and other Catholic NGOs. Although the Conference dissolved under pressure from the Pontifical Council for the Laity in 2008, three of these centers continue to exist with broader missions: the International Catholic Organizations Information Center in New York, the Centre catholique international de coopération avec l'UNESCO in Paris; and the Centre catholique international de Genève.¹¹²

Closely related to the ICOs is a second major grouping, the international Catholic development and charitable agencies. While many of national Catholic development agencies, such as Catholic Relief Services (USA) or Trócaire (Ireland) have their own international accreditation, most also form part of the broader networks of Caritas Internationalis and/or CIDSE. Both of these broader networks operate globally as NGOs with their own formal status. While CIDSE was never formally recognized as an ICO as Caritas was, it did participate in the Conference of ICOs as an associate member.

¹¹² The ICO Center in New York was created in 1976 as the successor to the National Catholic Welfare Office for United Nations Affairs (1946-1972). See Gartlan, *At the United Nations: The Story of the NCWC/USCC Office for United Nations Affairs (1946-1972)*; Rossi, *American Catholics and the Formation of the United Nations*; Rossi, *Uncharted Territory*; and Blin, *Repères pour l'histoire de la COIC*, 68–72.

Beginning in the early 1990s, *religious congregations* and communities of vowed priests, sisters and brothers emerged as a third major grouping of Catholic NGOs to develop formal relationships with the UN. Following the Second Vatican Council, many religious congregations and orders adopted a strong concern for justice and peace, leading some to seek relations with the UN. Today, several dozen such NGOs, from Franciscans International to the Sisters of Mercy, have a formal presence in the global political arena. While some religious congregations obtain status as NGOs in their own right, such as the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, others engage the international system through one of their specific ministries or an NGOs established for the specific purpose of international advocacy, sometimes in collaboration with others. Partnership for Global Justice, UNANIMA International, and VIVAT International, for example, are organizations created by several different congregations, with distinct charisms, for the explicit purpose of NGO advocacy.

The fourth and most recent grouping of Catholic-NGOs to become directly involved with the intergovernmental system are the NGOs of the *new ecclesial movements*. In a letter to the first World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements in 1998, Pope John Paul II defined a new movement as being “a concrete ecclesial reality with predominately lay membership” whose work and identity is based on the “precise charism given to the person of the founder in specific circumstances and ways.”¹¹³

As with certain communities of vowed religious, a number of the new movements have created NGOs for the specific purpose of NGO work. For example, the movement

¹¹³ John Paul II, “Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II,” in *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998*, ed. Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Laity Today 2* (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999), 18.

Communion and Liberation operates through its NGO, the Association de Volontaires pour le Service International.

In 2006, representatives from a variety of Catholic NGOs were invited by the Vatican Secretariat of State to help organize an international conference of “Catholic-inspired” NGOs. In 2007, the first Forum of Catholic-inspired NGOs was organized at the Vatican with over ninety NGOs present. This was the first time that the leadership of such a wide-range of organizations came together. In their meeting they were also joined by representatives from major dicasteries of the Roman Curia.

With the dissolution of the Conference of ICOs in 2008, it was hoped that this “Forum of Catholic-Inspired NGOs” might take its place in facilitating dialogue and common action not only among different groupings of NGOs, but also between them and the Holy See. In 2010, a second Forum was held, once again, in Rome. The NGOs present at this meeting agreed to continue the dialogue and established informal thematic groups to network the efforts of various Catholic NGOs.

In the following chapters, this project will look more deeply at the ways in which Catholic NGOs operate; how they perceive their own specific missions; and how they understand the relationship of their mission to the broader mission of the church in the world. Chapters Three and Four will investigate representative case studies from the two larger grouping: an ICO (the International Movement of Catholic Students-Pax Romana) and an NGO sponsored by a vowed religious congregation (Jesuit Refugee Service).

III. RESISTANCE TO THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT OF CATHOLIC NGOS

Despite their contribution in the promotion of the global common good, Catholic NGOs face resistance to their work from both inside and outside the Christian community. In their active engagement within global civil society, these organizations occasionally encounter opposition from other NGOs, government representatives and individuals who argue against any and all direct engagement in the public sphere by religious actors.

While sophisticated arguments against a public role for religion have been made for well over a century from a variety of perspectives, the more recent attacks on religion by the so-called “new atheists” have encouraged more popular resistance to the public role of all religious actors and organizations in Europe and the United States. Religion, it continues to be argued, has no place in political life. It should either be privatized or suppressed altogether. For the more popular champions of this position today, including Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, and Christopher Hitchens, religion functions primarily as a source of conflict and oppression and as such it should not be allowed to occupy a place in the public sphere.¹¹⁴

The hostilities to the public work of Catholic NGOs have intensified following the sexual abuse crisis within the Roman Catholic Church. Unfortunately, revelations of the unconscionable abuse and efforts to cover it up have supported the popular sentiments against institutional religion and have overshadowed the good work being done by many Catholic NGOs.

¹¹⁴ See Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006); Sam Harris, *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2004); Christopher Hitchens, *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything* (New York: Twelve, 2007).

Resistance to the work of Catholic NGOs also comes from within the Christian community, including from within the Catholic NGOs themselves. Some Christians oppose any direct political engagement with governmental or inter-governmental structures. Any such formal relationships are perceived to involve a compromise of the radical demands of Christian discipleship. For many of these critics, such as those inspired by the work of Dorothy Day, the founder of the Catholic Worker movement or the Methodist theologian Stanley Hauerwas, the most effective and authentically Christian way to interact with political structures is through prophetic witness, resistance, and protest. Among these critics, the American Catholic theologian Michael Baxter stands out. For Baxter, the “public theology” that underlines much of the engagement of Catholic NGOs is an ideology that functions to legitimize the unjust nation-state and international order.¹¹⁵

This criticism is especially strong for NGOs which engage the Bretton Woods Institutions and other structures that support models of neoliberal globalization as characterized by the “Washington Consensus.” Even within those organizations with a long tradition of working with the intergovernmental system, there can be opposition to publicly engaging the international financial institutions.¹¹⁶

A third source of resistance comes from those Christians who are reluctant to devote too much attention to social justice as they seek to live out their mission as

¹¹⁵ Michael J. Baxter, “‘Blowing the Dynamite of the Church’: Catholic Radicalism from a Catholic Radicalist Perspective,” in *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*, ed. William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin (Milwaukee WI.: Marquette University, 2001), 93.; See also Michael J. Baxter, “Review Essay: The Non-Catholic Character of the Public Church,” *Modern Theology* 11, no. 2 (April 1, 1995): 243–258. For an overview of Baxter’s critique of public theology and Catholic political advocacy at the national level, see Heyer, *Prophetic & Public*.

¹¹⁶ See Seamus Cleary, “The World Bank and NGOs,” in *The “Conscience of the World”: The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, ed. Peter Willetts (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996), 63–97.

Christian organizations. While the 1971 World Synod of Bishops recognized that the struggle for justice in the world is a “a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel,” some in the church continue to perceive public action for justice as irrelevant or at best secondary to the supposed “real” religious mission of the church in its sacramental life, efforts at fostering internal communion, and the search for “truth.”¹¹⁷

Unlike the other two forms of resistance, this resistance to the work of Catholic NGOs generally manifests is more passive. Given the strong social justice tradition within Christianity, very few people directly contest the relevancy of justice to the Christian life and mission. The place and import of justice in relationship to the church’s mission, however, continues to be a source of debate.

As we will again take up in the following chapter, Pope Benedict XVI’s first encyclical *Deus Caritas Est* (2005) and its reception in certain circles suggests this type of resistance to the public work of Catholic NGOs in three ways.¹¹⁸ First, according to Pope Benedict, who maintains a sharp distinction between the domain of the church and the domain of the state, public work for justice is not the direct responsibility of the church, but it is more the responsibility of Christians in their individual capacity *as citizens*. In the letter, the pope writes:

the formation of just structures is not *directly* the duty of the Church, but belongs to the world of politics, the sphere of the autonomous use of reason. The Church has an *indirect* duty here, in that she is called to contribute to the purification of reason... The direct duty to work for a just ordering of society, on the other hand,

¹¹⁷ See Synod of Bishops, *Justitia in Mundo, Justice in the World* (1971), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), introduction.

¹¹⁸ For an positive reception of the encyclical’s understanding of justice and the church’s mission, see Richard John Neuhaus, “Pope Benedict on Love and Justice,” *First Things*, May 2006, <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2009/03/pope-benedict-on-love-and-justice-32>.

is proper to the lay faithful. As citizens of the State, they are called to take part in public life in a *personal capacity*.¹¹⁹

This distinction between the role of the church and the role of the lay faithful in their personal capacity calls into question both the public presence of NGOs of religious congregations and the ecclesial status of NGOs of the laity who identify themselves as acting as church in their international actions for justice. Even while expressing gratitude for the work of “Catholic-inspired” NGOs in his address to the 2007 Forum, the pope quoted the above paragraph to again emphasize that direct work for social justice is not the work of the church directly, but is the role of the lay faithful in “a personal capacity” as they serve as “Christian diplomats and members of” NGOs.¹²⁰ Though, as Lisa Sowle Cahill notes, Pope Benedict’s subsequent encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate* (2009), suggests a shift in his understanding of the importance of justice for the church’s role, it remains unclear whether he would consider the collective work of Catholic NGOs to be a part of the mission as church.¹²¹

Second, while he by no means condemns the public work of Catholic NGOs in *Deus Caritas Est*, Pope Benedict is critical of the style of political engagement of two of the most active Catholic NGOs (CIDSE and Caritas Internationals). He does this by stressing that service to the “immediate needs and specific situation” and independence

¹¹⁹ Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est, God Is Love* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2005), no. 29, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est_en.html. Emphasis added.

¹²⁰ Benedict XVI, “Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to Representatives of the Holy See; to International Organizations and to Participants in the Forum of Catholic-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations,” *The Holy See*, December 1, 2007, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2007/december/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20071201_ong_en.html.

¹²¹ See Lisa Sowle Cahill, “*Caritas in Veritate*: Benedict’s Global Reorientation,” *Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (June 1, 2010): 291–319. The relationship between charity and justice in the teaching of Pope Benedict will again be addressed in the next chapter.

from “worldly stratagems” are “essential elements” of a true church charitable organization.¹²² Framing the point in this way might suggest that the two main networks of Catholic charitable and development agencies should leave aside their focus on addressing the root causes of poverty, conflict, and humanitarian emergencies and focus more on traditional forms of charitable service.

Third, though he later in *Caritas in Veritate* acknowledges that charity and justice are “inseparable,” he stresses there that “*Charity goes beyond justice.*”¹²³ Reflecting the Augustinian framework of his thought, *Deus Caritas Est* prioritizes the theological virtue of charity over justice as the pope distinguishes between the role of justice in building up the “*earthly city*” from the role of charity in “the building of the universal *city of God*, which is the goal of the history of the human family.”¹²⁴ Just before addressing the relationship between charity and justice, for example, *Deus Caritas Est* affirms that the church’s “deepest nature is expressed in her three-fold responsibility: of proclaiming the word of God (*kerygma-martyria*), celebrating the sacraments (*leitourgia*), and exercising the ministry of charity (*diakonia*).”¹²⁵ In this way, as Charles Murphy points out, the pope makes charity and not justice the constitutive element of the church’s mission. In a 2007 article in *Theological Studies*, Murphy shows that with this encyclical and his previous work in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the pope departs from

¹²² Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, no. 31.

¹²³ Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate, Charity in Truth* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009), no. 6, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.

¹²⁴ Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, nos. 6–7.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

the 1971 Synod's understanding of the church's mission which has inspired many Catholic NGOs in their public action.¹²⁶

CONCLUSION

For over ninety years, transnational Catholic organizations have actively sought to participate in the church's mission in the world by working for the global common good. Through advocacy, analysis, leadership formation, and program implementation the more than one hundred officially recognized Catholic NGOs are challenging what J. Bryan Hehir has called the "double legacy" of the Peace of Westphalia. In the present context of globalization, states can no longer be seen as the exclusive sovereign agents of international relations. As shown in different ways by the frameworks offered by Montville, Ledderach, Weiss and others, Catholic NGOs and other civil society actors must play a vital role if we are to address the complex problems facing the world.

With their public actions, Catholic NGOs are showing that religion and religious actors are refusing to be relegated to the private sphere. From their own charisms, experiences, and interpretations of the church's mission in the world, these organizations feel compelled to be engaged in shaping the global public sphere.

At the same time, Catholic NGOs continue to face resistance, including opposition from those within the church who fail to see the fundamental connection between international action for social justice and the church's mission in the world. As

¹²⁶ Ibid., no. 20; and Charles M. Murphy, "Charity, Not Justice, as Constitutive of the Church's Mission," *Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (2007): 275.

will be developed more specifically in the following chapters, the separation of the public work of Catholic NGOs from the church's mission is problematic for several reasons.

The way in which Catholics and church institutions engage the world is closely linked to the ways we interpret God's active role in history today (through the Holy Spirit, grace and charism). By failing to recognize the work of Catholic communities for justice and peace as being a constitutive part of the church's mission, we risk supporting highly individualized, and privatized notions of grace and the responsibility of Christians in history.

Furthermore, by disconnecting social action from the mission of the church, Catholic NGOs themselves may miss specific guiding values and ethical principles from the Catholic tradition to help guide their work. As with all NGOs, Catholic organizations face several practical and ethical challenges. Regardless of their good intentions, some NGOs may end up doing more harm than good. Within the international NGO community as a whole there are a number of ethical perils, to which Catholic organizations are not immune.

For example, among some NGOs there are bitter divisions over a number of politically controversial questions, especially those relating to gender and abortion. Tensions also arise among NGOs as a result of competition for funding and public attention. In the present context, NGOs are most effective in their advocacy when they can work in networks with likeminded organizations for a common purpose.¹²⁷ Unfortunately, however, these same organizations are often more effective in the crucial area of fundraising if they can prove their uniqueness and ability to go it alone. For

¹²⁷ See Weiss and Gordenker, "Pluralizing Global Governance," 25; and Coate, "The John W. Holmes Lecture," 158.

Catholic organizations operative in this context, additional tensions and conflicts occasionally emerge in their relationships with Holy See and other organizations with different ecclesial visions.

Beyond these relational tensions, Catholic NGOs along with their non-Catholic counterparts face four sets of ethical questions in their global public engagement.¹²⁸ A first set relates to *power and participation*. How is power distributed within the organization? Who establishes the norms, rules, and procedures? How are leaders and priority areas chosen? Is anyone empowered by the work of the organization? And what is the relationship between the NGO and other agents of power (e.g., governments, donors, TNCs, etc)?

A second set of questions arises around NGO *legitimacy*. The question of NGO legitimacy has been the topic of a number of recent essays that ask what makes an NGO legitimate in the eyes of its members and in international law.¹²⁹ It is clear that organizational legitimacy goes beyond adherence to proper rules and procedure. For NGOs that self-identify as “Catholic,” there is an added dimension of seeking legitimacy in the eyes of the ecclesial community.

Linked to the questions of power and legitimacy are questions of *accountability*. To whom are NGOs and NGO leaders accountable? And what structures are in place to ensure this accountability? For many NGOs, there is the danger of being controlled by

¹²⁸ Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 31–32.

¹²⁹ See, for example, Darren Halpin and Peter McLaverty, “Legitimizing INGO Advocacy: The Case of Internal Democracies,” in *Evaluating Transnational NGOs Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation*, ed. Kristina Hahn and Jens Steffek (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 55–73; Tanja Bruhl, “Representing the People? NGOs in International Negotiations,” in *Evaluating Transnational NGOs Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation*, ed. Kristina Hahn and Jens Steffek (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 181–99; Kristina Hahn and Jens Steffek, “Evaluating NGOs: Prospects for Academic Analysis,” in *Evaluating Transnational NGOs Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation*, ed. Kristina Hahn and Jens Steffek (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 257–64.

groups of elites, from Europe or North America, with little direct input from the membership. In this way, these organizations can no longer function as middle-range actors. Critical to NGO accountability is NGO *transparency*, something lacking in many NGOs.¹³⁰

A final set of questions relates to NGO *effectiveness*.¹³¹ How are NGOs effective? What prevents an NGO from being effective in its work? And has anything been compromised in order to be effective? The effectiveness of NGO actions, especially in terms of advocacy and formation, are notoriously very difficult to measure. While states and others may wish to downplay the role played by NGOs, organizations may well be tempted to overstate their impact.

In the following chapters we will investigate the ways in which Catholic NGOs participate in the church's mission and how they understand this relationship. After reviewing the renewed understanding of mission that took place within the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century, case studies will help us to see what, if any, guiding values might emerge from such an understanding of the relationship between mission and the work for the global common good. As we will explore more fully in the final chapter, a proper understanding of the relationship between mission and justice can help guide NGOs as they respond to the ethical questions of power, legitimacy, accountability and effectiveness.

¹³⁰ Karns and Mingst, *International Organizations*, 246; See also Peter J. Spiro, "Accounting for NGOs," *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 161–169; Paul Wapner, "Introductory Essay: Paradise Lost? NGOs and Global Accountability," *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 155–60.

¹³¹ See Debora Spar and James Dail, "Of Measurement and Mission: Accounting for Performance in Non-Governmental Organizations," *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 171–81.

Chapter Two: Modern Roman Catholic Foundations for Socio-Political Action

The previous chapter examined the distinctive ways in which Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) contribute to international political life in the present global context. Before turning to studies of specific NGOs, this project will now seek to identify the modern foundational principles that motivate these organizations and to situate their action for the global common good within the overall mission of the church.

Building upon the experiences of Catholic communities and theological reflections following the two world wars, the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) articulated a renewed understanding of the church’s mission in the world. As already indicated in Chapter One, this vision inspired new forms of Catholic political engagement from national pro-democracy movements to global political advocacy within the United Nations system.

Without a doubt, the council’s articulation of mission and its teaching on the role of the church in the world had a tremendous impact on Catholic NGOs. Vatican II’s holistic framework offers Catholic organizations a hermeneutical lens through which to interpret and respond to the insights emerging from various sources, including scripture, the church’s social tradition, specific organizational charisms, experience, and reasoned political discourse.

More concretely, the impact of the council on Catholic NGOs was threefold. First, for those international Catholic organizations (ICOs) already engaged in different forms of social-political action before Vatican II, the council’s vision offered more explicit

theological justifications for this engagement and helped these organizations to see their work as rooted in the gospel and the church's mission. Second, for those Catholic communities not yet directly engaged in social action, including many communities of vowed religious, the council opened the door to a more concerted commitment to social justice and ecclesial public engagement. Finally, the council's teaching itself sparked the creation of many new socially concerned NGOs, agencies, and movements within the church.

Clearly, a detailed analysis of the council's teachings and the diverse ways in which it has been received, interpreted, and implemented far exceeds the scope of this project.¹ Nevertheless, as we will see in this chapter and in the case studies to follow, a review of certain conciliar and postconciliar teachings is instructive for understanding the significance of Catholic NGOs and their relationship to the church's mission.

It would be difficult to overstate the significance of the Second Vatican Council in seeking to understand the relationship between Christian socio-political action and mission. Although Pope Benedict XVI, Agostino Marchetto, and others have strongly cautioned against interpreting Vatican II as a discontinuous break from the past, the council clearly marks the beginning of a different approach of the church to the world.²

The Australian ecclesiologist Ormond Rush summarizes this shift well:

¹ For a detailed analysis of the council and its teaching, see Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II*, 5 vols. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995).

² Both Pope Benedict XVI and Archbishop Marchetto have criticized the interpretation of the council held by Giuseppe Alberigo and the so-called "Bologna School." For example, in his often cited 2005 Christmas address to the Roman Curia, the pope instructed that the council be seen through a "hermeneutics of reform" and not through "a hermeneutics of discontinuity and rupture." Addressing this debate, Ormond Rush constructively distinguishes between "micro-ruptures" and "macro-ruptures" within the tradition. For Rush, the council did not intend to break with the tradition. Rather, it accepted some micro-ruptures for the sake of preserving the tradition. See Benedict XVI, "Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering Them His Christmas Greetings," *The Holy See*, December 22, 2005,

Vatican II certainly broke with the Constantinian era through the Council's desire for dialogue with nonbelievers and in its rejection of the church-state. It certainly broke with the era of Gregory VII in its shift to a diversified world-church and its emphasis on collegiality. It certainly broke with the Counter-Reformation mentality through its appreciation of the independent reception of the great tradition by the separated churches. And it certainly broke with the style of modern Catholicism of the Pius era exemplified by the *Syllabus of Modern Errors*, of Pius IX, neo-Scholastic uniformity, and the authoritarian form of governance exhibited during the Modernist crisis and its aftermath.³

As the above quote indicates, the official Catholic Church's relationship to the world in the period leading up to the council was largely defensive and hostile in the wake of the Reformation, Enlightenment, and French Revolution. The mission of the church in this context was characterized primarily in terms of defending, strengthening, and expanding existing structures and juridical norms of the Roman Catholic Church, which alone was seen to offer the possibility of salvation. Action in society on behalf of justice did not factor strongly into this understanding of mission. Even with the emergence of modern Catholic social teaching following *Rerum Novarum*, the 1891 encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, the Catholic Church continued to condemn the "modernist errors" of lay participation, rapprochement with democracy, and ecumenical cooperation. An officially established church under the protection of the state was seen as the most

http://www.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html; Agostino Marchetto, *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: A Counterpoint for the History of the Council*, trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead (Scranton, PA: University of Scranton Press, 2010); Massimo Faggioli, *Vatican II: The Battle for Meaning* (New York: Paulist Press, 2012); Richard R. Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Rediscovering Vatican II (New York: Paulist Press, 2006), xiii–xviii; Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004), 7.

³ Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, 4; Leon-Joseph Suenes, "Introduction: Co-Responsibility: Dominating Idea of the Council and Its Pastoral Consequences," in *Renewal of Religious Structures: Proceedings of the Congress on the Theology of the Renewal of the Church Centenary of Canada, 1867-1967*, ed. L. K. Shook, vol. 2 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 7.

ideal situation, and organizations under the auspices of Catholic action were expected to protect the church's mission in the "saving of souls."⁴

In calling the Second Vatican Council, Pope John XXIII made it possible for the bishops, as Richard Gaillardetz notes, to overcome the "defensive Catholic posture that had resulted from centuries of perceived threats to the church and its mission."⁵ Even before any text was finalized, it was clear that this council would be distinct in both form and content from the previous ecumenical councils and that a renewed relationship between the church and the world was on the horizon.

For those observing the events in Rome, one of the most obvious indicators of this shift in style was the sheer magnitude of what the Jesuit historian John O'Malley describes as the "biggest meeting" in the history of the world. Over 2,860 bishops and heads of male religious congregations formally participated in part or all of the council, more than triple the 750 bishops who participated in First Vatican Council.⁶ Beyond the official participants, hundreds of theological experts (*periti*), staff, non-Catholic observers, and even a small group of lay "auditors" came to Rome for the event. In O'Malley's estimation, more than 7,500 people converged on Rome at any one time because of the council.⁷

⁴ This is not to say that this period was devoid of Catholic engagement on social questions. Various figures, apostolic religious communities, and lay movements emerged in the century before Vatican II. Many of these innovative and sometimes experimental efforts can be seen as antecedents to modern Catholic NGOs and social movements. See

Edward Cahill, "The Catholic Social Movement: Historical Aspects," in *Official Catholic Social Teaching*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, Readings in Moral Theology 5 (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 3–31; Alexander Roper Vidler, *A Century of Social Catholicism: 1820-1920* (London: SPCK, 1964); Denis Lefèvre, *Marc Sangnier: L'Aventure du Catholicisme social* (Paris: Mame, 2008); Thomas S. Bokenkotter, *Church and Revolution: Catholics in the Struggle for Democracy and Social Justice* (New York: Image Books, 1998).

⁵ Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 4.

⁶ John W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2010), 21.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.

The list of participants is also striking given the unprecedented geographic distribution. Coming from 116 different countries, the participants included a growing number of indigenous bishops from the post-colonial “mission countries.” If only by their participation, the members of the council signaled an important shift in the church’s self-understanding. The Roman Catholic Church could no longer consider itself primarily through the lens of medieval European Christendom; it had become clear that the Catholic Church was truly, in the famous description of Karl Rahner, a “world church.”⁸

Beyond the different relationship indicated by the form of the council, the shift in the church’s relationship to the world is clearly visible in the content of the official texts and teaching. As the council fathers met over the course of four years, questions of mission and the relationship of the church to the “modern world” were a major topic of debate.⁹ While *Gaudium et Spes (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World)* and *Ad Gentes (Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity)* address these questions most directly, teachings on the social dimensions of the church’s mission appear in different ways throughout the sixteen documents of the council. Taken together, these texts offer a comprehensive or integral vision of mission, which, among other things, calls the church and its members to engage in action for social transformation.

This chapter will offer an overview of Vatican II’s renewed vision of mission and how it shapes our understanding of Catholic NGO action. It will begin by looking at the council’s multifaceted understanding of mission. This first part will identify several key

⁸ Karl Rahner, “Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II,” *Theological Studies* 40, no. 4 (1979): 717.

⁹ See Norman P. Tanner, *The Church and the World: Gaudium Et Spes, Inter Mirifica*, Rediscovering Vatican II (New York: Paulist Press, 2005); Norman P. Tanner, “V. The Church in the World (Ecclesia Ad Extra),” in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A Komonchak, trans. Matthew O’Connell, vol. 5, 5 vols. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 270–82.

elements of conciliar teaching that are particularly relevant to the public work of Catholic NGOs. The second part will then examine how this vision of mission has been developed in official Catholic social teaching in the post-conciliar period. In particular, this chapter will examine how action for justice and social transformation on the part of Catholic communities and NGOs has been understood in relation to the church's mission in the world. Before concluding, this chapter will outline a recently proposed missiological framework that addresses the council's integral vision of mission.

I. THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL AND THE RENEWAL OF MISSION

A. The Church in History

One distinguishing feature of the council's renewed vision of mission that has had a strong impact on the work of Catholic NGOs is its affirmation of the church's role and responsibility in history. For Ormond Rush, Vatican II's "historical consciousness" makes it "unique among the councils of the church."¹⁰ As a corrective to those spiritualities and ecclesiologies that promoted a vision of the church detached from history and culture, the council envisions an intimate relationship between the church and the world as it describes the church as a pilgrim people in history.¹¹ The use of the

¹⁰ Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, 8–9.

¹¹ The descriptive metaphor of pilgrim is used several times by the council to describe the church and its journey in the world. See, for example, Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (1964), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Colman O'Neill, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), nos. 48 and 50; Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* (1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Ronan Lennon, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 45; Second Vatican Council, *Ad Gentes Divinitus, Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity* (1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Redmond Fitzmaurice, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 2.

pilgrim imagery captures both the church's nature as existing in history and its vocation toward its eschatological fulfillment.¹² While looking to the future, the church cannot be aloof from the needs and concerns of the present.¹³ Written during the council, Pope Paul VI's encyclical on the church speaks directly to this point:

...the Church cannot remain indifferent to or unaffected by the changes which take place in the world around. They influence, modify, and condition its course of action in all sorts of ways. As we know, the Church does not exist in isolation from the world. It lives in the world, and its members are consequently influenced and guided by the world.¹⁴

This awareness of the place of the church within history enabled both the critical retrieval of insights from earlier moments in time as well as the updating of the tradition to the needs and contexts of the present.¹⁵ In its task of *ressourcement*, of “returning to the sources,” the council draws from the historical-critical method employed by modern biblical and patristic scholars. Insights recovered from scripture and the early church enabled the council to overcome some of the limitations of the pre-conciliar neo-scholastic approaches.¹⁶

This historical consciousness is also apparent in the council's efforts to bring the church up to date (*aggiornamento*) with the needs and contexts of the present. Being

¹² See Richard R. Gaillardetz, “Shifting Meanings in the Lay-Clergy Distinction,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 64 (1999): 124; David Jacobus Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, American Society of Missiology Series 16 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 373–374.

¹³ Expanding on this point, Edward Schillebeeckx argues that salvation can only come about through history: “In this sense it is true that *extra mundum nulla salus*, there is no salvation outside the human world. The world of creation, our history within the environment of nature, is the sphere of God's saving action in and through human mediation.” Edward Schillebeeckx, *Church: The Human Story of God* (New York: Crossroad, 1993); See also Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Mission of the Church* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1973), 69.

¹⁴ Paul VI, *Ecclesiam Suam, On the Church* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1964), no. 42, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam_en.html.

¹⁵ Moreover, the unprecedented media attention given to the council event from news outlets around the world led the bishops to a profound awareness of the importance of their work for the “modern” world and the life of the church across the globe.

¹⁶ See Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, 9.

conscious of the church's increasingly global nature, the council moved beyond ecclesiological models based in an idealized vision of medieval Western Europe.

Throughout the conciliar texts one can observe an appreciation of both universal values and particular cultures.¹⁷ Unlike earlier Tridentine approaches, Vatican II explicitly recognizes the richness and legitimacy of diverse cultural traditions, from the ancient Eastern Catholic Churches to the “new” post-colonial mission churches. *Sacrosanctum Concilium (Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy)*, for example, encourages “legitimate variations and adaptations” of the liturgy, especially in mission countries where local traditions could be incorporated into different celebrations under certain circumstances.¹⁸ In a similar way, *Lumen Gentium (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church)* highlights the value of the diversity that already exists within the church and expresses its desire to embrace other “good” cultural elements.¹⁹

In *Ad Gentes*, missionary activity is grounded in the Trinity and God's decision “to enter into [the] history of mankind in a new and definitive manner, by sending his own Son in human flesh.”²⁰ In following the mission of the incarnate Christ, the church cannot be detached from society or the particular cultures in which it lives. In a departure from previous models of mission that looked down on non-European cultures, *Ad Gentes* affirms the value of local cultures, including those that have not yet explicitly heard the

¹⁷ David Hollenbach constructively describes this approach of the council as “dialogic universalism.” See Hollenbach, *The Global Face of Public Faith*, 3–23.

¹⁸ See Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Joseph Rodgers, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), nos. 34–40.

¹⁹ The church, *Lumen Gentium* writes, “fosters and takes to herself, in so far as they are good, the abilities, the resources and customs of peoples.” *Lumen Gentium*, no. 13.

²⁰ *Ad Gentes*, no. 3.

gospel. Christians should be attentive to these local traditions since in them they can discover “seeds of the Word” already present.²¹

This historical and cultural consciousness is perhaps most explicit in *Gaudium et Spes*, which calls the church to “read the signs of the time” through the lens of the gospel.²² The concerns of church, we are told at the very beginning of the pastoral constitution, are deeply related to the concerns of people in different times and places in the world:

The joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the men of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted in any way, are the joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well... That is why Christians cherish a feeling of deep solidarity with the human race and its history.²³

In its fourth chapter *Gaudium et Spes* highlights the mutual relationship that exists between the church and the world. The church, we read, both contributes and receives in its dynamic relations with the world. Traveling “the same journey as all of mankind,” the pilgrim church gains much from science, culture, philosophy, and language.²⁴

This relationship is not simply of a practical nature. Rather, it is deeply rooted in pneumatology and Christology.²⁵ The council’s vision, for instance, reflects an understanding of grace and the Holy Spirit as being immanent and active within history. Commenting on *Gaudium et Spes*, David Hollenbach points out that in the theology of

²¹ *Ad Gentes*, no. 11. See also Stephen B. Bevans, “Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity: *Ad Gentes*,” in *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*, ed. Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, Rediscovering Vatican II (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 39.

²² *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 4.

²³ *Ibid.*, no. 1.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, no 40. See also nos. 41–44.

²⁵ As J. Bryan Hehir points out, one of the distinguishing features of Vatican II’s social teaching is its grounding in theological concepts. This marks an important shift in the Catholic social doctrine tradition, which was previously grounded in appeals to natural law. J. Bryan Hehir, “Religious Activism for Human Rights: A Christian Case Study,” in *Religious Human Rights in Global Perspective: Religious Perspectives*, ed. John Witte and Johan David Van der Vyver (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1996), 105–107.

the council, “God’s grace is not extrinsic to human experience, understanding, society, or culture.”²⁶ Without discounting the presence of sin and its destructive effects in the world, *Gaudium et Spes* sees signs of grace present in developments of history and culture.²⁷

The ecclesial relationship with the world is also Christological. *Gaudium et Spes* frames its overall vision of the church’s relationship to the world in a well-developed incarnational Christology based on a deep reading of scripture. Jesus Christ, “the Word made flesh” and “redeemer of all mankind,” entered into history through the Incarnation.²⁸ As we read in the Gospels, he shared in the cultural practices and social structures of the time and died at the hands of the state. Christ, in other words, is not some intangible ideal. On the contrary, as the council argues, Christ showed deep concern for the needs of those both near and far as he called his followers “to preach the Gospel to all peoples in order that the human race would become the family of God.”²⁹

By the end of the first session, dialogue became a key concept for many council members seeking to understand the church’s relationship with the world.³⁰ While not itself a text of the council, Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam*—written between the second and third sessions—captures the council’s broad vision of dialogue, using the imagery of four concentric circles: dialogue with all humanity; dialogue with all believers

²⁶ David Hollenbach, “*Gaudium et Spes*,” in *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries And Interpretations*, ed. Kenneth R. Himes et al. (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 277. For an overview of the development of the relationship between nature and grace, see Roger Haight, *The Experience and Language of Grace* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979).

²⁷ “Thus, far from thinking that works produced by man’s own talent and energy are in opposition to God’s power, and that the rational creature exists as a kind of rival to the Creator, Christians are convinced that the triumphs of the human race are a sign of God’s grace and the flowering of His own mysterious design.” *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 34. See also nos. 22 and 41.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 32.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 158.

of the one God; dialogue with all Christians; and dialogue within the Catholic community.³¹

As Vatican II met, two events particularly symbolized this commitment to social engagement and dialogue. Shortly after the council was convened, the bishops indicated that a renewed approach was emerging by issuing a “message to the world,” a move “unprecedented in the history of ecumenical councils.”³² The act of having a positive message directed beyond the church strongly illustrates the shift from the defensive and hostile posture of the past.³³

Three years later, the church’s new dialogical relationship with the world was dramatically captured by the October 1965 visit of Pope Paul VI to the United Nations General Assembly in New York. Leaving the council fathers at the Vatican, the pope in both words and actions communicated to the world the church’s commitment to dialogue and the social concerns faced by the community of nations.³⁴ This “conciliar event” was of particular importance to Catholic NGOs, whose representatives at the time participated in a special audience with the pope at Holy Family Parish near the UN headquarters.³⁵

³¹ Paul VI, *Ecclesiam Suam*, nos. 96–119.

³² O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 99.

³³ The idea for a message to the world originated with Marie-Dominique Chenu, who believed that the council should begin by addressing the concrete reality of the world. The text took on a deeper sense of urgency for the council in light of the particularly tense global political context of October 1963. See Andrea, Régis Ladous Riccardi, “I. The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council,” in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A Komonchak, trans. Matthew O’Connell, vol. 1 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 53–54; Gerald P. Fogarty, “II. The Council Gets Underway,” in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A Komonchak, trans. Matthew O’Connell, vol. 1 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 94.

³⁴ In this regard, the council was building on teachings already expressed by John XXIII in *Pacem in Terris*, which offered support to structures of global governance and emphasized the duties of Christians to participate in the promotion of the global common good. See *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 146.

³⁵ The visit of the pope to the United Nations was warmly welcomed by the council participants, who watched the events in New York from the Vatican. Upon his return to Rome, the pope appeared before the council, which decided to add his speech at the United Nations to its official documentation. Peter

B. The Church as a Sign and Instrument

According to the council, this commitment to social engagement and dialogue flows, in large part, from the church's sacramental vocation to be both a sign and instrument in the world. This is certainly an inspiring vision for Catholic NGOs seeking to positively transform social and political structures. Using biblical imagery *Sacrosanctum Concilium* affirms the obligation of Christians to be “lights of the world.”³⁶ *Lumen Gentium* develops this sacramental mandate further in its very first paragraph:

Since the Church, in Christ, is in the nature of sacrament—a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men—she here proposes, for the benefit of the faithful and of the whole world, to set forth, as clearly as possible, and in the tradition laid down by earlier Councils, her own nature and universal mission.³⁷

As the document subsequently explains, the sacramental nature of the church is closely connected to its mission of proclaiming and witnessing to the kingdom of God on earth.³⁸ The church, even with all its human limitations and failings, “prefigures” this kingdom in the here and now as it gathers together people and communities from different cultures.³⁹ While its reality goes beyond the present, the kingdom of God cannot be detached from history. Members of the church, particularly—but not

Hünemann, “V. The Final Weeds of the Council,” in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, trans. Matthew O’Connell, vol. 5 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 391–392.

³⁶ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 9. For Edward Schillebeeckx, the church is called by its very nature to be “*spes mundi*, hope for the whole world.” Schillebeeckx, *The Mission of the Church*, 48–49.

³⁷ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 5.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 13.

exclusively—the laity, have an obligation to work for the “kingdom of justice, love and peace” in the world today.⁴⁰

Both *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (*Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*) and *Ad Gentes* build upon this sacramental understanding of the church and cite the specific role of the laity, who participate in mission “both as witnesses and living instruments” of evangelization.⁴¹ It is *Gaudium et Spes*, however, that offers the fullest treatment of the church’s sacramental role in the world. Like the social encyclicals of John XXIII, the pastoral constitution welcomes the growing awareness of the unity of the “whole human family” and the responsibility of individuals and groups toward one another.⁴² Such a development aligns well with the universal vision of the church and Christian concerns for unity and peace.

Gaudium et Spes points to the increased unity and interdependence of peoples and cultures as one of the major “signs” of the “modern world.”⁴³ This dynamic reality, the council teaches, calls for “a new endeavor of analysis and synthesis” on the part of the church.⁴⁴ Even if it carries with it some dangers, the process the council describes as “socialization” foreshadows the kingdom of God with its universality and hopes for peace

⁴⁰ Ibid., nos. 35–36; See also *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 43. While several texts of the council highlight the specific role of the laity in the “secular sphere,” other texts point to the obligation of the whole church in this regard.

⁴¹ *Ad Gentes*, no. 1; See also Second Vatican Council, *Apostolicam Actuositatem, The Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People* (1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Father Finnian, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 5.

⁴² *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 75; See also Second Vatican Council, *Dignitatis Humanae, Declaration on Religious Liberty* (1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Laurence Ryan, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 15.

⁴³ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 4.

⁴⁴ Ibid., no. 5.

and development.⁴⁵ Since the church is not detached from the world, the increased interdependence of the human family exerts a profound impact on the way it lives out this mission. Analyzing this context, *Gaudium et Spes* calls for a “widening of the role of the common good” that takes into account the “needs and legitimate aspirations of every other group, and still more of the human family as a whole.”⁴⁶

Because of this link between the kingdom of God and the growing interdependence of the world, the council calls upon all people “to put aside, in the family spirit of the children of God, all conflict between nations and races and to consolidate legitimate human organizations in themselves.”⁴⁷ While not mentioning any directly by name, *Gaudium et Spes* speaks positively of the responsibility of intergovernmental organizations like the United Nations, an organization given “a moral and solemn ratification” by Pope Paul VI’s historic visit only a few weeks before *Gaudium et Spes*’s promulgation.⁴⁸ For the council, global and regional inter-governmental organizations, like the UN, “represent the first attempts at laying the foundations on an international level for a community of all men to work towards the solutions of the very serious problems of our times.”⁴⁹

Due to its fundamental vocation to be both a sign and an instrument of the unity of the human family that God has intended, it is not enough for the church to simply

⁴⁵ See *ibid.*, nos. 25 and 39.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 26.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 42.

⁴⁸ “Our message is meant to be, first of all, a moral and solemn ratification of this lofty institution. This message comes from Our historical experience. It is as an ‘expert in humanity’ that We bring to this Organization the suffrage of Our recent Predecessors, that of the entire Catholic Episcopate, and Our own, convinced as We are that this Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace.” Paul VI, “Address to United Nations General Assembly” (New York, October 4, 1965), <http://www.holyseemission.org/about/paul-VI-speech-at-the-un.aspx>.

⁴⁹ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 84.

approve these developments. Christians, especially the laity, “should willingly and wholeheartedly” as individuals and apostolic associations be involved in the building up and strengthening of a more just and peaceful ordering of the community of nations.⁵⁰

C. The Church as the People of God

A third major aspect of the Second Vatican Council’s teaching that is particularly important for the work of Catholic NGOs, especially lay organizations, is the renewed self-understanding of the church as the “people of God.” In contrast to some of the more hierarchal conceptions of the church that were dominant prior to the council, this image embraces and promotes the participation of the laity in the internal life of the church and its external mission in the world. One of the first signs of this vision can be found in the council’s concern for a more active engagement of the laity in the liturgical life of the church. In the years leading up to the council, bishops, priests, and lay leaders expressed concern with what John O’Malley describes as “a great pastoral problem,” namely that the “faithful had become ‘mute spectators’ at Mass instead of active participants.”⁵¹

With the *Constitution on Sacred Liturgy*, the fathers took up this “problem” at the beginning of their deliberations. In what has become one of the most lasting aspects of

⁵⁰ Ibid., no. 88.

⁵¹ O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 130. Of particular importance here is the role of ICOs in the development of the theology of the laity. For example, Pax Romana, the International Young Christian Workers, and the World Union of Catholic Women’s Organizations served as the primary organizers of the influential World Congresses of the Lay Apostolate leading up to the council. Moreover it was largely from the leadership of these organizations that Paul VI chose the twenty-one lay men and seven lay women to serve as auditors of the council. See Goldie, *From a Roman Window*; Dolores R. Leckey, *The Laity And Christian Education: Apostolicam Actuositatem, Gravissimum Educationis*, *Rediscovering Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 2006), 12; Carmel Elizabeth McEnroy, *Guests in Their Own House: The Women of Vatican II* (New York: Crossroad, 1996); Jan Grootaers, “VIII. The Drama Continues Between the Acts: The ‘Second Preparation’ and Its Opponents,” in *History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, trans. Matthew O’Connell, vol. 2 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 435–446.

the council's teaching, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* calls for adaptations in the liturgy to enable a greater participation of all the baptized:

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy, and to which the Christian people, "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people" (1 Pet. 2:9) have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism.⁵²

According to Ormond Rush, this paragraph of the constitution "provides the hermeneutical key" to understanding the subsequent teaching of the council in several areas, from the participation of all the faithful in the reception of revelation (*sensus fidei*) to the "promotion of the laity as the advance guard in the mission of the church in the world."⁵³ In grounding membership of the church in the sacrament of baptism, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* no. 14 offers a vision of the laity as full participants and members of the church. If the laity have a "right and obligation" to participate in the Eucharist, what *Lumen Gentium* calls the "source and summit" of Christian life, it then follows that they are called to participate in the whole life and mission of the people of God.⁵⁴

The language of "people of God" is most explicit in *Lumen Gentium*. After a first chapter reflecting on the sacramental nature of the church, chapter two highlights the roles and duties of all the faithful by virtue of their baptism. Intentionally placed before the chapters that address the specific roles of bishops, priests, laity, and religious, the chapter entitled "On the People of God" speaks to the common responsibilities of all the faithful. Using the scriptural images of God's covenantal relationship with Israel, *Lumen*

⁵² *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 14.

⁵³ Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II*, 82.

⁵⁴ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 11.

Gentium points to the action of God in calling together men and women from different nations to become a “new” people.⁵⁵

Through the sacrament of baptism Christian men and women are “incorporated into Christ, are placed in the people of God, and in their own way share the priestly, prophetic and kingly office of Christ.”⁵⁶ This recovery of the language of the threefold office by Catholics, as Richard Gaillardetz notes, is “remarkable since it was a theme that for centuries had been so strongly identified with the theology of Luther and other reformers.”⁵⁷ Even if the text is careful to distinguish between the common priesthood and ministerial priesthood, the message is clear. All the faithful, no matter what office they belong to, are called by their baptism to “carry on the mission of the whole Christian people in the Church and in the world.”⁵⁸

While all are called to participate, this participation is not uniform, nor is it a simple distribution of tasks. There exists a wide diversity in the ways in which the faithful live out their baptismal vocation. One way in which the council explains this diversity of participation is through the recovery of the ancient Pauline category of charism. Citing several epistles of St. Paul, chapter one of *Lumen Gentium* speaks of the church as a temple or a dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, who guides the church and grants it “varied hierarchic and charismatic gifts.”⁵⁹

Later in its chapter on the people of God, *Lumen Gentium* expands on this as it points to the action of the Spirit in distributing “special graces among the faithful of

⁵⁵ Ibid., no. 9.

⁵⁶ Ibid., no. 31. This paragraph on the role of the laity in the three-fold office is quoted at the beginning of the *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity. Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 2.

⁵⁷ Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 48.

⁵⁸ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 31.

⁵⁹ Ibid., no. 4.

every rank.”⁶⁰ It is with these gifts, given for the common good of the community (1 Cor. 12:7), that the Holy Spirit works to build up the church and strengthen its mission. As such, the gifts offered by the Spirit will be diverse and fitting to the needs of the community at the time. These charisms are not limited only to extraordinary gifts, such as speaking in tongues or healing. Such amazing gifts should not be hastily sought, nor do they represent the fullness of the Holy Spirit’s activity in the community. Instead, *Lumen Gentium* draws our attention to the presence of “more simple and widely diffused” charisms which continually build up the church and sustain its mission in the world.⁶¹

It is important to note that both *Ad Gentes* and *Apostolicam Actuositatem* cite *Lumen Gentium*’s recovery of the language of charism when speaking of the church’s mission. *Ad Gentes*, for example, points to the hierarchical and charismatic gifts in “giving life to ecclesiastical structures, being as it were in their soul, and inspiring in the hearts of the faithful that same spirit of mission which impelled Christ himself.”⁶² Focusing on the specific role of the lay apostolate, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* affirms that the laity, too, are recipients of charisms given for the building up of the community. These gifts should compel the faithful to engage actively in both the church and the world: “From the reception of these charisms, even the most ordinary ones, there arises for each of the faithful the right and duty of exercising them in the Church and in the world for the good of men and the development of the Church.”⁶³

Mission is therefore not only the purview of the ordained, vowed missionaries or a select group of specialists; it is the responsibility and duty of each and every member of

⁶⁰ Ibid., no. 12; See also *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 38.

⁶¹ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 12; See also Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 51.

⁶² *Ad Gentes*, no. 4.

⁶³ *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 3.

the church. All the baptized, including the laity, have an obligation to respond to God's actions by participating in the "evangelizing and salvific mission of the Church."⁶⁴ The laity, as the council stresses in several places, have a "special vocation" to be like leaven in the world under the guidance of the Holy Spirit: "every lay person, through these gifts given to him, is at once the witness and the living instrument of the mission of the Church itself."⁶⁵

Participation in the church's sacramental and salvific mission in the world is not optional for any member of faithful.⁶⁶ This obligation is most clearly evident in the decrees on the laity and on mission. Drawing from the Pauline image of the church as the Body of Christ, the decree on the laity stresses that "a member who does not work at the growth of the body to the extent of his possibilities must be considered useless both to the Church and to himself."⁶⁷ In other words, all the baptized have an obligation to share in the missionary vocation "by example of their lives and their witness to the world, wherever they live."⁶⁸

The laity are called to participate in this task through various forms of the apostolate, both individually and in associations. *Apostolicam Actuositatem* details the need for a greater responsibility and organization of lay people in this regard. By virtue of their particular "secular" state, the laity's apostolic responsibility calls for a special

⁶⁴ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 33.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*; See also *Ad Gentes*, no. 15; *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 2; *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 43.

⁶⁶ "All the laity, then, have the exalted duty of working for the ever greater spread of the divine plan of salvation to all men, of every epoch and all over the earth. Therefore may the way be clear for them to share diligently in the salvific work of the Church according to their ability and the needs of the times." *Lumen Gentium*, no. 33.

⁶⁷ *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 2.

⁶⁸ *Ad Gentes*, no. 11.

concern for social justice, including a concern for the global common good.⁶⁹ After welcoming the growing “sense of solidarity” in the world, the decree on the laity specifically highlights the “task of the lay apostolate to take pains in developing this sense and transforming it into a really sincere desire for brotherly union.”⁷⁰ The laity, the text continues, have a specific obligation to be aware and engaged in the “international sector,” with special attention to the needs of the poor.

Organized associations of the apostolate play an important role in this part of the church’s mission. These associations are not limited to any specific model, such as that of Catholic action. The demands of the church’s mission call for a variety of apostolic associations to meet different needs in the community. While important, none of these, we read, should be understood as “ends in themselves.” Instead, “they are meant to be of service to the Church’s mission to the world.”⁷¹ Not surprisingly, both *Apostolicam Actuositatem* and *Gaudium et Spes* single out international Catholic organizations as playing an important role in supporting local apostolic initiatives among their members and advancing the church’s mission among the “community of nations.”

D. Renewed Vision of Religious Life

The rediscovery of the church’s nature as a diverse “people” united together in a single mission not only encourages greater social action among the laity but also calls for a deeper and more dynamic engagement in the world by communities of vowed religious women and men. The council’s teaching on religious life within its overall missiology,

⁶⁹ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 30.

⁷⁰ *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 14.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, no. 19.

ecclesiology, and ethical vision had a significant impact on religious institutes around the world. By putting aside the hostile and defensive posture toward the world, the council inspired many religious to take on new forms of public engagement at local, national, and global levels.

Among the council's documents, the renewed understanding of the role of religious life is articulated most directly in *Lumen Gentium* and *Perfectae Caritatis*, (*Decree on the Up-to-date Renewal of Religious Life*). The way in which these documents treat religious life stands in contrast to the ways in which it was perceived in the post-Tridentine period prior to the council. In this period vowed religious were seen as having a privileged place in the church. The evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience were seen as necessitating a flight or separation from the “profane” temptation of the world. Despite the impressive social initiatives of many apostolic communities in this period (e.g., schools, hospitals), religious were instructed to detach themselves from the historical and social context and focus on the original juridical rule of their community—even if that meant being out of step with the needs of the present. This was particularly difficult for vowed women, who, as Maryanne Confoy explains, were often reduced to “living anachronisms rather than witnesses to an authentic Christian lifestyle.”⁷²

By the 1960s it was clear that a renewed vision was needed. Building on earlier efforts at reform and the emerging historical consciousness within the church, *Lumen Gentium* rejects the idea that vowed life cuts one off from the world: “Let no one think either that their consecrated way of life alienates religious from other men or makes them

⁷² Maryanne Confoy, *Religious Life and Priesthood: Perfectae Caritatis, Optatam Totius, Presbyterorum Ordinis*, Rediscovering Vatican II (New York: Paulist Press, 2008), 181.

useless for human society.” Even in its strictest observance where monastic life limits contact with those outside the cloister or monastery, religious still participate in the “building up of human society” as they are united with others “in the heart of Christ” through prayer and contemplation.⁷³

In *Perfectae Caritatis* the council outlines how this renewal should take place. Guided by the Holy Spirit and in communion with the church, religious, like the church as a whole, are called to engage in the twofold process of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento*. On the one hand, religious should work toward “a constant return” to the Gospel and the animating charism of their community. At the same time, the renewal calls for the “adaptation” of religious life “to the changed conditions of our time.”⁷⁴

Throughout *Perfectae Caritatis* and the subsequent documents aimed at implementing the decree, the historical and social consciousness of the council is clear. Existing communities or institutes should renew their manner of life, including the practices of prayer and work so that they are “in harmony with the present-day” ecclesial, cultural, “social and economic circumstances.”⁷⁵ New institutes should be developed in such a way that takes “into account the character and way of life of the inhabitants, and the local customs and conditions.”⁷⁶ This also includes those nuns in papal cloisters who are to take into account the social context and adjust their rule “to suit the conditions of time and place.”⁷⁷

⁷³ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 46.

⁷⁴ Second Vatican Council, *Perfectae Caritatis, Decree on the Up-To-Date Renewal of Religious Life* (1965), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, trans. Austin Flannery, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 2.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 3.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 19.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 16.

In the decades following the council, religious women and men took seriously the calls for renewal contained in *Perfectae Caritatis*, *Gaudium et Spes*, *Ad Gentes*, and other conciliar documents. For many, the teachings of the council resulted in more explicit concerns and actions on issues of social justice, liberation, and the needs of the poor. Religious were no longer to be passive bystanders to the sufferings and joys of people in history. Rather, as with the whole people of God, vowed religious were to participate in the church's sacramental mission in the world. In his 1971 apostolic exhortation on the renewal of religious life, Pope Paul VI commends these developments. For the pope this concern, rooted in the Gospel and the example of Christ, is certainly appropriate for religious who "have an important role to fulfill in the sphere of works of mercy, assistance and social justice."⁷⁸ After ruling out the "temptation" of religious to "take violent action" in the service of justice, Paul VI calls upon religious not to "compromise with any form of social injustice." Instead, they should live in solidarity with the poor and work to "awaken consciences to the drama of misery and to the demands of social justice made by the Gospel and the Church."⁷⁹

As part of this effort at "awakening consciences," religious have collectively and individually engaged in a variety of efforts at social concern. Many congregations, for example, have created committees or leadership positions to pursue concerns of justice, peace, and the integrity of creation. They have included social justice in educational curricula, and some have begun to engage directly in public debates on social issues through advocacy initiatives at local, national and global levels.

⁷⁸ Paul VI, *Evangelica Testificatio, Apostolic Exhortation on the Renewal of Religious Life* (1971), in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery, vol. 1, New Revised Edition (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1998), no. 16.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 18.

E. Autonomy of the Political

While the council's historical consciousness and renewed reading of scripture led it to affirm a dialogical relationship with the world, the forms of such engagement were to be different from those championed by official Catholic teaching for more than a millennium. By affirming the right to religious freedom with its groundbreaking declaration *Dignitatis Humanae* (*Declaration on Religious Freedom*), the council put aside the Christendom model in favor of a new approach that affirmed the autonomy of the political sphere and encouraged the public work of Catholic NGOs.

Prior to the council, the Roman Catholic Church's official position vis-à-vis the political community was to work for the establishment of Catholicism as the religion of the state. Based on the belief that "error has no rights," the church's official position called on civil governments to promote the Catholic faith and discourage other religious practices. This stance, known as the "thesis/hypothesis," saw an established church as the ideal situation. Religious freedom would only be promoted in those "non-ideal" contexts where Catholics were not (yet) in the majority.⁸⁰

With *Dignitatis Humanae* the church no longer sought to establish national churches along the lines of the Christendom model. Instead, it dramatically changed its relationships with governments by endorsing the right of religious freedom, a right

⁸⁰ See O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 212; and Jeffery Gros, "Declaration on Religious Freedom: *Dignitatis Humanae*," in *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*, ed. Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, *Rediscovering Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 158. This was an issue particularly in the United States, where the growing social and political influence of Catholics signaled a tension between the thesis/hypothesis and the U.S. Constitution. Writing in response to this situation, the American Jesuit theologian John Courtney Murray made the influential case in support of religious freedom. As a theological expert at the council, Murray played an important role in *Dignitatis Humanae*'s articulation of this right.

already enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.⁸¹ Affirming the dignity of each and every person as known through reason and confirmed by scripture, *Dignitatis Humanae* puts forth the argument that persons should be “be free from undue coercion in religious matters in private or public, alone or in associations with others.”⁸²

By endorsing this right, the council clearly did not intend to support a privatized model of faith in which the church has no public role. On the contrary, both *Dignitatis Humanae* and *Gaudium et Spes* stress the public responsibility of the church and church communities. While “autonomous and independent of each other,” the church and state share a concern for the dignity and vocation of humanity.⁸³ Both share in the common task of promoting and protecting the common good, each “according to its particular duty.”⁸⁴ Thus, although the church’s mission is distinct from that of the state, it still maintains responsibilities to the common good that originate in both its sacramental nature, as we have already seen, and its place within civil society. It is precisely because the church has a religious mission to witness to the kingdom of God that it also has a public role.⁸⁵ In other words, to limit the Christian religion only to the “private” sphere risks seriously compromising its religious mission.

Thus, with the council we see what Roberto Tucci describes as “a twofold movement” in the relationship of the church to public life.⁸⁶ On the one hand, there is a

⁸¹ One of the lasting consequences of the Declaration was the renegotiation of the concordats between the Holy See and different national governments, especially in those countries where the Catholic Church enjoyed a special privilege. See Gros, “Declaration on Religious Freedom: *Dignitatis Humanae*,” 205.

⁸² *Dignitatis Humanae*, no. 2.

⁸³ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 76.

⁸⁴ *Dignitatis Humanae*, no. 5.

⁸⁵ See Hollenbach, “*Gaudium et Spes*,” 275–76.

⁸⁶ Tucci, Roberto, “Introduction Historique et Doctrinale,” in *Vatican II: L’Église dans le monde de ce temps*, Unam Sanctam 65 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967), 474.

movement of separation or “disengagement from temporal tasks.”⁸⁷ The church is recognized as exercising a different role than that of the state authorities. On the other hand, there is a movement of greater engagement with the world, what Tucci describes as “a movement of incarnation.”⁸⁸ The church, as we have seen, is called to be sign and *instrument* in the world and a *leaven* in public life. In other words, in affirming the autonomy of the political sphere, the council does not teach that the church should withdraw completely from public life, which, as we saw in the first chapter, is a space that is much more extensive than the state.

This twofold movement had a significant impact on the work of Catholic NGOs. In the pre-conciliar Christendom model, Catholic organizations were seen largely as playing a passive or auxiliary role to the bishops. For much of the first half of the twentieth century, the public roles of “Catholic Action” and various Catholic-inspired political parties were valued insofar as they defended the interests of the hierarchy and the institutional church.

Those national and international organizations, including a number of the ICOs that went beyond the defensive Christendom positions in this period, often encountered resistance and suspicion from the hierarchy.⁸⁹ By recognizing both the autonomy of the political sphere and the responsibility of the people of God to engage the world, the council had the effect of freeing Catholic organizations from undue control by the hierarchy. While *Apostolicam Actuositatem* still speaks about Catholic Action, it offers a

⁸⁷ Ibid., 475.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 474–75.

⁸⁹ As with other areas of the council’s teaching, the group of international Catholic organizations in the tradition of specialized Catholic action “with their concern for the role of the laity and new models for the church’s influence and understanding of religion and culture, social teaching, church-state relations, and theological education of the laity, laid a receptive ground for the council’s initiatives, including religious freedom.” Gros, “Declaration on Religious Freedom: *Dignitatis Humanae*,” 162.

broader definition of the apostolate that highlights the personal and collective responsibility of the people of God to work toward “the true common good” both nationally and internationally.⁹⁰

In several places the council recognizes the need for individual Catholics to unite “their forces” in working to transform and make more just “the institutions and conditions of the world.”⁹¹ Citing an address of Pius XII to Pax Romana in 1957, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* encourages the laity to participate and support “private or public works of charity and social assistance movements, including international schemes.”⁹² *Gaudium et Spes*, however, is most explicit in its support for the work of Catholic NGOs. After speaking about the international community and the role of Christians in international aid, the final paragraph before the conclusion of *Gaudium et Spes* speaks directly to the role of Catholic NGOs and calls for greater support to strengthen their action in the international community:

Different Catholic international bodies can assist the community of nations on the way to peace and brotherhood; these bodies should be strengthened by enlarging their number of well-trained members, by increasing the subsidies they need so badly, and by suitable coordination of their forces. Nowadays efficiency of action and the need for dialogue call for concerted effort. Organizations of this kind, moreover, contribute more than a little to the instilling of a feeling of universality, which is certainly appropriate for Catholics, and to the formation of truly worldwide solidarity and responsibility.⁹³

⁹⁰ *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 14.

⁹¹ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 36.

⁹² *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 8.

⁹³ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 90. This paragraph is also noteworthy because it concludes by calling for the creation “of some organization of the universal Church whose task it would be to arouse the Catholic community to promote the progress of areas which are in want and to foster social justice between nations.” Following Vatican II, Pope Paul VI responded to this concern by establishing the Pontifical Council for the Laity and the Pontifical Commission (later Council) for Justice and Peace.

F. A Holistic Vision of Mission

Taken together, these five aspects of the council's teaching suggest an integrated or holistic understanding of mission, whereby all the people of God (as church) are called to actively engage the world. Retrieving earlier aspects of the tradition, the conciliar vision links the very core of the ecclesial identity to its relationship with history. As we read near the beginning of *Ad Gentes*, the church "by its very nature" is missionary.⁹⁴ By virtue of baptism, all the faithful, lay and ordained alike, share in the vocation and duty to participate in mission, what the council calls "the fundamental task of the people of God."⁹⁵

While *Ad Gentes* explicitly addresses the topic, the council's teachings on mission, as we have seen, are not limited to this document alone. In isolation, the decree offers surprisingly little about the relationship between mission and action for justice in the world. This relationship only becomes clear when one takes into account the broader vision of what has been described as "a missionary council."⁹⁶ The theme of mission and questions about the church's relationships to the world surface throughout the other texts of the council, most notably in *Lumen Gentium*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, *Dignitatis Humanae*, and *Gaudium et Spes*.

Due to the process by which the conciliar documents were formulated, aspects of Vatican II's vision of mission are somewhat ambiguous and open to interpretation. Of

⁹⁴ *Ad Gentes*, no. 2.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 35. The American missiologist Stephen Bevens summarizes this teaching by asserting that in the vision of the council "there are no passive Christians because the church *as such* is a communion-in-mission (see *LG*, 31). This finds an echo in the document on the laity, where we read that 'the Christian vocation by its very nature is also a vocation to the apostolate' (*AA*,2) and in *Ad Gentes* 35, where we read that 'the work of evangelization is a basic duty of the People of God.'" Bevens, "Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity: *Ad Gentes*," 5.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

particular relevance is the question of who is to be understood as the agent of social transformation. At times, the council speaks of the responsibility of the whole church, the people of God, to be a sign and instrument in history. Social engagement is described as a task of the whole church. In other places, however, the council seems to suggest that it is the role of the laity, and not the church as a whole, as it highlights their “special vocation” in the temporal sphere.⁹⁷ As the next section of this chapter will show, these ambiguities in the council’s texts have contributed to different interpretations of the exact nature of the relationship between mission and action for justice.

II. POSTCONCILIAR SOCIAL TEACHING ON MISSION AND JUSTICE

As with other aspects of its teachings, the Second Vatican Council’s articulation of the role of the church in the world has been received and interpreted in different and sometimes conflicting ways. Putting aside the very small minority who have rejected completely the council’s renewed dialogical relationship with the world (i.e., non-reception), scholars often identify two broad ecclesiological approaches to the council. These two areas of reception are generally categorized by the titles of the two major international theological journals that emerged following the council: *Concilium* and *Communio*.

The first approach, which can broadly be described as reflecting an “ecclesiology from below,” is often described as the *concilium* approach.⁹⁸ Those who are grouped

⁹⁷ See Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 149.

⁹⁸ See Gerard Mannion, *Ecclesiology and Postmodernity: Questions for the Church in Our Time* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2007), chap. 3; Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 89–93. As Mannion carefully points out when comparing these two models, these two approaches should be considered as “ideal types” since in reality neither exists “in a pure form” (31).

under this model, including most liberation theologians, generally adopt an inductive method which privileges the council's task of *aggiornamento* and the responsibilities of the "people of God" within history dialogue with and engage history and culture. In this model, the distinction between the laity and clergy is deemphasized in favor of the conciliar emphasis on the people of God. Critics of this interpretation often point to the dangers of losing sight of the transcendent spiritual dimensions of the Christian faith by focusing only on its social and historical demands. Extreme versions of this approach, we are warned, reduce the church only to its human and sociological elements.

By contrast, those who ascribe to an "ecclesiology from above," or an official *communio* approach, generally tend to privilege the council's task of *ressourcement*.⁹⁹ This more deductive model seeks to emphasize the distinctive and mysterious nature of the church through the lens of the ancient concept of *koinonia* (communion). Although Vatican II did not directly define the church in terms of communion, the concept became the official way to understand the vision of the council under the pontificates of Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI. Seldom used in the 1970s, the term gained official support at the 1985 extraordinary synod of bishops, partially as a reaction against the use of "people of God."¹⁰⁰ In its Final Report, the synod only mentions "people of God" once

⁹⁹ This is not to say that those who approach the council through the model of *concilium* do not appreciate the concept of communion. As Dennis Doyle has demonstrated, there are different models of communion ecclesiology that appeal to both those with an "ecclesiology from above" and those with "an ecclesiology from below." See Dennis M. Doyle, *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000).

¹⁰⁰ Richard Gaillardetz explains this dynamic: "At the synod some bishops voiced concerns regarding overly ideological readings of the 'people of God' image. Some complained that this image of the church was being employed to create an opposition between the hierarchy and a 'people's church.' Consequently, the Final Report of the synod expressly avoided considering the church as the people of God, and favored a retrieval of the conciliar teaching on the church as mystery, sacrament, and communion." Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 92. See also José Comblin, *People of God*, trans. Philip Berryman (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), chap. 4.

in a list of other descriptions of the church, and makes the influential point that the “ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea of the Council’s documents.”¹⁰¹ This priority given to communion is again strongly reiterated in the 1988 apostolic exhortation *Christifideles Laici* and in the 1992 statement by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Communio Notio (Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion)*.¹⁰²

Critics of this model, as Gerard Mannion writes, often express concern that “such ecclesiologies from above appear to turn their back on the world. A world of religious, ideological, and cultural pluralism, and yet also a world of mass poverty.”¹⁰³ For José Comblin, a strong critic of this version of communion ecclesiology, the shift in language at the 1985 synod amounts to a rejection and reversal of the advances made by the council regarding mission. The change of language from “people of God” to “communion,” he argues, represents a shift in “the entire council message.”¹⁰⁴

While it is beyond the scope of this project to detail all the aspects of these distinct interpretations of the council, a study of post-conciliar Catholic social teaching

¹⁰¹ Synod of Bishops, “The Church, in the Word of God, Celebrates the Mysteries of Christ for the Salvation of the World,” *Eternal Word Television Network*, 1985, <http://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/SYNFINAL.HTM>.

¹⁰² See John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation On the Vocation and Mission of the Laity in the Church and in the World* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1988), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_en.html; Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Communio Notio, Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_28051992_communio-notio_en.html.

¹⁰³ Mannion, *Ecclesiology and Postmodernity*, 36.

¹⁰⁴ Comblin, *People of God*, 54. Comblin sees the use of *communio* as especially precarious for mission and social action, as it can easily lead to a ghetto mentality, which cuts the church off from the world and emphasizes a distinction between the laity and church: “One of the problems with this distinction, which arose out of a particular social context, is that the action of lay people remains individual or personal. It is not connected organizationally, and hence is not very effective. Those who should be on the front lines of the battle take refuge in generalities. The doctrine of the people of God must be taken all the way: the church’s action is that of a people, united collective action.” (164).

illustrates how these two models have shaped the ecclesiological understanding of Catholic NGOs and the relationship between their action for the global common good and the church's mission.

A. Pope Paul VI and the 1971 Synod of Bishops

i. *Populorum Progressio* (1967)

Two years after the close of Vatican II, Pope Paul VI issued the first post-conciliar social encyclical, *Populorum Progressio* (*On the Development of Peoples*). As he indicates at its very beginning, the encyclical seeks to deepen the “renewed consciousness” of the church’s role and responsibility in society that emerged with the council.¹⁰⁵ Citing *Gaudium et Spes* directly, he strongly reaffirms the obligations of the church within history.¹⁰⁶

In *Populorum Progressio*, Pope Paul follows *Ecclesiam Suam* and *Gaudium et Spes* by rooting the church’s concern for human development in the person of Jesus Christ, “who cited the preaching of the Gospel to the poor as a sign of his mission.”¹⁰⁷ In the second section of *Populorum Progressio*, the pope highlights the ways in which missionaries, inspired by the example of Jesus, have contributed to social development throughout history. Though, as he points out, they might not always have been perfect in

¹⁰⁵ Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio, On the Development of Peoples* (1967), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), no. 1.

¹⁰⁶ “But, since the Church lives in history, she ought to ‘scrutinize the signs of the times and interpret them in the light of the Gospel.’ Sharing the noblest aspirations of men and suffering when she sees the not satisfied, she wishes to help them attain their full flowering, and that is why she offers men what she possesses as her characteristic attribute: a global vision of man and of the human race.” Ibid., no. 13.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., no. 12.

their projects, he commends the work of missionaries in their response to the social and cultural needs of people.

While important, however, these “local and individual undertakings are no longer enough.” Recognizing the increasing complexity and interconnection of social issues, Paul VI calls for “concerted action” that includes but goes beyond the local charitable efforts that marked mission in the past.¹⁰⁸ While the encyclical is not directly about mission, it does, as Philip Land points out, follow the “*Conciliar line*” in showing how the work for “development is part of mission.”¹⁰⁹

According to Pope Paul, the church has much more to offer society than its missionary schools and hospitals. In the public debate on how to develop a more just ordering of society, the church offers the world a critically needed “global” or “integral” vision of development. Building upon the work of the French Dominican theologian *Louis-Joseph Lebret*, Paul identifies two key aspects of this vision of mission. On the one hand, “integral human development” wishes to promote and encourage concern for the development of all persons in the world in the face of dehumanizing nationalism and individualism. At the same time, Paul’s framework seeks to promote the development of the whole person, including the spiritual, social, physical, and economic dimensions of the human being.¹¹⁰ Human development, therefore, cannot be seen in merely technical or economic terms, nor can it be separated from questions of justice and peace.¹¹¹ All

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., no. 13.

¹⁰⁹ Philip Land, “*Populorum Progressio*, Mission and Development,” *International Review of Mission* 58, no. 232 (October 1, 1969): 407 See also 404.

¹¹⁰ Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, no. 14.

¹¹¹ Liberation theologians were critical of the use of the term “development” because it was often used to promote a purely economic process in which oppression and injustice could still persist. While Paul’s “integral” framework is also concerned with this, they prefer the term “liberation,” as it speaks to the deeper aspirations of the marginalized and their own agency in social transformation. See Gustavo

nations, he urges, must work together to promote an integral vision of human development, which he believes is the way to achieve authentic peace.¹¹²

Beyond its relevancy to an increasingly divided and compartmentalized world, Paul's integral framework also has much to say to Christians about their relationship to the world. Such a holistic anthropology makes it difficult to focus on one's own spiritual development without taking into consideration the spiritual, physical, and social needs of others. The work for development is a basic responsibility of the human being created in the image and likeness of God.¹¹³ In other words, as the encyclical teaches, authentic work for justice and development are deeply relevant to "spiritual progress."¹¹⁴

ii. *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971)

Four year later Paul VI developed these themes further with his apostolic letter *Octogesima Adveniens* (*On the Eightieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum* or *A Call to Action*), written in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*.¹¹⁵ Like *Populorum Progressio*, the letter develops key themes from the council as it strongly emphasizes the links between the Gospel and participation in society. While all people, he writes, have a duty to work for solidarity, justice, and peace, Christians and Christian communities have a specific responsibility in this regard. Quoting *Nostra Aetate*, Paul emphasizes the deep connection between our relationship with God and our

Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988), 15.

¹¹² Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, nos. 76–77.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 15.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 76.

¹¹⁵ *Octogesima Adveniens* is not an encyclical but an apostolic letter addressed to Cardinal Maurice Roy, who was serving as president of both Pontifical Council of the Laity and the Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace. Both dicasteries were created by Paul after the suggestions of Vatican II in *Gaudium et Spes* no. 90.

actions toward others.¹¹⁶ Because of this connection, all Christians must take seriously their duties to promote and build the common good at the local, national, and international levels.¹¹⁷

For Pope Paul, the duty to work for social transformation goes beyond personal responsibility and extends to Christian communities. Near the beginning of the letter, Pope Paul affirms the responsibility of Christian *communities* to discern and respond to social needs in light of the Gospel. While Catholic social doctrine helps to inform this discernment, it is not, he writes, the responsibility of the pope to offer universal solutions to all the world's problems. Building on *Mater et Magistra* and *Gaudium et Spes*, Paul instead calls upon local Christian communities to employ the see-judge-act methodology developed by the ICOs in the tradition of specialized Catholic action:

It is up to the Christian communities to analyze with objectivity the situation which is proper to their own country, to shed on it the light of the Gospel's unalterable words and to draw principles of reflection, norms of judgment and directives for action from the social teaching of the Church.¹¹⁸

Octogesima Adveniens then highlights “a double function” of the church in the public sphere. The first task is for the church to “enlighten minds in order to assist them to discover the truth and to find the right path to follow amid the different teachings that

¹¹⁶ “We cannot in truthfulness call upon God who is Father of us all if we refuse to act in a brotherly way toward certain men, created in God's image. A man's relationship with God the Father and his relationship with his brother men are so linked together that scripture says: ‘He who does not know love does not know God; (John 4:8).’” Paul VI, *Octogesima Adveniens, A Call to Action* (1971), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), no. 17.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 50. See also no. 24.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 4. This paragraph, as Mary Elsbernd points out “was heralded as a central expression of a historically conscious methodology in magisterial teaching. Paul VI there highlighted the historically constituted nature of the social teaching of the Church, the role of the local community, and the difficulty as well as the undesirability of a single universal papal message or solution to problems.” Mary Elsbernd, “What Ever Happened to *Octogesima Adveniens?*,” *Theological Studies* 56, no. 1 (March 1995): 39.

call for their attention.”¹¹⁹ The role of the church does not stop at pedagogy and individual conversion, however; it also involves the task of apostolic “action...to spread, with real care for service and effectiveness, the energies of the Gospel.”¹²⁰ The global or integral vision of the person that is taught by the church cannot remain only in the consciousness of people. It must come alive in action and social participation as local communities seek to discern and act upon the local needs of their communities.

“It is not enough,” he writes, to merely speak out against “crying injustices” or to point to changes for a more just society. Such words are meaningless “unless they are accompanied for each individual by a livelier awareness of personal responsibility and by effective action.”¹²¹ In both of these tasks, NGOs play an important role, something the pope explicitly recognizes toward the end of the letter:

It is in this regard too that Christian organizations, under their different forms, have a responsibility for collective action. Without putting themselves in the place of the institutions of civil society, they have to express, in their own way and rising above their particular nature, the concrete demands of the Christian faith for a just, and consequently necessary, transformation of society.¹²²

iii. *Justice in the World* (1971)

For many Catholic NGOs, one of the most influential social documents of the postconciliar period came not from a pope but from the 1971 World Synod of Bishops, which issued a final statement on the theme of *Justitia in Mundo* (*Justice in the World*). The synod’s explicit connection between action for justice and evangelization helped

¹¹⁹ Paul VI, *Octogesima Adveniens*, no. 48.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*, no. 51.

many organizations to reevaluate their efforts through a “justice lens” and inspired countless social initiatives and NGOs around the world.¹²³

While the document largely reiterates key themes already articulated by the council and Paul VI, the synod makes explicit the connection between the work for justice and the Gospel mission. Building on the momentum already underway with the recent emergence of liberation theology and the insights of the 1968 meeting of Latin American bishops, the synod situates the Catholic concern for justice in the biblical imagery of God’s role “as the liberator of the oppressed and the defender of the poor.”¹²⁴

For the synod, the bible makes a clear connection between our relationship with God and the demands of justice. As is taught in scripture, the way we love or fail to love our neighbor is deeply relevant to our relationship with God, and ultimately to our own salvation. Authentic love of neighbor, according to the synod, involves a commitment to justice, since “love implies an absolute demand for justice, namely a recognition of the dignity and rights of one’s neighbor. Justice attains its inner fullness only in love.”¹²⁵

The church’s commitment to justice is therefore not optional but is a part of its very mission and gospel-inspired vocation in the world. The church, we read in the synod’s statement, “has the right, indeed the duty, to proclaim justice on the social, national, and international level.”¹²⁶ The synod is most explicit about these concerns in

¹²³ Charles M. Murphy, “Action for Justice as Constitutive of the Preaching of the Gospel: What Did the 1971 Synod Mean?” in *Readings in Moral Theology No. 5: Official Catholic Social Teaching*, ed. Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 151.

¹²⁴ Synod of Bishops, *Justicia in Mundo*, chap. 2. According to Murphy, the core emphasis of the synod on the relationship between justice and the Gospel mission can be seen “as an outgrowth of trends in earlier Church teaching,” especially in *Gaudium et Spes, Populorum Progressio*, and the meetings of Latin American bishops, where concerns for justice were seen from the perspective of scripture. See Murphy, “Action for Justice,” 160.

¹²⁵ Synod of Bishops, *Justicia in Mundo*, chap. 2.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

its most influential and controversial affirmation that appears in its introductory section, which makes explicit the connection between action for justice and the task of evangelization:

Action on behalf of justice and participation in the transformation of the world fully appear to us as a constitutive dimension of the preaching of the Gospel, or, in other words, of the Church's mission for the redemption of the human race and its liberation from every oppressive situation.¹²⁷

iv. *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975)

The subsequent synod on the topic of “Evangelization in the Modern World” offered bishops and Pope Paul the chance to deepen the reflections on the church’s mission in the world. Instead of issuing a final statement, the reflections of the 1974 synod were taken up by Pope Paul VI in his 1975 apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, the release of which coincided with the tenth anniversary of *Ad Gentes*.

As Charles Murphy details, questions regarding the relationship between the work for justice and evangelization were strongly debated at and in the lead up to the 1974 synod. In particular, questions were raised concerning the most appropriate way to interpret the 1971 synod’s use of the word “constitutive.” Different translations and understandings of the term led some to question the exact nature of the relationship between mission and justice. Should constitutive be understood as “essential” or “integral”? Is action for justice so central to Christianity, some asked, that there could be no evangelization without it? ¹²⁸

¹²⁷ Ibid., Introduction.

¹²⁸ Some, like Bishop Ramón Torrella Cascante, the vice president of the Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace, disfavored those interpretations of “constitutive” that suggested that work for justice was an “essential” aspect of evangelization. Instead, Torrella and others interpreted the previous synod’s

Rather than building upon the trajectories of the 1971 Synod, Paul VI takes a different approach to the question by pointing to evangelization—not action for justice and social transformation—as the “constitutive” element of the church’s mission.¹²⁹ This does not mean, however, that action for justice is foreign to mission and evangelization. On the contrary, Paul envisions mission as “a complex process,” which among other aspects, includes efforts aimed at liberation and the creation of a more just social order.¹³⁰

Evangelii Nuntiandi marked an important development in the church’s understanding of mission at a time when many missionary priests, brothers, and sisters were questioning the purpose and relevancy of their apostolates.¹³¹ The pope’s integral vision based on the incorporation of themes from multiple council documents, offered missionaries a renewed sense of purpose.

In contrast to *Ad Gentes*’s strongly Trinitarian approach, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* adopts an approach that Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder describe as “liberating service of the reign of God.” While *Ad Gentes* largely centers mission in the doctrine of the Trinity, Paul VI, like *Gaudium et Spes* and much of liberation theology, centers

introductory statement to indicate that the work for justice is an “integral” part of mission. See Murphy, “Action for Justice,” 156.

¹²⁹ Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi, On Evangelization in the Modern World* (1975), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O’Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), no. 14. See also chapters 9 and 10 of Donal Dorr, *Option for the Poor: A Hundred Years of Vatican Social Teaching*, Revised (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992).

¹³⁰ Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, no. 24.

¹³¹ See Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*, Rediscovering Vatican II (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 253.

evangelization (and therefore the church's relationship with the world) in "the concrete ministry of Jesus Christ and his preaching of the kingdom or reign of God."¹³²

Looking to Jesus as the model of mission, Paul VI begins the text by pointing to the liberating proclamation of God's kingdom as being at the center of evangelization. Like Christ, the church is called to proclaim the kingdom of God and the liberation "from everything that oppresses man," especially sin.¹³³ Mindful of the critiques of the 1971 synod and the dangers of reducing "mission to the dimensions of a simply temporal project"—what has been called "horizontalism"—Paul prioritizes Christ's message of liberation from sin while at the same time highlighting the role of social transformation and liberation in the broad task that is mission.¹³⁴

In the second chapter, he clarifies the relationship between mission and social transformation by defining evangelization as "a complex process made up of varied elements: the renewal of humanity, witness, explicit proclamation, inner adherence, entry into the community, acceptance of signs, apostolic initiative."¹³⁵ These different aspects are then developed in the third chapter where he offers a special emphasis on the theme of liberation.

For the pope, there are indeed "profound links" between evangelization, liberation, and human advancement.¹³⁶ Evangelization, in fact, would be incomplete, he argues, "if it did not take account of the unceasing interplay of the Gospel and of man's

¹³² Stephen B. Bevans and Roger Schroeder, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), 305.

¹³³ Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, no. 9.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 32.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 24.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 31.

concrete life, both personal and social.”¹³⁷ For him, the links between evangelization and social transformation are threefold. First, his understanding of evangelization has clear roots in his anthropology and vision of integral human development as highlighted in *Populorum Progressio*. If the human person is made up of different aspects (spiritual, social, corporeal, etc.), then the Christian message of salvation and liberation must also address the whole person.

Second, this relationship is also theological, “since one cannot disassociate the plan of creation from the plan of Redemption. The latter plan touches the very concrete situations of injustice to be combated and of justice to be resorted.”¹³⁸ Finally, these links are of an “eminently evangelical order.” One cannot proclaim Christ’s commandment of love and the coming kingdom of God, he argues, without working toward a more just and peaceful social order.¹³⁹

So while there may be subtle differences in tone between Paul VI and the statement of 1971 synod, official Catholic teaching in the decade following the council insists on an intimate connection between the church’s vocation and the work for justice in the world. Action for justice and liberation are not be seen as secondary to an abstracted spiritual mission. Rather, action for justice and social liberation are part of what Pope Paul describes as the “complex” task that is evangelization.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ Ibid., no. 29.

¹³⁸ Ibid., no. 31.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Murphy, “Action for Justice,” 161.

B. Pope John Paul II

Concerns about the relationship between the church's mission and social issues appear frequently in the writings and teachings of Pope John Paul II. As with Paul VI, his social teaching exerted great influence upon the work of Catholic NGOs, especially for the ecclesial movements that gained recognition during his pontificate.

A prolific writer, world traveler, and speaker, John Paul II offered a complex vision of the church's mission and its relationship to the global public sphere. On the one hand, he often addressed issues of social justice and personally witnessed to a commitment to democracy, social participation, reconciliation, and the global common good. He is also often credited for bringing about social and political change in Eastern Europe in the 1980s and 1990s. On the other hand, the pope expressed strong reservations about liberation theology, critiqued some theologians and lay associations for their involvement in social justice work, and condemned the direct engagement of priests and vowed religious in politics. From the beginning of his pontificate, the Polish pope sought to counteract the trends of secularism and indifferentism by accentuating the church's unique mission of proclaiming and safeguarding the "truth" revealed in Christ.¹⁴¹

While social and political concerns appear often in his official writings and teachings, the question of how action for justice relates to mission are perhaps most visible in two important texts of his pontificate.

¹⁴¹ See his first encyclical, in which he outlined the program for his pontificate. John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis, The Redeemer of Man* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1979), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_04031979_redemptor-hominis_en.html.

i. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1987)

Written to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, John Paul II's 1987 encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (*On Social Concern*) addresses the responsibility of Christians and the church in the face of continued injustice and divisions in the world. Of particular concern to the pope are the growing social, economic and ideological divisions that threaten to compromise world unity.

Citing *Populorum Progressio* and the teachings of the council, John Paul II highlights the vocation of the church in this context to encourage greater solidarity in the world based in a vision of authentic human development and the church's vocation to be "a sign and instrument" of unity in the world.¹⁴²

Work for authentic human development is not an individualistic responsibility. Rather, it is a duty of "each and every man and woman, as well as societies and nations."¹⁴³ The integral and universal vision calls Christians and others to respond to divisions with a genuine solidarity, something he defines as "a firm and preserving determination to commit oneself to the *common good*; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are *all* really responsible *for all*."¹⁴⁴

By virtue of their baptismal vocation, all Christians have a particular responsibility to promote solidarity and work for the common good. Special attention must be paid to the needs and realities of the poor. Following the developments in liberation theology, the pope calls upon Christians to adopt an "*option or love of*

¹⁴² John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, On Social Concern* (1987), in *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*, ed. David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, Expanded Edition (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1987), no. 31.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, no. 32.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 38.

preference for the poor” in both the exercise of charity and their commitments in society.¹⁴⁵

Though the treatment of these themes indicates an important role for the church in the face of social injustice, poverty, and division, Pope John Paul II offers a vision that differs from his predecessor and the 1971 synod on the relationship between action for justice and the church’s mission. This is can be seen most clearly in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* no. 41, where he describes this relationship:

The teaching and spreading of her social doctrine are part of the Church’s evangelizing mission. And since it is a doctrine aimed at guiding *people’s behavior*, it consequently gives rise to a “commitment to justice,” according to each individual’s role, vocation and circumstances.¹⁴⁶

Here we can observe several key differences between John Paul II and Paul VI on this question. First, as we saw above, *Octogesima Adveniens* affirms a dual role for the church in both the formation of conscience and in action for justice. John Paul II, on the other hand, primarily emphasizes the first task of formation and proclamation of the truth. While *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* acknowledges a place for the prophetic proclamation of justice in the “*ministry of evangelization*,” he stresses that this must be accompanied by the “more important” task of the proclamation of Christ.¹⁴⁷ Without the proclamation of Christ, he suggests, the condemnation of injustice losses its evangelical meaning. Notably absent as he addresses this topic in the encyclical is the notion that *action* for justice is part of the church’s mission.

A second, closely related difference between the teachings of the two popes here is the interpretation of the see-judge-act methodology developed by the movements of

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., no. 42.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., no. 41.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

specialized Catholic action and affirmed by John XXIII and Paul VI. In her 1995 article in *Theological Studies*, “What Ever Happened to *Octogesima Adveniens?*,” Mary Elsbernd critiques what she describes as a “reinterpretation” of Paul VI’s social teachings in this and other texts. Elsbernd is particularly concerned with the way in which John Paul II reinterprets Paul’s understanding of see-judge-act in *Octogesima Adveniens* no. 4. In describing the importance of Catholic social “doctrine,” John Paul II references his predecessor’s teaching on the method, but with his own distinct emphasis:

In addition, the social doctrine of the Church has once more demonstrated its character as an application of the word of God to people's lives and the life of society, as well as to the earthly realities connected with them, offering “principles for reflection,” “criteria of judgment” and “directives for action.”

According to Elsbernd, instead of affirming Paul VI’s teaching, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* ends up distorting it.¹⁴⁸ As we have seen, *Octogesima Adveniens* no. 4 employs the see-judge-act method to affirm the active agency and responsibility of Christian communities to analyze social situations (“signs of the times”) in light of the Gospel and Catholic social teaching. It is up to these communities, and not the pope, to discern the best course of action in specific historical and cultural contexts—an inspiring teaching for Catholic NGOs.

In contrast, John Paul II focuses on the universality of truths in Catholic social doctrine (as opposed to teaching) and emphasizes the role of the magisterium as the interpreter of truth.¹⁴⁹ Christian communities are not to offer their own analysis, as

¹⁴⁸ Elsbernd, “What Ever Happened to *Octogesima Adveniens?*” 59.

¹⁴⁹ For Elsbernd, John Paul II’s framework represents an “overall effort to reject or at least minimize historically contextualized methodologies in favor of theologies built on ahistorical truths, universally valid principles, and a suspicion of the material, historical world.” *Ibid.*, 60. The difference in interpretation of the see-judge-act method serves as an illuminating contrast between the *concilium* and *communio* approaches.

suggested by Paul. Instead, Christians as individuals and citizens are asked, as Elsbernd writes, only “to apply and be faithful to the social doctrine they have been given.”¹⁵⁰ Thus, while Paul attributes agency to the church and ecclesial communities in social action, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* sees the church as playing primarily a formative role, with lay people acting within society as individuals.

ii. *Redemptoris Missio* (1990)

These broader theological and ecclesiological concerns on the relationship between mission and the work for justice are also reflected in John Paul II’s missionary encyclical *Redemptoris Missio* (*On the Permanent Validity of the Church’s Missionary Mandate*). While written to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Ad Gentes* and the fifteenth anniversary of *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, the encyclical offers its own distinctive theological approach. Instead of framing mission through a theology of the Trinity or through the liberating message of God’s reign, John Paul II adopts a Christocentric approach that defines the church’s mission as the “proclamation of Jesus Christ as universal savior.”¹⁵¹

John Paul II begins the encyclical by emphasizing the continued relevancy of missionary efforts directed to non-Christians.¹⁵² He expresses concern that in the years since Vatican II such efforts have been weakened by what he suggests is a misinterpretation of the council. The conciliar teachings on dialogue, religious freedom,

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 49.

¹⁵¹ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 323.

¹⁵² John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio, On the Permanent Validity of the Church’s Missionary Mandate* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990), no. 2, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio_en.html.

social engagement, and the possibility of salvation outside of the church do not, he argues, make the explicit proclamation of Christ any less important.

Rather, the teachings of the council, he goes on to explain, must be seen in light of the “Church's fundamental function” to proclaim and witness to Christ.¹⁵³ This proclamation cannot be put aside by Christians, because it is only through Christ that one’s activity in the world has any meaning, and it is only through Christ that one can attain salvation.¹⁵⁴ A decade later, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith strongly argued this point in its controversial declaration *Dominus Iesus (On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ And The Church)*.¹⁵⁵

Throughout *Redemptoris Missio*, the pope expresses strong concern for the increasing secularism and relativism in traditionally Catholic countries and the tendencies toward “horizontalism” among Catholic missionaries.¹⁵⁶ By emphasizing the primacy of Christ and truth, here and in other teachings, John Paul II seeks to counter those trends that he perceives as weakening the unique function of the church in society. He thus calls for “a new evangelization” aimed especially at those areas where the church has lost influence in the face of secularism and relativism. In this task, he specifically points to the role of the “new ecclesial movements.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ Citing *Redemptor Hominis* no. 10, he writes that “The Church’s fundamental function in every age and particularly in ours is to direct man’s gaze, to point the awareness and experience of the whole of humanity towards the mystery of God, to help all men to be familiar with the profundity of the Redemption taking place in Christ Jesus.” Ibid., no. 4.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., no. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Dominus Iesus, On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ And The Church* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html.

¹⁵⁶ See Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 324.

¹⁵⁷ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio*, no. 72.

With regard to the relationship between action for justice and the church's mission, *Redemptoris Missio* expresses concern that the emphasis on liberation and justice will overshadow or fail to include the spiritual dimensions:

The temptation today is to reduce Christianity to merely human wisdom, a pseudo-science of well-being. In our heavily secularized world a "gradual secularization of salvation" has taken place, so that people strive for the good of man, but man who is truncated, reduced to his merely horizontal dimension. We know, however, that Jesus came to bring internal salvation, one which embraces the whole person and all mankind, and opens up the wondrous prospect of divine filiation.¹⁵⁸

In the encyclical's fifth chapter, the pope cautiously highlights some ways in which mission and action for justice are related as he explores the "single but complex reality" that is mission.¹⁵⁹ In this chapter he highlights nine overlapping "paths of mission," which both affirm and seem to put into question Catholic NGOs action.¹⁶⁰ On the one hand, he recognizes that service to and solidarity with the poor is one of the most powerful forms of Christian witness and that this should also be reflected in a personal "commitment to peace, justice, human rights and human promotion."¹⁶¹

On the other hand, he stresses that it is not the mission of the church "to work directly on the economic, technical or political levels, or to contribute materially to development." This, he believes, is the role of the state and other actors of civil society. Instead, it is the mission of the church to form or "awaken" the personal conscience and lead them to conversion. Such a "conversion of heart" that is in line with the Gospel, according to *Redemptoris Missio*, can be a "force for liberation" as it engenders in the

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., no. 11.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., no. 41.

¹⁶⁰ The "paths of mission" highlighted by the pope are witness, proclamation, conversion, forming local churches, ecclesial basic communities, inculturation, dialogue, promoting development by forming consciences, and charity.

¹⁶¹ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 42.

individual person a deeper awareness of human dignity, solidarity, service, and justice.¹⁶² Again, while he stresses the Christian duty to work for social justice at the individual level, John Paul II sees the church as playing a primarily pedagogical or personal role in forming the individual conscience through the teaching of the social doctrine and the proclamation of truth.

Pope John Paul II offers a complex vision of the relationship between action for justice and the church's mission that has both inspired and frustrated Catholic NGOs. While his teachings on solidarity, the environment, and concern for the poor have inspired NGOs, his concerns for the dangers of horizontalism and relativism put into question the ecclesiological identity and agency of Catholic NGOs in two ways.

First, as Mary Elsbernd details, John Paul II offers a different model of how the church should read the signs of the times. Whereas *Octogesima Adveniens* reflects an ecclesiology "from below" by highlighting the role of local communities in reading and responding to social and historical issues, John Paul II abandons the basic thrust of the see-judge-act methodology with an ecclesiology "from above." True to this version of *communio* ecclesiology, the magisterium alone is seen as possessing the privilege of interpreting the universal truth through official doctrine. There is little room in this model for Catholic NGOs and other ecclesial communities to offer their own analysis of social issues in the light of scripture, tradition, and reason. *Gaudium et Spes*'s call for the church to read and analyze the signs of the times becomes a function exclusively of the hierarchy.

¹⁶² John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio*, no. 59.

Second, in relation to the role of the church in the promotion of justice, both *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Redemptoris Missio* downplay the earlier emphasis on the church's *action for justice*. While earlier teachings speak of the church as having a twofold mission through personal conversion and social action, John Paul II prioritizes social transformation at the personal level. For example, in his 1984 apostolic exhortation *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia*, and later again in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, he argues that social and structural sins are rooted in personal sins.¹⁶³ Therefore, the church can most effectively combat social injustice by pointing the way to Christ and instructing the laity in the truth. It is then up to the laity, informed by the church's doctrine, to be engaged in transforming society.

Undoubtedly, there is much in the social teachings of John Paul II that inspires and supports Catholic NGOs committed to working for social transformation in light of the Gospel. However, the emphasis on the unique role of the magisterium in social analysis and the distinction made between the role of the church and the role of the laity in society put into question the agency and identity of Catholic NGOs as church. The next section will show how these questions continue to arise in the teachings of Benedict XVI.

C. Pope Benedict XVI

Like John Paul II, Benedict XVI offers a complex treatment of the relationship between mission and the work for social transformation. Not surprisingly, the former prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and author of several influential

¹⁶³ John Paul II, *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia, Reconciliation and Penance* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1984), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_02121984_reconciliatio-et-paenitentia_en.html; John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, no. 36.

doctrinal notes shares many of the same concerns as his predecessor. As with John Paul II, Pope Benedict adheres to a *communio* ecclesiology “from above” which emphasizes the distinctive role of the Catholic church and the unique teaching function of the magisterium. Perhaps even more strongly than his predecessor, Benedict is concerned with preserving the church’s primary role in safeguarding and proclaiming the truth of Christ in the face of an increasing secularized Europe.¹⁶⁴ While many of his writings favor action for justice at an individual/personal level over the collective action of the church, there are some developments in his thought.¹⁶⁵

i. *Deus Caritas Est* (2005)

As already indicated at the end of Chapter One, Pope Benedict XVI’s first encyclical, *Deus Caritas Est* (*God is Love*), prioritizes charity over justice in the church’s mission.¹⁶⁶ Comparing the text to the statement made by the 1971 synod of bishops, Charles Murphy argues that for Benedict it is charity and not justice that is a “constitutive” element of mission and evangelization.¹⁶⁷ After offering in the first half a theological and philosophical treatise on the different forms of love and the primacy of

¹⁶⁴ See Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church As Communion* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005); Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, “Europe in the Crisis of Cultures,” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 32 (2005): 345–56; Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Values in a Time of Upheaval*, trans. Brian McNeil (New York: Crossroad; San Francisco, 2006).

¹⁶⁵ A full treatment of the theology of Pope Benedict XVI (Joseph Ratzinger) is well beyond the scope of this project. For a more detailed analysis of his theology see Thomas P. Rausch, *Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to His Theological Vision* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009); Aidan Nichols, *The Thought of Benedict XVI: An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger* (New York: Burns & Oates, 2005); Thomas R. Rourke, *The Social and Political Thought of Benedict XVI* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010).

¹⁶⁶ See also Stephen J. Pope, “Benedict XVI’s *Deus Caritas Est*: An Ethical Analysis,” in *Applied Ethics in a World Church: The Padua Conference*, ed. Linda Hogan (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008), 271–277.

¹⁶⁷ Murphy, “Charity, Not Justice.”

Christ, the second half of the encyclical addresses the ways in which the church practices love in the world.¹⁶⁸

Part II begins by stressing the responsibility of the church, “from the local community...to the Church universal in its entirety,” to put into practice love of neighbor, grounded in God’s love.¹⁶⁹ This responsibility, he writes, is “constitutive” to the very nature of the church as expressed through the establishment of the office of deacon (*diaconia*).¹⁷⁰ In fact, according to Benedict, *diaconia*, together with the proclamation of the word (*kerygma-martyria*) and the celebration of sacraments (*leitourgia*), forms the “Church’s deepest nature.”¹⁷¹ But how exactly is this charity lived out today, and how does charity relate to justice?

In the following section (nos. 26–29), the pope addresses these questions directly. After a brief historical reflection in which he admits that the church had been slow to recognize social questions emerging from industrialization, the pope emphasizes the specific role of the church in the promotion of charity. True to his particular Augustinian outlook (and even citing the doctor of the church directly here), Pope Benedict draws from the teachings of Vatican II to highlight the distinct roles of the church and the state, charity and justice, laity and the church. It is the role of the state, not the church, he writes, to safeguard and promote justice. The church does not seek a direct engagement in political questions, but instead through its social doctrine aims to “purify reason” and

¹⁶⁸ Reportedly, the second half is based on a text about the work of Catholic charitable organizations already prepared under the pontificate of John Paul II.

¹⁶⁹ Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, no. 20.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 20–25.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, no. 25.

“help form consciences in political life.”¹⁷² It is through this *indirect* function of ethical formation that the pope believes the church can best promote justice in society. Contrary to the 1971 synod and the teaching of Paul VI, *Deus Caritas Est* leaves little room for *direct* action for justice as a role of the church. Rather it is the role of the lay faithful *as citizens* who “are called to take part in public life in a personal capacity.”¹⁷³ “The unavoidable connotation” here, as Lisa Sowle Cahill points out, is that the “real” church consists in the hierarchy, with the laity serving an auxiliary role.”¹⁷⁴ For many Catholic NGOs, this distinction between direct and indirect social action (which the pope noted when addressing the Forum of Catholic NGOs in 2007) is particularly troublesome because it opposes their collective actions for justice with their ecclesial identity.

In the final sections of *Deus Caritas Est*, the pope looks directly at the church’s charitable organizations, the vast majority of which are members of two of the most active Catholic NGOs in the world today: Caritas Internationalis, the worldwide confederation of national charitable agencies, and CIDSE, the international alliance of Catholic development agencies. After affirming the charitable work of the church’s agencies, Pope Benedict expresses concern about the identity of the organizations, their relationship to the hierarchy, “and the growing secularism of many Christians engaged in charitable work.”¹⁷⁵ To help these organizations remain true to their mission, he repeatedly warns them that they and their personnel “must not be inspired by ideologies aimed at improving the world, but should rather be guided by the faith which works

¹⁷² Ibid., no. 28.

¹⁷³ Ibid., no. 29.

¹⁷⁴ Cahill, “*Caritas in Veritate*,” 297.

¹⁷⁵ Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, no. 37.

through love.”¹⁷⁶ While there may well be merit in some of his concerns about the loss of Catholic identity in some organizations, his call for them to detach themselves from political action calls into question the work of Caritas Internationalis, CIDSE, and other charitable NGOs as they seek to address the root causes of suffering, conflict, and injustice.

ii. *Caritas in Veritate* (2009)

In 2009 Pope Benedict XVI issued his first explicitly social encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate* (*On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth*). Originally planned to commemorate the anniversaries of *Populorum Progressio* and *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, the release of the encyclical was delayed so that it might also take into account the economic crisis of 2008. While the text stands in continuity with many of the themes already developed by Pope Benedict, there are hints of what Cahill describes as a “political reorientation” on the question of the relationship of action for justice and the mission.¹⁷⁷

Taking Paul’s teaching on integral human development as a starting point, the text suggests a broader understanding of mission than *Deus Caritas Est*. *Caritas in Veritate* addresses a number of issues of social concern that go beyond the immediate demands of charity and the threats of European secularism, including economic justice, employment, global governance reform, and the environmental crisis. In the face of these complex challenges, *Caritas in Veritate* highlights the responsibility of the church, its members, and church organizations. The role of the church, he writes, is not limited only to “her charitable and educational activities,” as some secularists and some readings of *Deus*

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., no. 33.

¹⁷⁷ Cahill, “*Caritas in Veritate*,” 304.

Caritas Est might suggest. On the contrary, the pope points to the “public role” of the church and its duty to respond to issues that threaten human dignity.¹⁷⁸

While not as strongly as in *Octogesima Adveniens*, participation emerges as an important theme in *Caritas in Veritate*'s overall vision. In addition to affirming the responsibility of Christians to participate in the promotion of the universal common good, he advocates for new forms of participation nationally and internationally through civil society organizations, associations of consumers, and the reform and strengthening of the institutions of global governance.¹⁷⁹

One of the most striking features of *Caritas in Veritate* is its emphasis on justice and its relationship to the church's mission. Adopting a broader vision of mission than *Deus Caritas Est* and those writings of John Paul II that tend to deemphasize action for justice, this encyclical moves closer to Paul VI's understanding of the council by admitting that mission includes action for justice. Bringing in *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, Benedict reiterates the linkages among evangelization, development, and liberation. While he still prioritizes the role of social doctrine in the formation of conscience and the purification of reason, he critically acknowledges that:

*Testimony to Christ's charity, through works of justice, peace, and development, is part and parcel of evangelization, because Jesus Christ, who loves us, is concerned with the whole person. These important teachings form the basis for the missionary aspect of the Church's social doctrine, which is an essential element of evangelization.*¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, nos. 11 and 51.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 24, 66, and 67.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 15.

iii. *Africae Munus* (2011)

This deeper appreciation for participation and justice in what Cahill describes as the “latter Benedict XVI” is also reflected in his recent messages for the world days of peace (especially 2009 and 2010) and his addresses at the 2009 Synod on Africa.¹⁸¹ Despite this broader understanding of mission and his increased openness to action for justice as being “*part and parcel of evangelization*,” his post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Africae Munus* (*On the Church in Africa in Service to Reconciliation Justice and Peace*) reinforces some of the elements of his earlier teaching, which again appear to question the ecclesial role of Catholic NGOs action.

While the synod’s themes of reconciliation, justice, and peace reflect, for Benedict, three important elements of the church’s “theological and social responsibility,” he is insistent that action for justice is not part of the church’s mission.¹⁸² Drawing from the council’s teaching on the autonomy of the temporal, and those conciliar lines that emphasize a strong lay/clerical distinction, Benedict again affirms that it is the role of the state, civil society, and individual citizens—not the church—to work for justice. Instead, the role of the church is indirect, through the formation of “upright consciences receptive to the demands of justice, so as to produce men and women willing and able to build this just social order by their responsible conduct.”¹⁸³

Like *Deus Caritas Est*, *Africae Munus* presents a distinction between the church and the laity—a distinction that stands in considerable tension with the council’s teaching

¹⁸¹ See Cahill, “*Caritas in Veritate*.”

¹⁸² Benedict XVI, *Africae Munus, On the Church in Africa in Service to Reconciliation, Justice and Peace* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2011), no. 17, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20111119_africae-munus_en.html.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, no. 22.

on the people of God. While the individual “disciple of Christ” is called to work toward the creation of a “just society where all will be able to participate,” the role of the church is limited to “the teachings of the Beatitudes.”¹⁸⁴ Even in addressing the work of the politically and socially active justice and peace commissions throughout Africa, the pope downplays their advocacy role and appears to reduce their social action to formation:

Through her Justice and Peace Commissions, the Church is engaged in the civic formation of citizens and in assisting with the electoral process in a number of countries. In this way she contributes to the education of peoples, awakening their conscience and their civic responsibility. This particular educational role is appreciated by a great many countries which recognize the Church as a peacemaker, an agent of reconciliation and a herald of justice. It is worth repeating that, while a distinction must be made between the role of pastors and that of the lay faithful, the Church’s mission is not political in nature. Her task is to open to the world to the religious sense by proclaiming Christ.¹⁸⁵

iv. *Ecclesia in Medio Oriente* (2012)

In the same line as *Africae Munus*, Pope Benedict’s post-synodal apostolic exhortation following the synod on the Middle East, *Ecclesia in Medio Oriente*, defines the mission of the church in terms of the proclamation of the truth of Christ and the witness of charity. The direct work for justice and the common good is not seen as duty of the church. Rather, the church is called to proclaim the Gospel by addressing the immediate needs” of all people. It is through this “witness of charity” that the church will be at the “service of that peace which the region needs.”¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., nos. 26 and 27.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., no. 23.

¹⁸⁶ Benedict XVI, *Ecclesia in Medio Oriente, The Church in the Middle East* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20120914_ecclesia-in-medio-orient_e.html.

v. New Evangelization (2012)

At the most recent synod on the theme of the “The New Evangelization for the Transmission of the Christian Faith,” the question of the relationship between justice and evangelization has been raised by a few of the synod fathers, mainly from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Following the line set by *Redemptoris Missio*, the synod’s focus on the “new” evangelization is aimed primarily at addressing concerns of secularism and the “re-Christianization” of traditionally Catholic regions.

Importantly, however, the notion of a “new evangelization” originated with a different focus. The first explicit appeal for a “new evangelization” emerged within the context of liberation theology and the Latin American church’s call to strengthen the social faith commitments of people in positions of power at the at the 1968 CELAM conference in Medellin.¹⁸⁷ There, the bishops called for an “intensive new evangelization and catechesis to enable both the elite and the masses to achieve a lucid and committed faith.” The term was then picked up by Pope John Paul II in his address to the 1979 meeting of CELAM at Puebla and then again in his address to workers in Nowa Huta.¹⁸⁸ Unfortunately, the social dimensions of the new evangelization have largely been lost in most of the recent discussions.

Nevertheless, at the synod, justice, social transformation, and the option for the poor were raised by a handful of participants. In his address, Archbishop Baselios Cleemis Thottunkal, the Major Archbishop and Catholicos of the Syro-Malankara

¹⁸⁷ I am grateful to Gustavo Gutiérrez for first alerting me to this in an informal conversation with him in July 2012.

¹⁸⁸ According to Stefan Gigacz, the concerns of Medellin and John Paul II can be traced to the efforts of the Young Christian Workers and worker-priest movement in France to re-Christianize the working class population. See Stefan Gigacz, “The Radical Roots of the New Evangelisation,” *CathNews*, August 9, 2012, <http://cathnews.com/article.aspx?aeid=32734>.

Catholic Church, argued that “[a]ny attempt of the Church to promote human dignity, to bring justice to the underprivileged is a genuine mark of obedience to the will of Jesus.”¹⁸⁹ Bishop Jorge Eduardo Lozano, Bishop of Gualeguaychú in Argentina was one of the few synod fathers to link evangelization to the “option of the poor” in his address. Citing the parable of the poor Lazarus and lamenting the gaps between the rich and the poor, Bishop Lozano stressed how the service of the poor through acts justice is much deeper than simply being a “fruit” or a mark of credibility of evangelization—as it is described in the synod’s working document:

One cannot think about a New Evangelization without a proclamation of the integral freedom from all that oppresses man, sin and its consequences. There can be no authentic option for the poor without a firm commitment to justice and a change of the structures of sin. Our closeness with the poor is necessary not only to render our preaching credible *but also to render it Christian* and not “a gong booming or a cymbal clashing” (1 Cor 13:1).¹⁹⁰

In his address to the synod, Bishop François Lapierre, PME, the Bishop of Saint-Hyacinthe in Canada and the former international chaplain for two ICOs, critiqued the synod’s working document (*Intrumentum Laboris*) for being “rather weak” in its treatment of justice. Citing the example of great missionaries, the former missionary

¹⁸⁹ “Enhancing human dignity, speaking for the voiceless, being a symbol of justice, promotion of democratic values, etc. are to be seen seriously as marks of promoting human life which eventually lead people to life in abundance.” “Intervention of H. B. Baselios Cleemis Thottunkal, Archbishop Major of Trivandrum of Syro-Malankars, Head of the Synod of the Syro-Malankar Church (India),” *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 13, 2012), http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b14_02.html.

¹⁹⁰ “Intervention of H. Exc. Rev. Mons. Jorge Eduardo Lozano, Bishop of Gualeguaychú (Argentina),” *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 12, 2012), http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b12_02.html. Emphasis mine. See also the interventions at the synod by Bishop Gervas Rozario, Bishop of Rajshahi (Bangladesh) and Gerald Frederick Kicanas, Bishop of Tucson (USA).

priest reminded the synod that actions on behalf of justice can often speak louder than words as testimony to the gospel.¹⁹¹

The weakness of the *Intrumentum Laboris* can be seen in its minimal discussion of justice. While the document does importantly cite *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (by way of *Caritas in Veritate*) in teaching that works of justice are “part and parcel of evangelization,” it does not develop the question in any substantial way.¹⁹² In paragraph 35, the text cites at length the *Doctrinal Note on Some Aspects of Evangelization* drafted by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 2007. The *Note* seeks to emphasize the spiritual and Christological dimensions of evangelization and raises concerns with what it perceives as relativistic or reductionist forms of evangelization especially in the areas of social action and dialogue. Questions of social justice and poverty only appear twice in the text where the Holy Office warns against reducing mission and the Kingdom of God to a social utopia. Nowhere in the *Note* do we see the teaching of the Pope Paul VI that justice is an integral part of evangelization (not to mention the 1971 Synod). Instead, the section of the *Note* quoted by the *Intrumentum Laboris* laments some of the attention given to justice:

There is today, however, a growing confusion which leads many to leave the missionary command of the Lord unheard and ineffective (cf. *Mt* 28:19)...It is enough, so they say, to help people to become more human or more faithful to their own religion; it is enough to build communities which strive for justice, freedom, peace and solidarity. Furthermore, some maintain that Christ should not be proclaimed to those who do not know him, nor should joining the Church be

¹⁹¹ “Intervention of H. Exc. Rev. Mons. François Lapierre, P.M.E., Bishop of Saint-Hyacinthe (Canada),” *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 13, 2012), http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b14_02.html.

¹⁹² General Secretariat of the Synod of Bishops, *Intrumentum Laboris for XIII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012), no. 130, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20120619_instrumentum-xiii_en.html See also no. 17.

promoted, since it would also be possible to be saved without explicit knowledge of Christ and without formal incorporation in the Church.¹⁹³

In its final statement (released on October 26), which takes a more hopeful tone than the *Instrumentum Laboris* the synod offers a much more positive and constructive approach to justice. Though the treatment of justice and social transformation remains minimal in the text, the synod emphasizes service to the poor along with contemplation and as two important “expressions” or “symbols” of the new evangelization. Acts of charity, the synod teaches “must also be accompanied by commitment to justice with an appeal that concerns all, poor and rich.” Catholic social doctrine is then highlighted as playing a special role on “the pathways of the new evangelization” in the “formation of Christians to dedicate themselves to serve the human community in social and political life.¹⁹⁴ While positive, this language still suggests a deductive approach to justice where the church works through the formation of committed individual Christians rather than as a direct agent in the action for justice.¹⁹⁵

The treatment of justice and social transformation in the recent *Doctrinal Note*, *Instrumentum Laboris* and *Final Statement*, for the synod is striking in light of the close attention given to justice and the poor in the post-conciliar period. How the relationship between justice and mission will be addressed in the forthcoming post-synodal apostolic

¹⁹³ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Doctrinal Note on Some Aspects of Evangelization* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007), no. 3,

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20071203_notaevangellizzazione_en.html; General Secretariat of the Synod of Bishops, *Instrumentum Laboris for XIII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops*, no. 35.

¹⁹⁴ Synod of Bishops, “Message of the XIII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops,” *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 30 (October 26, 2012): no. 12,

http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b30_02.html See also no. 10.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 12.

exhortation on the new evangelization will indicate much about Pope Francis's understanding of the issue.

Ultimately, like his predecessor, Pope Benedict XVI's exhibits a *communio* ecclesiology, which downplays the church's role in action for justice by emphasizing the unique teaching role of the Catholic Church's magisterium (ecclesiology from above). While there is much in his social teachings that can inspire the social engagement of Catholics, the overall framework Benedict adopts leaves little room for Catholic communities and organizations to engage in direct forms of social action and advocacy *as church*.

III. RECLAIMING THE COUNCIL'S INTEGRAL VISION OF MISSION

The vision of mission and evangelization developed by the Second Vatican Council and in the immediate post-conciliar period inspired many lay and religious communities within the church to understand action for justice as an integral dimension to their own specific missions and the mission of the church as a whole. The Society of Jesus, for example, in their 32nd General Congregation famously re-articulated their mission as “the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement.”¹⁹⁶

These developments, however, have not been welcome by all in the church. Both Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI expressed concerns that some of the renewed understanding of justice had gone too far. Certainly, in the immediate wake of Vatican II

¹⁹⁶ Jean-Yves Calvez, *Faith and Justice: The Social Dimension of Evangelization* (St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1991).

there were excesses in reception of the council and the 1971 Synod. But this was not the norm. Following Vatican II lay movements and communities of vowed religious, as the following case studies illustrate, sought to respond to the council's integral vision of mission in balancing *both* the "horizontal" and "vertical" demands of faith. Such concerns are evident, for example, in the efforts by the leadership of the major missionary congregations to offer a holistic definition of mission. In 1981, SEDOS—the international forum of Catholic missionary congregations—drew heavily from *Evangelii Nuntiandi* in identifying four inter-related elements of mission: proclamation, dialogue, inculturation, and the liberation of the poor.¹⁹⁷

More recently, in their book *Constants in Context*, Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder have proposed a constructive synthesis of what they see as the distinct missionary approaches embodied by *Ad Gentes*, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, and *Redemptoris Missio*. Drawing from all three texts (and the earlier efforts of SEDOS), the two missiologists propose an integral framework which they term "mission as prophetic dialogue."¹⁹⁸ Such an approach, they believe, enables the church to faithfully participate in God's mission in light of the multifaceted realities of contemporary world.

Like *Ad Gentes*, "mission as prophetic dialogue" affirms the responsibility of all the baptized to participate in what *Redemptoris Missio* describes as a "single, complex reality."¹⁹⁹ This approach is dialogical in the way it takes seriously the experiences, cultures, and contexts of people both inside and outside the visible church. A missionary

¹⁹⁷ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 254.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio*, no. 41.

church, as the council teaches, cannot ignore the pressing needs of people and the dynamic activity of God in history and culture.

At the same time, the mission of the church must also be prophetic. Mission, as Pope John Paul II often stressed, cannot ignore the call to proclaim and witness to Jesus Christ and the Kingdom of God. The mission of the church, therefore, must be challenging and rooted in Christian belief and practice. It is prophetic in the ways it “calls people beyond; it calls people to conversion; it calls people to deeper and fuller truth that can only be found in communion with dialogue’s trinitarian ground.”²⁰⁰

According to this model of prophetic dialogue, the mission of the church in the world cannot be reduced to proclamation, action for liberation, or any single element. Mission as prophetic dialogue seeks to navigate between two extremes. On the one hand, this model cautions against a narrow view of mission that looks only at its role in social transformation—horizontalism. On the other, it also reminds the church that it cannot reduce mission and evangelization only to spiritual proclamation detached from the social realities of the world—what might be called “verticalism.” By looking at the council as a whole, it is evident that the mission of the church is more holistic and integral than any one task. Mission is complex as Pope Paul taught. Nevertheless it remains a single reality: “there is *one* mission: the mission of God that is shared, by God’s grace, by the

²⁰⁰ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 285. Here, there are parallels between this understanding of mission and the approach of “dialogical universalism” proposed by David Hollenbach. In this approach, Christian communities “combine fidelity to the particularistic vision of the human good grounded in the gospel with a commitment to discerning the common morality needed in a pluralistic interdependent world.” In other words, in this approach, the particular Christian moral and ethical vision is prophetically expressed in public but in a way that is dialogical, humble, and hopeful. Hollenbach, *The Global Face of Public Faith*, 11.

church. It has *two* directions—to the church itself (*ad intra*) and to the world (*ad extra*).”²⁰¹

More concretely, according to Bevens and Schroeder, mission as prophetic dialogue encompasses six interrelated elements: (1) witness and proclamation; (2) liturgy, prayer and contemplation; (3) action for justice, peace, and the integrity of creation; (4) the practice of interreligious dialogue; (5) efforts at inculturation; and (6) the ministry of reconciliation.²⁰² For church communities engaged in one or more of these areas—including Catholic NGOs—this holistic framework is constructive for several reasons. First, it encourages all Christian communities to pay attention to both the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of mission. Second, it assists Christian communities in situating their actions for the global common good within the vision of mission outlined by Vatican II. Finally, this framework reminds socially involved organizations that the mission of the church is more comprehensive than what any one organization or community can accomplish on its own.

CONCLUSION

This chapter examines the central aspects of the Second Vatican Council’s renewed understanding of mission and the ways in which it has been interpreted in postconciliar Catholic social teaching. The conciliar teachings and their subsequent

²⁰¹ Bevens and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 394.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 351. These six elements were originally articulated by Bevens and Eleanor Doidge. See Stephen B. Bevens and Eleanor Doidge, “Theological Reflection,” in *Reflection and Dialogue: What MISSION Confronts Religious Life Today?*, ed. Barbara Kraemer (Chicago: Center for the Study of Religious Life, 2000), 48.

reception have been tremendously important for the life, action, and self-understanding of Catholic nongovernmental organizations.

The vision of mission that is present throughout the texts of Vatican II is complex and multifaceted. In *Ad Gentes* the council offers an important theological reflection on the origins of the church's mission in the missionary activity of the dynamic triune God. The council's reflection on mission however, is not limited to this one decree. Rather, the theme of mission is present throughout the conciliar texts in a way that presents an integral vision of mission. In contrast to some earlier understandings of mission, the conciliar vision calls upon the church to read the signs of the times in light of the Gospel and to engage the world as a sacramental sign and instrument. While this engagement respects the autonomy of the political sphere and abandons the established church model, the council emphasizes the relevance of social and political issues to the church's very missionary nature.

In the decades following the council, this integral vision of mission has been developed and received in different ways. Several questions emerge in postconciliar Catholic social teaching about the exact nature of the relationship between mission and social action. Generally, these questions revolve around three overlapping questions: Is action for justice (a constitutive) part of the church's mission? Is action for justice the role of the church as church or is it the role of lay people as individuals? Finally, is it the responsibility of the magisterium alone or all the baptized to read the signs of the times and interpret them in light of the gospel?

Recent Catholic social teaching, as this chapter has shown, has offered distinct and sometimes conflicting responses to these questions. Emphasizing both dialogue and

social action, Pope Paul VI and the 1971 Synod of Bishops developed the council's integral vision in a way that weaves together the themes and concerns of *Lumen Gentium*, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, *Ad Gentes*, and *Gaudium et Spes*. While there are some differences between *Evangelii Nuntiandi* and *Justice in the World*, both understand action for justice and liberation in light of God's reign to be central to what Pope Paul describes as the "complex" task of evangelization.

Concerned with the dangers of what they describe as a "horizontalism" that might accompany a strong concern for social action, Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI approach these questions from a communion ecclesiology that highlights truth, beauty, and the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. This model draws from the council in emphasizing autonomy of the temporal sphere, the distinctive role of the laity in social transformation, and the unique role of the church in proclaiming the truth of Christ. While both popes speak of important social issues, they deemphasize the role of the church as a sacramental agent for social transformation, downplay the language of the "people of God," and place the responsibility for interpreting the signs of the time on the magisterium alone.

Recognizing these somewhat divergent interpretations, some theologians have called for new efforts to get past what Gaillardetz calls "the false polarization of a 'people of God ecclesiology' and a 'communion ecclesiology.'"²⁰³ To this end, several missiologists have proposed models that emphasize *both* action for justice and the proclamation of Christ. The model of "mission as prophetic dialogue" as proposed by Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder seeks to offer a vision of mission that is faithful to

²⁰³ Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making*, 147.

the comprehensive vision of Vatican II and the experience of the church in the world today.

The council's holistic or integral vision of mission situates well the work of NGOs in the overall mission of the church. As the following case studies demonstrate, very few NGOs are involved only in actions for justice or advocacy. Indeed, for most, if not all, Catholic NGOs the commitment to act for justice is deeply related to other missionary tasks described by Bevans and Schoreder above. Reclaiming such an integral or holistic vision of mission is essential in light of the complex challenges facing the church and the human family today.

Part Two:
Case Studies

Chapter Three: The International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana)

In the previous two chapters this project considered the role of transnational Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) from two perspectives. Chapter One examined the increasing importance of NGOs and other non-state actors in the context of globalization. Utilizing several analytical frameworks, the chapter identified four roles played by international NGOs in the world today: advocacy, analysis, formation, and program implementation. Through these different public roles, Catholic and other faith-based organizations, networks, and movements are challenging both traditional notions of state sovereignty and those models of secularization which seek to relegate religion to the private sphere.

Chapter Two situated the actions of Catholic NGOs theologically by examining the comprehensive vision of mission put forth by the Second Vatican Council. After considering key elements of the council's teaching, the chapter analyzed the distinctive, and somewhat divergent, conceptions of the relationship between the actions of Catholic organizations in promotion of the common good and the church's mission in the world. The nature of the relationship between collective action for justice and mission is critically important to understand and appreciate the role of Catholic NGOs and their relationship to the church. While the social and missiological teachings of Pope Paul VI and the 1971 Synod of Bishops situate the social action of Catholic communities within the mission of the church, later social teachings downplay and put into question the ecclesial status of communal action for justice.

In this and the following chapter, this project will develop the study of the relationship between Catholic NGOs and the church's mission by turning to the experiences of the organizations themselves. By examining representative case studies of the two major types of transnational Catholic organizations this dissertation will illustrate how Catholic NGOs perceive themselves to be participating in the mission of the church and the theological models underlying this understanding. The case studies will not attempt to offer a complete overview of these specific NGOs or their organizational type. Such a task is impossible within the confines of this project. Instead, the case studies will examine the mission and contribution of each organization by asking several interrelated questions. What is the organization's mission and what theological concepts and ecclesiological models frame that mission? How is this understanding of mission and the theology behind it embodied in the transnational actions of the organization? Finally, how is the organization's specific mission understood in relation to the broader mission of the church?

This chapter will examine the mission and role of an international Catholic organization (ICO), the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana). Beyond serving as a representative case study of the experience of ICOs, the choice of IMCS is instructive as it illustrates the impact of the Second Vatican Council on existing organizations and the deepening appreciation of collective action for justice as an integral part of the church's mission. Vatican II's holistic vision of mission, particularly its teachings on the role of the laity and lay associations, exerted a transformative impact on the life and mission of IMCS. The council's teaching on the church/world relationship and the renewed definition of the church as the people of God

brought forth new theological models that deepened IMCS's understanding of its specific mission with students. This new sense of mission moved IMCS from a narrow defensive or passive model of social engagement to a more pro-active and integral vision of mission that includes action for justice and social transformation.

This chapter will examine IMCS as an NGO in three parts. First, it will begin by looking at the mission of IMCS, its development, and the key theological concepts behind it. Like other ICOs, in particular the movements of "specialized Catholic action,"¹ IMCS's understanding of its mission has developed alongside several ecclesiological and missiological models of the wider church. Following Vatican II, IMCS redefined its mission using similar language to the 1971 Synod of Bishops and the social teachings of Paul VI. According to this redefined sense of mission, action for justice and social transformation is understood as a constitutive objective of its mission as a church movement. This new model enabled IMCS to understand its international public action as more deeply integrated and connected to its ecclesial identity..

In its second part, this chapter will examine how this deeper sense of mission is expressed through IMCS's actions as an international NGO. Advocacy within intergovernmental structures and the formation of empowered leaders became important means for IMCS to live out its mission in the world. Rooted in its mission and the

¹ The other ten movements of specialized Catholic action closely related to IMCS are: the International Young Catholic Students (IYCS); the International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs (ICMICA-Pax Romana); the International Young Christian Workers (JOCI); the International Coordination of Young Christian Workers (CIJOC); the International Catholic Movement of Rural and Agricultural Youth (MIJARC); International *Independent* Christian Youth (JICI); International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements (FIMARC); International Movement of Apostolate of Children (MIDADE); International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus (MIAMSI); and the World Movement of Christian Workers (MMTC).

teachings of the council, IMCS especially intensified its global action in three areas: social transformation, integral education, and youth participation.

Finally, this chapter will briefly consider how the mission and actions of IMCS, and other similar NGOs, relate to the mission of the church. As indicated in Chapter Two, collective action for justice and social transformation is not fully appreciated to be a role for the church in the world. Not all in the church welcome or share IMCS's integral understanding of mission. This section will particularly examine how the recent change of status of IMCS from an international Catholic organization to an intentional association of the lay faithful raises new questions about the ecclesial status of the organization.

I. THE MISSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT OF CATHOLIC STUDENTS (IMCS-PAX ROMANA)

Addressing the leadership of the International Movement of Catholic Students in a meeting celebrating its 60th anniversary, Pope John Paul II aptly summarized the mission of IMCS as the “evangelization of the student milieu.”² Since its foundation in 1921, IMCS has understood this role of being an “evangelizing presence” among students in different ways.³

² “Notre rencontre prend place parmi celles, fréquentes et variées, que j’ai avec de nombreux groupes de jeunes, mais elle a une importance particulière à cause de la responsabilité qui incombe à vos mouvements par rapport à la vie chrétienne de leurs membres et à l’évangélisation du milieu étudiant.” John Paul II, “Discours du Saint-Père Jean-Paul II aux secrétaires régionaux de la Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique Internationale et aux membres du conseil directeur du Mouvement International Des Étudiants Catholiques” (Vatican City, January 16, 1981), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1981/january/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19810116_students-cattolici_fr.html.

³ See XXXI Interfederal Assembly, *Study Session 4: Movement* (Paris: International Movement of Catholic Students, 1986), 44.

Today, the movement brings together 83 national federations or associations of Catholic university students in 75 countries.⁴ Like many other ICOs, IMCS-Pax Romana is structured as a federation of autonomous “national movements.” While most student groups in Africa use the name IMCS or the French acronym “MIEC” at the campus and national levels, national member associations in other regions, including those founded on the initiative of IMCS leadership, operate under their own names (e.g., *Federazione Universitaria Cattolica Italiana-FUCI*, *Unión Nacional de Estudiantes Católicos-UNEC*, All India Catholic University Federation-AICUF).⁵

This structure enables local students to take creative ownership over their local structures while also allowing for considerable diversity among the member movements who share in the common goal of making the church “present in the student milieu and the student milieu present in the church.”⁶ As a global movement, IMCS and its member federations live out this task of “evangelization” in different ways from the planning of weekly liturgies on university campuses to the organization of national and international conferences and campaigns.

⁴ “National Movements,” *International Movement of Catholic Students*, accessed July 23, 2012, http://imcs-miec.org/national_movements-English,s,35. National movements of students may join as constitutive (full) members, ecumenical members, or correspondent members.

⁵ Several studies have been written on the role of national IMCS federations, including: Gabriella Marcucci Fanello, *Storia della F.U.C.I.* (Roma: Editrice Studium, 1971); Antoine Prost, “La Fédération française des étudiants catholiques,” *Académique* (January 1, 1965): 161–166; Emmanuel Godin, “La Fédération française des étudiants catholiques (FFEC). de l’Entre-deux-guerres au Régime de Vichy,” *Revue d’Histoire de l’Eglise de France* 87, no. 1 (2008): 87–110; John Whitney Evans, *The Newman Movement: Roman Catholics in American Higher Education, 1883-1971* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1980); Anthony Egan, *The Politics of a South African Catholic Student Movement, 1960-1987* (Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1991); Joaquín M. Chávez, “‘University Apostles’: Catholic Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Left, El Salvador, 1950-1970” (presented at the Congress of The Latin American Studies Association, Toronto, Canada, Toronto, 2010); María Luisa Aspe Armella, *La formación social y política de los católicos mexicanos : la Acción Católica Mexicana y la Unión Nacional de Estudiantes Católicos, 1929-1958* (Ciudad de México: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2008).

⁶ 28th Interfederal Assembly of IMCS (Lima), “Toward a Re-Definition of the Movement” (International Movement of Catholic Students, 1975), 4, AIF 75/312/FES, Pax Romana Archives, University of Fribourg.

Internationally, the movement is led by an international team (president and secretary general) based in Paris and regional coordinators in Nairobi, Brussels, Quito, and Manila.⁷ These recent students (under the age of thirty) are elected by student delegates at the World Assembly and regional assemblies to serve a three to four year mandate as lay missionaries assisted by part-time chaplains.⁸

In the ninety years since the creation of the organization, the way in which it has understood its role as a movement of the student apostolate and the theology behind that understanding has developed in four distinct phases. These phases or ecclesiological models reflect many of the broader trends in the church's understanding of mission and social action that were detailed in Chapter Two. As I will show, IMCS was particularly shaped by the theology of Vatican II and the social teachings of Paul VI as it moved from an *indirect* model of social engagement to one that encourages *direct* action on behalf of justice and social transformation in history.

A. Catholic Action and the Christendom Model (1880s-1930s)

The first phase of IMCS-Pax Romana's understanding of its mission roughly corresponds to the early model of "Catholic Action," which Pope Pius XI famously defined as the participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate.⁹ In this model, the

⁷ IMCS does not have a regional office in the Middle East or North America.

⁸ While the international office is headquartered in Europe, non-Europeans have played a critical role in leading the movement over the past several decades. Since 1960, the majority of international team members have come from outside of Europe.

⁹ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1956), 346.

mission of the movement and its international social engagement was deeply formed by the complex realities of the European social and ecclesial context.¹⁰

Here, IMCS-Pax Romana and its member associations maintained close relationships with the hierarchy and based their mission with students in a specific Catholic Action “mandate” granted to them by bishops and the Holy See who oversaw their work. IMCS’s influential Italian federation, the FUCI, is often cited as being in the vanguard of the development of this model of the lay apostolate within the church.¹¹ Although the traditional Catholic action framework encouraged more active participation of the laity in society than earlier frameworks, it often reduced the laity to passive agents of the church hierarchy, which remained largely hostile to the “modern world.”

While Pius XI is generally credited for establishing the “Catholic Action” model, its framework originates earlier in the late nineteenth century with the experience of innovative efforts of social Catholicism and the teachings of Pope Leo XIII who encouraged the organized response of Catholics to defend the church in a hostile world.¹² Building upon these efforts, Pius XI called for a formalized structure of Catholic Action in every country to organize existing initiatives and foster new lay actions, under the direction of the bishops, to defend the faith in a hostile social environment.¹³

It was in this context that IMCS-Pax Romana was founded. In 1887 two pioneers of social Catholicism, Georges de Montenach of the *Société des étudiants suisses* and Albert du Mun of *l’Association catholique de la jeunesse française*, envisioned the

¹⁰ These included the transformations of industrialization, the responses of church to the “labor question,” the marginalization of the Catholic Church as a worldly power with the creation of the Italian Republic, and a shortage of clergy in many part of Europe.

¹¹ See Gabriele de Rosa, *Storia politica dell’Azione cattolica in Italia*. (Bari: Glaterza, 1953); Fanello, *Storia della F.U.C.I.*; Giacomo de Antonellis, *Storia dell’Azione cattolica* (Milano: Rizzoli, 1987).

¹² Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 344.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 347.

creation of what would become the first international student NGO, *l'Union internationale des étudiants catholiques*.¹⁴

With the approval of Pope Leo XIII, the Union was established in 1888 with Fribourg, Switzerland as the headquarters and de Montenach as president. In October 1891, it organized a pilgrimage to Rome for seven thousand students during which a conference of delegates would develop the structure of the Union. Deeply sympathetic to the pope's cause in "Roman question," the presence of the student pilgrims angered Italian nationalists. These tensions surfaced clearly when French students defaced the registry book at the tomb of Victor Emmanuel II with the words "*Vive le pape-roi!*" The students involved were beaten, detained and later deported. Other participants were attacked by violent mobs and the remainder of the conference was cancelled—cutting short the life the Union.¹⁵ In the following decades, subsequent attempts at creating an international organization of students were also unsuccessful, including an international student congress in 1900 under the leadership of de Montenach and Marc Sangnier.¹⁶

It was not until 1921 that a solid organization could be formed. Following the disaster of the First World War, the Catholic student associations in Switzerland, Spain,

¹⁴ Both men would later be members of the historic Fribourg Union. For more information on social Catholicism in this period, see Bokenkotter, *Church and Revolution*; Roger Aubert, *Catholic Social Teaching: An Historical Perspective* (Milwaukee WI: Marquette University, 2003).

¹⁵ See Guillaume de Weck, *Histoire de la Confédération internationale des étudiants catholiques "Pax Romana" 1887-1921-1946* (Fribourg: Max Jendly, 1946), chap. 1. The events, widely reported in the international press also deepened the conflict between the pope and the Italian state. Following the riots, the pope cited the riots as a justification to leave Rome. See also "Insults by French Pilgrims: Riots Caused in Rome by Acts at Victor Emmanuel's Tomb," *New York Times*, October 2, 1891; "The Vatican and Italy: A War to the Bitter End Has Been Commenced. The Assaults on the Pilgrims Early This Month Instigated by the Government--the Scandals May Result in the Pope Leaving Rome.," *New York Times*, October 23, 1891; "The Disorders in Rome," *New York Times*, October 3, 1891; "Leo's Life in Danger: The Pope Said to Be Threatened with Assassination.," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, October 23, 1891; "A Row at the Pantheon: Pilgrims Show Disrespect to the Tomb of King Emmanuel," *The Atlanta Constitution*, October 3, 1891; "What It May Lead To: An Influential Cardinal Talks About the Pantheon Incident," *The Atlanta Constitution*, October 23, 1891.

¹⁶ See Lefèvre, *Marc Sangnier*.

and Holland—countries that remained neutral during the war—called for a revival of the organization envisioned by de Montenach. With the approval of Pope Benedict XV, the students organized an international congress in July 1921. Despite the serious mistrust that existed between students from the formerly belligerent states, the delegates of seventeen European countries, the United States, Java (Indonesia), and Argentina agreed to re-form *l'Union internationale des étudiants catholiques*. The students took “Pax Romana” as an emblem to reflect their commitment to work for peace based in Roman Catholic values and teaching.

The mission of the renewed union was laid out in four goals, which had already been approved by Pope Benedict XV prior to the congress. As with model of Catholic Action outlined by Pius XI in the following years, the organization was to be limited only to activity that was “strictly religious and professional.”¹⁷ While the Union should be concerned with social questions, its “non political” mission was to be limited to four goals.

First and foremost, the mission of the new organization was to diffuse the “Catholic ideal in all branches and activities of student life.” Second, it pledged to “repudiate all liberal compromise and submit itself to the direction of the Catholic doctrinal authority.”¹⁸ The third aim of the Union was to facilitate the exchanges of

¹⁷ de Weck, *Histoire*, 101. See also Edward Cahill’s description of the “non-political” nature of the Catholic social movement at the time in Cahill, “The Catholic Social Movement: Historical Aspects,” 7.

¹⁸ “L’activité des étudiants devait rester strictement religieuse et professionnelle. On pouvait lui tracer comme limites les quatre points approuvés par S.S. Benoît XV et qui sont les suivants: 1. L’Union internationale des Etudiants catholiques a pour but la dissusion des idées et de l’idéal catholiques dans toutes les branches de la vie et de l’activité étudiante et meme du dehors. 2. Elle répudie tout compromission libérale et reste inviolablement soumise aux directions de l’autorité doctrinal catholique.” de Weck, *Histoire*, 101. To help develop this diffusion of ideas, specialized secretariats within Pax Romana were created for students in specific fields, such as press (1932), medicine (1932), law (1934), and

opinions of Catholic student groups in different countries to facilitate mutual understanding. Finally, it sought to encourage the study of vital questions in religion, philosophy, and sociology. To respond to these goals, a secretariat was established in Fribourg with a local Swiss priest appointed as secretary general to oversee the day-to-day functioning of the organization. Each year, a lay student president from one of the national associations would be elected and charged with organizing annual congresses, study sessions, and other programs.

At this stage, the mission of Pax Romana as articulated in its four goals reflected a model of Catholic Action that still largely operated in a “Christendom” understanding of mission and the relationship between the church and world. Under this model, which was the dominant ecclesial paradigm for the preceding centuries, the world outside the (Roman Catholic) church lacked autonomy and any real value. Society, it was taught, would be best ordered if it was placed under the direction of the Catholic Church, which alone held the keys to salvation. Despite the new rapprochement with society following *Rerum Novarum* (1891), the church remained largely defensive and hostile to the dangers posed by secularism, liberalism, and communism—dangers that had developed deep roots within European universities at the time.

According to this mentality, as Gustavo Gutiérrez comments, the engagement of Catholics in society was “to work for the direct and immediate benefit of the Church.”¹⁹ There was little room here for any autonomous action for social transformation on the part of Catholics. Rooted in the political Augustinianism of earlier centuries, this model

comparative literature (1935). Buenaventura Pelegri, *IMCS-IYCS: Their Option Their Pedagogy* (IMCS Asia Secretariat, 1979), 6.

¹⁹ See Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 34–35.

emphasized a separation of Christian faith from social life in the absence of any critical historical consciousness. The laity and lay associations were seen as auxiliaries in the battle to defend and safeguard the teachings and power of the church within society.²⁰ In line with Pius XI's vision of Catholic Action, lay people were to participate in the social mission under the direction of the hierarchy. Those that went beyond this passive role were often condemned or suppressed, such as Marc Sangnier's French student movement *Le Sillon* (1894 to 1910).²¹ While Pax Romana, in this period, elected a lay student president, the secretary general was a priest and organization was overseen by the bishop of Lausanne and Geneva and a Cardinal protector from the Roman Curia.

Despite the limitations of this largely deductive and passive model, Pax Romana did address social concerns in ways that went beyond a purely defensive Catholic posture. Some of these efforts, grounded on the urgent experiences of students after World War I, anticipated later efforts of IMCS-Pax Romana as an NGO. For example, soon after its foundation, it began an impressive series of relief efforts aimed at helping student refugees. In the 1920s, the international secretariat incurred large debts in organizing railroad cars filled with provisions to be sent to displaced youth in Vienna.²² These efforts brought it into a working relationship with the Protestant student group, the World Student Christian Federation (WSCF) and foreshadowed later efforts of Pax Romana with marginalized young people. With little support from the Roman hierarchy,

²⁰ See Cahill, "The Catholic Social Movement: Historical Aspects," 5.

²¹ *Le Sillon* was suppressed by Pope Pius X's *Notre Charge Apostolique* (1910) because of alleged sympathies to liberalism and democratic practices. See Institut Marc Sangnier, *Marc Sangnier en 1910: La Lettre Notre Charge Apostolique et ses suites: Actes de la Journée d'études du Vendredi 29 Septembre 2000* (Paris: Institut Marc Sangnier, 2002). Almost certainly, the memory of the suppression of *Le Sillon* movement was present to those who founded Pax Romana in 1921, given Sangnier's involvement in the previous efforts with students.

²² Jules H. Levasseur, "Pax Romana: Its Higher Educational Role" (Dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1965), 18.

Pax Romana also developed formal relations with the League of Nations' Committee for Intellectual Cooperation to address concerns related to students, including student exchanges, degree recognition, and grant allocations.²³ In this engagement, it facilitated a group of international student organizations, which included WSCF, the World Union of Jewish Students, and the student branches of international political parties.²⁴ In the end, however, these efforts within the Christendom framework remained largely non-political and focused on spirituality detached from social questions.

B. A New Christendom Approach (1930s-1950s)

The Second World War and the election of Pope Pius XII deeply impacted the church's relationship with the world and its understanding of mission. Within this context, a second model of mission for IMCS-Pax Romana to understand its mission emerged with the election of a non-European student as president (1938), the organization of the first world congress outside Europe (1939), the appointment of the first lay person as secretary general (1948) and the expansion of the movement throughout Latin America, Asia, and Africa. In this period from World War II to end of the Second Vatican Council, the movement's vision of mission moved from earlier

²³ Engagement with the international political structures intensified following the 1925 Congress when the Chancellor of Austria, Msgr. Ignaz Seipel, called upon to the organization to strengthen its efforts as a "Catholic peace movement." This relationship was further facilitated by the presence of two associates of Pax Romana (Oscar Halecki, of Warsaw, Poland, and Gonzague de Reynold, of Fribourg, Switzerland) on the Committee for Intellectual Cooperation. Roger Pochon, *Les Associations internationales d'étudiantes* (Fribourg: L'Oeuvre de Saint-Paul, 1928), 149; Levasseur, "Pax Romana: Its Higher Educational Role," 20; de Weck, *Histoire*, 135.

²⁴ Among the actions of this time was the publication of a directory of the international student organizations, published by the Roger Pochon of the Fribourg Secretariat. The directory included listings for the major international student associations, including Pax Romana, WSCF, the World Union of Jewish Students and the student branches of political parties. See Roger Pochon, *Les associations internationales d'étudiantes*.

concerns for “defending the Church” from a hostile world to “defending justice” in the world.²⁵ To this end, the movement placed a considerable amount of emphasis on the social responsibility of students and the laity as active agents, which is evident in the themes of its assemblies and congresses in this period.²⁶ Instead of looking to bishops for direction in this model, IMCS became more autonomous in its activity, while still maintaining a close relationship with the hierarchy under Pius XII’s more developed and socially engaged model of Catholic Action.

Here the movement became closely associated with the social-political vision of the French philosopher Jacques Maritain, and was involved in the formation of a generation of leaders for the Christian Democratic parties of Europe and Latin America who were inspired by Maritain’s thought on the role of Christians in politics. A number of key figures in these parties from Rafael Caldera and Eduardo Frei in Latin America to Aldo Moro and Joaquín Ruiz-Giménez in Europe, were involved in the international life of IMCS as student leaders.²⁷

The influential vision of Maritain attempted to move past many of the shortcomings and limitations of the previous defensive “Christendom” model in favor of a new approach, which he called the “New Christendom.” Here, the laity were called

²⁵ XXXI Interfederal Assembly, *Study Session 4: Movement*, 7.

²⁶ Themes of the major world congresses and interfederal assemblies of IMCS in this period, included: “The Catholic Student in Face of Actual Problems of the World” (1946); “The Christian Duty of the University Student” (1946); “Social Responsibilities of the Student” (1948); “Co-Operation of the Intellectual in the Work of Redemption” (1950); “Political Responsibility of the Christian” (1954); “Social Responsibility of the Student” (1959); “The Christian Responsibility in a Technological Era” (1961); “The Responsibility of the University Towards Society” (1962). Writing about the mission of IMCS in 1961, William Ferree argues that the student as an “intellectual leader is more responsible than others for the institutional structures of human life.” William Ferree, *Guide to the International Movement of Catholic Students* (Fribourg, Switzerland: International Movement of Catholic Students, 1965).

²⁷ The IMCS federation in Italy, the *Federazione Universitaria Cattolica Italiana* (FUCI) was particularly influential in forming leaders of the Italian Christian Democratic party. See, for example, the chapters on Italy in Gerd-Rainer Horn and Emmanuel Gerard, eds., *Left Catholicism, 1943-1955: Catholics and Society in Western Europe at the Point of Liberation* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001).

upon to take a more active role in the pursuit of social and political justice, the promotion of human rights, the construction of peace and the defense of the common good.²⁸ The “profane” world is looked on more positively and seen as having autonomy from the control and powers of the church. In their position as Christian *citizens*, the laity were understood to have a specific duty to transform the temporal and social realm under the inspiration of Christian teaching. However, as they participate in society, they do so only as individuals and not formally as “church.” The participation of the church and church movements in society, in other words, was to be indirect through the actions of secular institutions inspired by Catholic ideals.²⁹

Maritain’s vision and understanding of the potential role played by Catholic associations had a significant impact on Pax Romana’s understanding of its mission with students in this period and shaped its development as an international NGO. The beginning of the new understanding of mission according to the new Christendom model came in September, 1939 with the outbreak of World War II and the organization of the Pax Romana Congress in New York and Washington, DC. Studying “the Role of Students in Catholic Action,” the delegates from Europe (including Germany and Poland) again demonstrated a commitment to peace rooted in the common identity of being a Catholic university student. With the start of the war, the congress took the decision to open a second international secretariat in Washington under the direction Edward Kirchner, the outgoing president from the United States, and Rudi Salat, a German member of the Fribourg secretariat who remained in the Americas due to his opposition

²⁸ Maritain himself was a supporter of the United Nations and the human rights movement.

²⁹ See Dean Brackley, *Divine Revolution: Salvation and Liberation in Catholic Thought* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 69.

to the Nazi regime.³⁰ Unable to return home to Germany, Salat traveled throughout Latin America on a Vatican passport to establish national student associations and the first Pax Romana continental secretariat in Bogota in 1941.³¹

As the movement expanded in Latin America, the offices in Washington and Fribourg coordinated impressive charitable relief activities for students. With funds from the Swiss Catholic Mission and the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Pax Romana sent over 600,000 books in different languages to student prisoners. Together with the Protestant World Student Christian Federation, they launched the European Fund for Aid to Students, which in 1943 became the World Fund.³² Aimed at helping student prisoners, internees and refugees, the ecumenical fund maintained rest centers in Europe and opened university hostels in China and India.

After the war, two world congresses in 1946 signaled a dynamic renewal within Pax Romana along Maritain's model. The first took place in Salamanca with delegates from 40 countries discussing "The Catholic Student in Face of Actual Problems of the World." A few months later, a congress in Fribourg commemorated the movement's 25th anniversary. The Fribourg Congress marked an important turning point for the movement. Seventeen new federations, mostly from Latin America, were admitted as members and two new international movements were created that would shape the future of the movement.³³

³⁰ The Washington office was also aided by two chaplains, William Ferree, a former member of the Fribourg secretariat and John Courtney Murray, de Weck, *Histoire*, 90.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 191.

³² Levasseur, "Pax Romana: Its Higher Educational Role," 27.

³³ See Roger Pochon and Ramon Sugranyes de Franch, *Pax Romana Down the Years (1921-1961)* (Fribourg: Bersier, 1961).

Among the participants at the Congress were representatives of national Young Christian Student (YCS) groups—some of which were members of Pax Romana. Unlike the broader-based university federations of IMCS, these movements were organized in the tradition of *specialized* Catholic action. Following the model of the Young Christian Worker (YCW) movement created by Fr. Joseph Cardijn and young women industrial workers in the 1920s, the movements of specialized Catholic action generally gather together small groups of Catholic to engaged in a “review of life” in cells of people in similar classes (workers, farmers, students, etc). Following the YCW methodology of “see-judge-act,” the YCS gathered secondary school and university students together in cell-based groups for reflection and common action. Meeting in the context of the Pax Romana Congress, the delegates created an International Center of Documentation and Information, which in 1954 became the International Young Catholic Students (IYCS). While initially welcomed by the movement, the creation of the IYCS later became a source of great frustration for Pax Romana who, in this period, sought to gather all forms of student life into one movement since it alone was granted the official Catholic action “mandate” for the student apostolate. While IMCS hoped IYCS would be a specialized secretariat within the movement, IYCS remains a distinct movement.³⁴

The Fribourg Congress of 1946 also approved the creation of a graduate and intellectual branch of Pax Romana. At Easter 1947, student leaders and intellectuals—many former student members—organized separate meetings near Rome. With the

³⁴ Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, debates on the nature of the relationship between the two movements were often a source of tension with Pax Romana opposing the recognition of IYCS as an ICO and the two movements competing for national groups and funding sources. Unhappy with “the duplication of presence within the student milieu,” the Holy See proposed a compromise in 1956 to give IMCS the mandate for university students and IYCS the mandate for secondary and technical school students. While IMCS accepted this, IYCS refused, and tensions remained throughout this period. Pelegri, *IMCS-IYCS: Their Option Their Pedagogy*, 18.

approval of Pope Pius XII and the participation of both Étienne Gilson and Jacques Maritain, a new structure of Pax Romana was created with one branch for students, the International Movement of Catholic Students and one for graduates, the International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs (ICMICA).³⁵ While autonomous and distinct, the two movements remain linked by the common “vocation of Christianising the university milieu: not only the milieu in the university, but also the milieu of all those who have intellectual work to do.”³⁶

Throughout the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, IMCS, in line with the new Christendom model, supported and encouraged students to engage in society under the inspiration of Christian principles. Importantly, however, this work was not simply educational and inspirational. As a movement, IMCS engaged social questions in several innovative and proactive ways. In 1949, IMCS and ICMICA were among the first Catholic organizations to acquire formal consultative status as a non-governmental organization with the United Nations Economic and Social Council and UNESCO under the common name Pax Romana. Together with other international Catholic organizations, IMCS worked to re-found the Conference of ICOs in 1946 to support and network Catholic groups in their international engagement with the newly created United Nations and its specialized agencies. Soon, the ICOs helped to establish Catholic centers in New York, Geneva and

³⁵ The interventions of Gilson and Maritain are included in the published proceedings of the Rome meeting: *Les intellectuels dans la Chrétienté* (Fribourg: Pax Romana, 1948).

Maritain’s address, included in the volume under the title “Les civilisations humaines et le rôle des chrétiens,” stresses the responsibility of the Christian intellectual according to the distinction of planes (and the distinction between the natural and supernatural orders).

³⁶ See Pochon and Sugranyes de Franch, *Pax Romana Down the Years (1921-1961)*. Within ICMICA, graduates of the specialized student secretariats founded their own autonomous secretariats for engineers, jurists, artists, writers, scientists, secondary school teachers, pharmacists and doctors. The latter two eventually separated and formed their own NGOs: the International Federation of Catholic Pharmacists and World Federation of Catholic Medical Associations. The secretariats for Catholic jurists, artists, engineers, and secondary school teachers remain as autonomous networks within ICMICA today.

Paris. Although it insisted that it remained “non-political” (according to new Christendom Catholic Action model) IMCS saw its relationship with the United Nations as an important aspect of its mission in helping students to transform the world and society according to Christian principles. This relationship allowed the movement to engage UN officials as speakers at its international meetings and to share the experiences and opinions of its members on relevant topics such as university reform, broad principles of human rights, culture, and student exchanges.

Second, the mission of IMCS in this period also widened geographically as the movement and its identity outside of Europe strengthened. In the Americas, it grew rapidly in this period, with member federations in nearly every country and an active regional structure for Latin America. At the end of 1954, IMCS organized its first continental program for Asian students in India with the theme: “The Catholic Student and the Transformations Taking Place in Asian Universities.” In 1957, the first continental program of African students was organized in Accra, Ghana. In December 1959 and January 1960, IMCS and ICMICA organized a series of programs in Manila for Asian students, chaplains and graduates, including an important joint Pax Romana-UNESCO inter-religious conference.³⁷ With these developments, many non-Europeans served as presidents of IMCS and major congresses and assemblies were organized outside Europe. By the time of the council, IMCS has become a truly global movement.

³⁷ The joint Pax Romana-UNESCO conference emerged from an invitation of the Luther Evans, the UNESCO Director General, during his address to the 1958 Pax Romana World Congress in Vienna. There, he invited Pax Romana to help UNESCO undertake a project on the great religions of the world. With the support of UNESCO and the approval of the Holy See, Pax Romana organized one of the first major inter-religious gatherings sanctioned by the Church with the theme: “The Present Impact of the Great Religions on the Lives of Men in the Orient and Occident.” Hindus, Buddhists, Shintoists, Muslims, Jews, Orthodox Christians, Protestants, and Catholics participated in this event. See Roque Ferriols, “The Pax Romana Conferences In Manila: A Special Report,” *Philippine Studies* 8, no. 2 (1960): 362–69.

Finally, IMCS, ICMICA and other ICOs took a leading role in the development of the new theology of the laity in the years leading up to the council. This is especially evident in the key role played by IMCS and former IMCS leaders in the Permanent Committee for International Congresses on the Lay Apostolate (1952-1967). Rosemary Goldie, Ramon Sugranyes de Franch, Vittorio Veronese, and others coming directly from Pax Romana leadership were important lay voices promoting a more active and direct engagement of the church in history and the status of the laity as members of the people of God developed.³⁸

C. Distinction of Planes (1950s-1960s)

While the new Christendom framework modeled a more positive approach to the modern world than the Christendom model, it was limited in its ability to address the complex social realities, particularly in Europe and Latin America. Confronted with the limitations of the new Christendom framework, French Catholic thinkers proposed a more developed framework for Christian social engagement that would impact the work of IMCS in this period. In contrast to the new Christendom model, this third approach emphasized “the *complete* autonomy and secularity of the temporal order with respect to the church.”³⁹ According to this “the distinction of planes” model, a clear disjunction is made between the church and the world.⁴⁰ Drawing from the work of

³⁸ See Rosemary Goldie, “Ramon Sugranyes: Catholic International Organizations, COPECIAL and Vatican II,” *Notes and Documents (Institut Jacques Maritain)* no. September-December (1998): 20–27; Bernard Minvielle, *L’Apostolat des laïcs à la veille du concile (1949-1959): histoire des congrès mondiaux de 1951 et 1957* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires, 2001); World Congress for the Lay Apostolate and Comité permanent des Congrès internationaux pour l’Apostolat des laïques, *Actes du 1er congrès mondial pour ;’apostolat des laïques* (Roma: Palazzo delle Congregazioni, 1951).

³⁹ Brackley, *Divine Revolution*, 69.

Étienne Gilson, another philosopher associated with Pax Romana, Jacques Maritain identifies “three distinct planes.”⁴¹ The first is the spiritual plane. This is the space of the church in its liturgical, sacramental, contemplative and apostolic work. The second plane is that of the temporal. Like the spiritual plane, this realm is oriented to God as its final end, but it is separate from the first as it is chiefly concerned with social, political, cultural and economic activity. In this temporal space, lay Christian citizens are seen as having the responsibility to shape society under Christian inspiration in their *personal* capacity. Occupying an intermediary space is a third plane, according to Maritain, where the Christian acts temporally as a formal member of the church (in Catholic Action) only “in order to defend their religious interests.”⁴²

This distinction between the planes proposes a further distinction, between the actions of “a Christian” and the actions of “a Christian as such.” According to Maritain’s framework, the layperson does act—and indeed has the responsibility to act—as a *Christian* in the second plane in seeking to transform the society under the inspiration of Christian teachings. This action, even when done in association with other Christians, however, does not constitute an action of the church or a direct participation in the apostolic mission. Rather, it is the action of the Christian in a personal capacity.

By contrast, the action of the *Christian as such*, in which laypersons participate in the mission of the church, takes place only within the ecclesial-liturgical (first) plane of action and, when necessary, to defend the church in the third plane. Catholic Action,

⁴⁰ Unlike some Augustinian approaches, which saw grace (via the church) as suppressing nature (the world), Maritain’s Thomistic framework understood grace as perfecting nature, which “opened the door to possibilities of a more autonomous and disinterested political action.” Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 35.

⁴¹ Jacques Maritain, *Integral Humanism: Temporal and Spiritual Problems of a New Christendom*, trans. Joseph W. Evans (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1968), 291.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 298.

and movements like Pax Romana in this model, are seen as inspiring the actions of Christian citizens and acting in society only in defense of the church.⁴³

Accordingly, is not the responsibility of the church (on the first plane) to intervene directly in the second, even in the pursuit of justice. Instead, as Gutiérrez summarizes, the role of the church in the face of injustice is to focus on “the inspiration of the temporal sphere.”⁴⁴ Lay apostolic movements like Pax Romana, should not go beyond this mission but should work to inspire and form engaged citizens and leaders to act in the second plane under Christian inspiration, but not as church *per se*. Catholic action is valuable, then, in the way in which it “*prepares* laymen to act *as Christians*” in this temporal sphere.⁴⁵

Writing about the role of the laity in this period, Yves Congar follows Maritain’s model as he differentiates between the direct and indirect actions of the church in society:

When it is a question of operations supernatural in their very matter, as, for example, incorporation into Christ by baptism, the Lord’s presence in the Eucharist, forgiveness of sins, the Church acts directly... But when it is a question of the hallowing and saving of what is outside and appurtenant to the soul, the Church’s action is not more than indirect, the more so the further one gets away from the personally spiritual.⁴⁶

As Congar explains, Catholic Action, as an official participant in the mission of hierarchy, must be limited only to this indirect role. It “has the duty of inspiring society with the Christian spirit” but this must be done indirectly through means such as

⁴³ Ibid., 249. “It is not to the Church but to Christians as temporal members of this temporal organism that the transformation and regeneration according to the Christian spirit belongs... The proper task of Catholic Action, as it does not cease to proclaim through its authorized organs, is to create an essentially Christian state of mind, and it is only when ‘politics touches the altar’ that it has to intervene.” (269)

⁴⁴ Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 37.

⁴⁵ Maritain, *Integral Humanism*, 298.

⁴⁶ Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 368.

education. It is not the role of Catholic Action organizations, *as organizations*, to take up “the task of direct ‘technical transformation of the political or economic structures.’”⁴⁷

Ultimately, however, like the new Christendom model, the distinction of planes was ineffective. The differentiation between the action of Christians and the actions of Christians as such, as championed by Maritain and others in this model, limited the ability of the church and Catholic organizations like IMCS to respond adequately to situations of injustice and engage in the promotion of the common good. According to this model, the mission of IMCS and other lay apostolic organizations, as Gustavo Gutiérrez points out, “was to evangelize and to inspire the temporal order, without directly intervening.”⁴⁸ Those groups, like French YCS, who challenged this model soon found themselves in conflict with their bishops and ultimately, in the words of Gutiérrez, “burned themselves out.”⁴⁹

D. Integral Liberation (1960s – Present)

The limitations of the new Christendom and distinction of planes models surfaced clearly in the late 1960s as IMCS entered into a moment of severe organizational and identity crisis caused by several converging social and ecclesial factors. For IMCS, the challenges of post-conciliar reception within the church converged with upheavals taking place within the university world and the experience of injustice and dictatorial regimes. The previous understanding of IMCS’s mission within the framework of the new Christendom model was unable to respond to this new context. Deeply shaped by the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 269.

⁴⁸ Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 39.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 40.

teachings of Vatican II and the social context in which IMCS members lived, the movement saw their mission in a new light—one that clearly situated its action for justice (as a movement) within the overall mission of the church.

This more radicalized understanding of evangelization in the student world mirrored and drew inspiration from Vatican II's holistic vision of mission, especially as articulated by Paul VI, the 1968 meeting of Latin American bishops (CELAM), and the 1971 Synod of Bishops. Rather than avoiding direct political action, as in the earlier models, IMCS developed an inductive and integral approach to mission that rejected the distinction of planes model in favor of a vision that emphasizes the integral connection between faith, mission, and action for justice. Unfortunately, this new commitment for social transformation, despite being rooted in the gospel and the teachings of Vatican II, placed IMCS for the first time into conflict with hierarchy in many places around the world.⁵⁰

The development of this new vision of mission was not easy. Immediately, following the council, in the tumultuous period surrounding the student revolutions of the late 1960s, IMCS was forced to rethink its role as the movement of the student apostolate. In Europe and North America, many of the traditionally strong student federations such as *La Fédération française des étudiants catholiques* and the National Newman Club Federation (USA) did not survive this transition. Other groups, like some of the traditional student fraternities in German-speaking countries resisted the new

⁵⁰ Gutiérrez explains: “Today, apostolic youth movements have radicalized their political options... The ever more revolutionary political options of Christian groups—especially students, workers, and peasants—have frequently been responsible for conflicts between lay apostolic movements and the hierarchy. These options have likewise caused the movement members to question their place in the Church and have been responsible for the severe crises experienced by some of them” (59).

emerging model of mission and disaffiliated from IMCS. Between 1967 and 1971 the number of IMCS's national member movements dropped from 111 federations in 94 countries to 87 federations in 78 countries.⁵¹

In other parts of the world, especially in Latin America, Catholic student leaders were becoming increasingly radicalized in their social and political commitments. In some places, students and chaplains left the movement to take leadership roles in leftist revolutionary groups such as Teoponte guerrillas in Bolivia, the Montoneros in Argentina, and CORECATO in the Dominican Republic—the latter named after Camilo Torres, the former IMCS student chaplain in Columbia who died in his first battle as a member of the *Ejército de Liberación Nacional*.⁵²

As with the broader church, a new way to understand mission was needed for IMCS—one that could engage its mission of evangelization without resorting to violence. Thankfully, for both the movement and the church, such a model was already emerging in Latin America and Asia in the years following Vatican II, thanks in part to IMCS movements who were profoundly inspired by the renewed vision of the Second Vatican Council and teachings of the Latin American bishops at their post-conciliar Medellín conference in 1968. The students, in particular, were inspired by the emerging historical consciousness within the church, the scripturally-based commitments to the poor and to

⁵¹ “Hoisting the Sails in the Changing Seventies: The International Movement of Catholic Students in Its 50th Year,” *Convergence* no. July (1971): 4.

⁵² According to Enrique Dussel, the engagement of Catholic student leaders in these revolutionary movements can be attributed to the fact that many “students...were unwilling to accept the fact that they did not naturally belong to the oppressed classes. For this reason the students rejected their class, passed from reformism to revolution...and at times fell into a naïve romanticism because of their lack of political realism. Their attitude was basically zealot, and theirs was a kind of zealotry characterized by a utopianism and heroism that was neither practical nor operative—as can be seen in the case of Camilo Torres in Colombia (d. February 16, 1966), or the ‘Teoponte’ guerrillas in Bolivia.” Enrique D. Dussel, *A History of the Church in Latin America: Colonialism to Liberation (1492-1979)*, trans. Alan Neely (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1981), 325.

justice, and the affirmation of the role of laity and lay communities as church. In Brazil, for instance, *the Juventude Universitária Católica* (JUC) helped to set the stage for the later emergence of Christian base communities through the efforts of Paulo Freire and other former militants of the movement.⁵³ Meanwhile in Peru, Gustavo Gutiérrez, the national chaplain of the IMCS federation (UNEC), was influenced by the experiences of the students he worked with and the other chaplains of the movement in Latin America.⁵⁴ This helped him to perceive the need for a new pastoral and theological framework, which he called “a theology of liberation” in a lecture published by the IMCS regional secretariat in Montevideo (MIEC) in 1969.⁵⁵

The experience of the UNEC and other dynamic movements in Latin America and Asia helped to shape this third approach to mission for IMCS and the emergence of liberation theology within the wider church. In his work on the history of the church in Latin America Enrique Dussel points to the role of IMCS (JUC), IYCS (JEC) and the YCW (JOC) as an important factor in preparing the ground for the emergence of liberation theology:

It was from these groups of militants, working-class or *petit bourgeois* (not only is the latter not a pejorative term here: this class showed itself an essential component in the revolutionary process throughout Latin America, as the Sandinista Front was to show) in origin that the church as a whole learned a new type of understanding of what Christian life meant in general, and Christian

⁵³ “Brazilian Catholic Action was undoubtedly important in preparing the ground from which the base communities were later to spring. Its main task was to create a new space for social and political involvement by Christians. The activity of Catholic Action (and especially JUC, JEC, and JOC) made acceptable the idea that Christian should be active in social and political affairs. Indeed, it put into practice the “see-judge-act” method, giving it new force as an instrument of social critique and transformation.” Faustino Luiz Couto Teixeira, “Base Church Communities in Brazil,” in *The Church in Latin America, 1492-1992*, ed. Enrique D. Dussel, trans. Francis McDonagh, vol. 1, *A History of the Church in the Third World* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992), 410.

⁵⁴ See Christian Smith, *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991), 54.

⁵⁵ See footnote no. 1 in Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, 175.

political life in particular. It was from both the practice and theory of these groups that the most important theological break in Latin American history was to emerge.⁵⁶

In her working paper *From Catholic Action to Liberation Theology: The Historical Process of the Laity in Latin America in the Twentieth Century*, Ana Maria Bidegain examines the impact of IMCS and IYCS for the development of liberation theology and the formation of some of its major thinkers, including Gutiérrez, Juan Luis Segundo, Dussel, and Paulo Freire. According to Bidegain, the shift in mission that took place within IMCS and IYCS following the council situated them as “prophetic minorities” within the church. Their new integrated approach to mission enabled the movements to “interpret the Latin American realities to the whole Church community. It is this context that gave birth to Liberation Theology, Basic Christian Communities, [and] Medellin.”⁵⁷

In a similar way, IMCS members in Asia were also developing their commitments to liberation in light of *Gaudium et Spes*, the war in Vietnam, repressive governments, and national security laws. Under the leadership of politically engaged student movements, especially in India, Indonesia, Korea, and Singapore, the movement, as Bernard D’Sami writes moved “from a kind of ‘Christian Democracy to the involvement of Christians in non-confessional socio-political action.’”⁵⁸ As in Latin America, the

⁵⁶ Enrique D. Dussel, “Recent Latin American Theology,” in *The Church in Latin America, 1492-1992*, ed. Enrique D. Dussel, trans. Paul Burns, vol. 1, A History of the Church in the Third World (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992), 392. See also Dussel, *A History of the Church in Latin America*, 324.

⁵⁷ Anna Maria Bidegain, *From Catholic Action to Liberation Theology: The Historical Process of the Laity in Latin America in the Twentieth Century*, Working Paper 48 (Notre Dame, IN: Kellogg Institute, 1985), 22.

⁵⁸ D’ Sami, Bernard, “The Impact of Gaudium Et Spes on The Social Mission of The Church in Asia with Particular Reference to Catholic Students and Workers Movements,” in *The Call to Justice: The Legacy of Gaudium Et Spes 40 Years Later* (Rome, 2005), 4.

teachings of the Second Vatican Council inspired Catholic students in Asia to see their mission as a movement in a new light as many groups engaged in broader social and political movements for democracy and human rights.

The new approach to student mission developing in Latin America and Asia affected the life of the movement as a whole and influenced the methodology and the theme of the 1971 Interfederal Assembly in Fribourg. Instead of the traditional deductive method with presentations from eminent personalities, the movement took an inductive approach. Responses to a questionnaire sent to all national federations served as the basis of the reflections and set the theme of the event: “Liberation – How?” A resource person from each region guided the participants through a social analysis of the reality of students in relation to the theme, the relationship of this reality to the Christian faith, and ways in which IMCS could address these challenges in the future.⁵⁹

With this inductive experience, a new sense of mission emerged in which IMCS increasingly defined itself in relation to the struggle for “liberation of all men and of the whole man.”⁶⁰ At the conclusion of the assembly, just a few months before the 1971 Synod of Bishops, the movement strongly called upon Pope Paul, the bishops, and the church as a whole to “take a stand through acts of concrete solidarity, in favor of justice and peace” and committed itself “to work in the student environment and in society as a whole for the liberation of man from all domination, oppression and discrimination, whether material or moral.”⁶¹

⁵⁹ Pelegri, *IMCS-IYCS: Their Option Their Pedagogy*, 8.

⁶⁰ “Resolutions Carried by the Directing Committee of IMCS,” *Convergence* no. July (1971): 28.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* For his part, Pope Paul VI’s message to the assembly affirmed the student’s commitment to liberation and the project for the coming years. See Paul VI, “Sodalibus Instituti ‘Pax Romana’ Appellati, Friburgi, in Helvetia, Ex Universo Terrarum Orbe, Conventum Habentibus, Quinquagesimo Volvente Anno

This sense of mission was strengthened four years later at the Interfederal Assembly in Lima. There, 80 delegates from 32 national federations examined the theme, “Christian Commitment in a World in Crisis.”⁶² Regional gatherings of student leaders before the assembly and an “exposure program” during the study session, helped to facilitate the inductive approach of the assembly. In Lima, the delegates articulated the mission of IMCS more clearly, explicitly grounding it in the mission of the church: “the Movement affirms and accomplishes its deep meaning: to be a sign of the Church committed to the transformation of the world starting from the university.”⁶³

In this third period, the relationship between IMCS and IYCS improved significantly. Joint regional secretariats between the two student movements were established in Latin America and Europe, common international programs were organized and IMCS moved from its longtime home in Fribourg with ICMICA to share a joint secretariat in Paris with IYCS.⁶⁴ Gradually, IMCS came to understand itself as a movement in the tradition of specialized Catholic action, which previously had only referred to those movements that drew inspiration from the methods of Joseph Cardijn and the YCW.⁶⁵

D. The Mission of IMCS Today and its Underlying Theology

Today, IMCS’s understanding of mission at the national, continental and global levels continues the inductive and integral liberationist approach developed after the

Ab Illa Associatione Condita,” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* LXIII, no. 1 (1971): no. 1; Richard A. McCormick, *Notes on Moral Theology, 1965-1980* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981), 381.

⁶² Pelegri, *IMCS-IYCS: Their Option Their Pedagogy*, 9.

⁶³ 28th Interfederal Assembly of IMCS (Lima), “Toward a Re-Definition of the Movement,” 6.

⁶⁴ The Latin American secretariat adopted the acronym “MIEC-JECI” and the European Secretariat JECI-MIEC.

⁶⁵ *Days of Reflection of International Movements for Specialized Catholic Action* (Brussels: MIACS, 2002).

Second Vatican Council. This understanding is captured well by the four “main objectives” enumerated at the beginning of the present international Statutes of IMCS:

- a) to promote the student apostolate among students in higher education stressing their responsibility in life, in the Church’s mission and in the world;
- b) to recognize the problems of justice, a recognition which is vital to the transformation of society, and work with all concerned women and men for joint action and reflection leading to a more just and equitable social order at all levels: national, continental and international;
- c) to further the Christian faith experience lived in one’s own commitment and to try to communicate this faith to the student milieu by bearing witness to Jesus Christ;
- d) to encourage pedagogies of action which help students integrate their Christian faith in their efforts to build a more just society. ⁶⁶

When compared to the four goals articulated at the foundational congress of Pax Romana in 1921, one can see the ways in which IMCS’s understanding of its mission has developed in light of the council’s holistic vision that was outlined in Chapter Two. In particular, these goals reflect Vatican II’s renewed understanding of the church/world relationship, its historical consciousness, and the renewed theology of the laity and lay associations. Before illustrating how IMCS lives out this mission as an international NGO today, I will briefly highlight four interrelated theological concepts that ground these four objectives and its actions as an NGO.

The first important concept that now frames the IMCS’s mission is participation. While it is not explicitly mentioned directly by name, the concept of participation strongly underlies this first objective. Drawing from the council’s historical consciousness and its articulation of the responsibilities of the laity as church, IMCS identifies its apostolic mission as empowering students to live up to their responsibilities

⁶⁶ *International Statutes of IMCS Pax Romana* (International Movement of Catholic Students, 2007), Article 3, <http://www.imcs-miec.org/statutes-English,s,98>.

“in life, in the Church’s mission and in the world.” Unlike the new Christendom’s articulation of lay responsibility in the world, IMCS here stresses the responsibility of students to participate both in the church and in the world *as church*. As an apostolic movement, it offers students a structure to promote and facilitate this participation and to have their voices heard in the structures of global governance and the church.

In the second objective, IMCS makes explicit the connection between its apostolic mission and public social engagement. Like *Octogesima Adveniens, Justice in the World*, and *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, IMCS understands action for justice and social transformation to be a key aspect of the Christian mission. Reflecting the teachings of the council and post-conciliar social teaching on dialogue, this mission also calls the movement to work with others in this task. Absent from this vision of mission is any sense of the distinction of planes, which detached IMCS, as a movement, from socially transformative action. Instead, as its statutes make clear, IMCS has a role beyond educating its members on justice. It is called, as a movement, “to recognize the problems of justice” and “work with all concerned women and men for joint action and reflection leading to a more just and equitable social order at all levels.” In recent years, IMCS has described this commitment to social action in terms of a specific “spirituality of action” which perceives God as “more deeply revealed as we engage in transformative actions which are subsequently reflected upon.”⁶⁷

Third, the present objectives of IMCS also reflect its concerns for the faith commitments of students and the value of witnessing to those commitments in the university. The practice of evangelization and witnessing to Christ in the student milieu

⁶⁷ “IMCS and IYCS Policy Paper on Integral Education,” 2003, IMCS Archives, Paris.

remains an important aspect of the movement's identity especially at the campus level. Like Vatican II's *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*, IMCS believes that young lay students should be empowered to be the "first apostles to the young."⁶⁸ The age and lay status of university students does not negate their obligation to witness to Christ in the church and in the world. Employing similar language to *Justice in the World* (1971) and *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975), the movement has also maintained the fundamental connection between Christian witness and social engagement as articulated in its 1978 identity document:

The vital presence of IMCS is evangelization, conversion to Christ which is embodied in history in the option for the poor, by the practice of justice, in the attitude for the transformation of society, a process that defies our maturity.⁶⁹

Finally, IMCS's objectives reflect its integral vision of mission. Drawing from the work of Louis Joseph Lebreton and the teachings of Pope Paul VI on integral human development that I outlined in Chapter Two, IMCS seeks to evangelize all students and the whole student, including their spiritual, social, and intellectual dimensions. Like the council, Pope Paul, and many liberation theologians, IMCS stresses the integral relationships between areas that are often disconnected from one another such as faith and life, the church and the world, and society and spirituality. For IMCS, it is

⁶⁸ *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 12. In 1986, IMCS described this mission and its relationship to action for justice: "The evangelizing presence of the movement must lead it to transform students into active protagonists of the University Apostolate, and not mere consumers (as they so often are made out to be). This mission of developing a responsible lay apostolate among students is a fundamental one, if students are really to live their faith in a committed manner in the Church and the world. In this regard, the option for the poor is an important value, which must be made actively present within the University Apostolate." XXXI Interfederal Assembly, *Study Session 4: Movement*, 44.

⁶⁹ "La presence vitale du MIEC est évangélisatrice, la conversion au Christ qui est incarné dans l'histoire dans l'option pour les pauvres, par la pratique de la justice, concrétisée dans l'attitude pour la transformation de la société, processus qui défie notre maturité." XXIX Interfederal Assembly, "Document Sur L'Identite Du MIEC" (International Movement of Catholic Students, 1978), 9, IMCS Archives, Paris.

particularly important to make these connections in the “efforts to build a more just society.” As a student movement, this integral perspective is captured well by the concept of “integral education:”

IMCS and IYCS define integral education in the formula set down by Fr. Louis Joseph Lebret who saw education as the formation ‘of the whole person and of all peoples.’ In this definition IMCS and IYCS believe that education must go beyond the accumulation of knowledge and development of intellectual capacities. Integral education needs to also address the emotional, social, and spiritual dimensions of the student. The end goal of integral education is the formation of well-rounded holistic persons that feel called to contribute their knowledge and skills to the common good of society.⁷⁰

As with the model of mission defined as prophetic dialogue that we identified at the end of Chapter Two, IMCS’s vision of its specific mission with students is multifaceted and includes several interrelated elements. Taken together, the four objectives articulated in Article 3 of its Statutes (participation, action for justice, evangelization, and integral education) call IMCS to publicly engage the world and its structures and to do so as church. According to these objectives, action for a more just social order is not optional for IMCS; nor is it secondary to some more “pastoral” activity with students. Instead, it is identified as a constitutive element of its apostolic action with students at the national, continental and global levels.

II. IMCS AS A TRANSNATIONAL NGO

After outlining the four objectives of the organization in Article 3, the Statutes of IMCS identify five “forms of action” through which the movement will try to live out its mission in the world. These include the formation and support of local Catholic student

⁷⁰ See “IMCS and IYCS Policy Paper on Integral Education.”

movements; the organization of international programs to reflect on common problems; joint action at the international level; the sharing of information; and the representation of students in intergovernmental and church structures.⁷¹ As an international NGO, these forms of action are expressed primarily in two ways: in international advocacy (actions of the movement *ad extra*) and formation and solidarity (actions of the movement *ad intra*).

A. IMCS and International Advocacy

The most visible form action of IMCS as an international NGO is through its formalized engagement with intergovernmental structures. Under the shared name of “Pax Romana (ICMICA-IMCS),” the two movements of Pax Romana hold joint status with several United Nations agencies including special consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), associate status with UNESCO, and recognition by the Department of Public Information.⁷² Together with the IYCS, IMCS’s European regional coordination (JECI-MIEC) has formal relations with the Council of Europe. IMCS also maintains active relationships with the International Labor Organization, the World Bank, and other agencies on questions relating to youth.⁷³

⁷¹ Article 4 reads: “With these objectives the IMCS will try: a) to facilitate the formation of Catholic Student movements and associations in countries in which they do not yet exist and to see that their continued growth goes hand in hand with that of the existing movements; b) to provide the students and chaplains of member movements and associations with possibilities for meeting and reflecting on joint problems, on the basis of the situation in their own continents, as well as on international problems; c) to propose guidelines for actions to be carried out in solidarity by the member movements and associations in accordance with the possibilities and reality of each national group; d) to organize, within the framework of its International Secretariat, an efficient communication service for the exchange of information in all areas concerning the student apostolate’s spheres of competence in the institutions of higher education; e) to represent, at the international level, the Catholic student movement in university and tertiary institutions and to cooperate with other international organizations.”

⁷² The International Secretariat of Catholic Technologists, Agriculturalists and Economists of Pax Romana is listed as having roster status with the Economic and Social Council by virtue of its relationship with the International Labor Organization.

⁷³ While the close partnerships with ICMICA and IYCS are positive on many levels, the complex set of relationships with the two movements can dilute the impact of the movement in a context where “brands”

While both international teams of IMCS and ICMICA are responsible for the representation of their respective movements as outlined in their statutes, the two collaborate in their shared NGO status with teams of missionaries and volunteers in New York, Geneva, Paris, Vienna, and Nairobi. The joint NGO status between IMCS and ICMICA originates in an agreement reached in the late 1940s. Eager to cooperate with the new structures of global governance, IMCS and ICMICA made separate applications in 1947 to the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).⁷⁴ After initial opposition to their application from the Soviet Union and France, the Economic and Social Council proposed in July of 1948 to admit Pax Romana under the condition that the two movements be jointly represented.⁷⁵ This agreement opened the door for Pax Romana (ICMICA-IMCS) to be accredited by UNESCO in 1948 and to be formally granted status by ECOSOC in February 1949.

and visible logos are important. This confusion is clear when examining the way the NGO is listed in intergovernmental, ecclesial, and academic publications. The range of names and acronyms used to describe IMCS internationally includes: Pax Romana, Pax Romana (ICMICA-IMCS); IMCS/MIEC; JECI-MIEC; and MIEC-JECI.

⁷⁴ See United Nations, *Yearbook of the United Nations 1947/48*, vol. 2 (New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 1948), 688.

⁷⁵ This issue was decided with the Resolution 1948 133(VI)A. The Soviet Union, in particular, raised three objections to the applications by ICMICA and IMCS. The first related to the presence of “federations in exile”—groups of Pax Romana from Eastern Europe (Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, etc), which, while banned in their homelands, existed among exiled nationals in the West. The second concern related to the presence of the federations in Spain under the Franco regime. The final concern raised related to the actions of a former IMCS president who held a position in the Italian government. To the first two, IMCS responded (in line with the vision of new Christendom) that its member federations were “strictly non-political.” To the third, IMCS argued that it could not be held accountable for the actions of individuals who had not been members for more than a decade and that many of its member federations had been suppressed in Germany and Austria during the war. See Bernard Cook, “Pax Romana and the Reconstruction of a United Europe Along Christian Lines,” in *Une Europe malgré tout, 1945-1990: Contacts et réseaux culturels, intellectuels et scientifiques entre Européens dans la guerre froide*, ed. Antoine Fleury and Lubor Jílek, vol. 9, L’Europe Et Les Europes (Brussels: Peter Land, 2009), 86; United Nations, *Yearbook of the United Nations 1948/49*, vol. 3 (New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 1949), 707; “Joint Response Letter by IMCS and ICMICA Pax Romana,” 1948, E/C.2/W.20, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

At first, the advocacy efforts of IMCS with the United Nations system in the 1950s and early 1960s reflected the positions and limitations of the new Christendom approach. Its efforts remained largely non-political, focused on the theoretical development of European and global governance structures, cultural and student issues, and the defense of the rights of Catholics living under communist regimes.⁷⁶

By the end of the 1960s, IMCS's approach to advocacy under the model of integral liberation developed as its understanding of mission became more radicalized and independent from hierarchical influence. Instead of looking at the hierarchy for direction, IMCS (as advised by *Octogesima Adveniens* no. 4) analyzed social issues facing students in light of the Gospel and responded with its own forms of action. This new methodological approach and inductive sense of mission led IMCS to openly confront governments and, at times, even official positions of the Holy See. Following Vatican II, the advocacy priorities of IMCS have focused primarily in three areas, which are reflective of its new articulation of mission.

⁷⁶ Within the context of the cold war, efforts were made by the intelligence agencies of the United States and Soviet Union to manipulate student and youth NGOs through the main umbrella networks at the time: the World Assembly of Youth (WAY), the Coordinating Secretariat of National Unions of *Students* (COSEC), and the International Union of Students (UIE). In February 1967 *The New York Times* published several articles examining the relationship between the US Central Intelligence Agency and several anti-Communist NGOs including the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Commission of Jurists, the World Assembly of Youth, and Pax Romana. The articles, as Peter Willetts explains, were used by anti-democratic and anti-NGO regimes to threaten the presence of NGOs in the UN system. An investigation by ECOSOC into the reports of CIA funding of Pax Romana and other NGOs revealed that the international secretariat did not receive any direct or indirect funding from any intelligence agency. While certain Eastern European "federations in exile" may have developed relationships with the US Government on their own, this was not seen to threaten the non-governmental nature of the international organization. A resolution at the 1967 IMCS Interfederal Assembly (cited in the UN review) strongly rejected such accusations and barred the international and regional secretariats from receiving such funds. See Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World"*, 41–42; "Review of the Consultative Activities of Non-Governmental Organizations Granted Consultative Status by the Economic and Social Council: Report Prepared by the Secretary-General Pursuant to Council Resolution J225 (XIII)," September 4, 1968, E/C.2/R.38, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

i. Advocacy for Justice and Social Transformation

Following the council, the advocacy priorities of IMCS and Pax Romana as a whole developed in response to the organization's deepening sense of mission and commitment to liberation. With its strong commitment to justice and its concern for the poor, IMCS has taken up concerns for marginalized women and men and worked to promote their human rights. Since the 1960s, it has had an important impact in the development of human rights particularly in two areas. First, the movement mobilized within the church and within the United Nations for the recognition of the right to conscientious objection to military service—a concern of many university students.⁷⁷ The American peace activist Eileen Egan, one of Pax Romana's UN representatives, had already lobbied for this issue in 1965 in the final session of the Second Vatican Council. In March of 1967, Egan, speaking on behalf of Pax Romana at the Human Rights Commission, was the first to formally raise the question of conscientious objection within the United Nations.⁷⁸

Following her intervention, the issue gained support from a few governments and other NGOs, including the Quakers and War Resisters International. Together the three organizations hosted seminars and luncheons for NGOs and governments on the issue.⁷⁹ Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, more NGOs joined the lobbying efforts. Eventually these resulted in the passage of two commission resolutions recognizing the right of conscientious objection to military service.

⁷⁷ "Resolutions Carried by the Directing Committee of IMCS," 26.

⁷⁸ Michael W. Hovey, "Interceding at the United Nations: The Human Rights of Conscientious Objection," in *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, ed. Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997), 217.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 219.

A second contribution of Pax Romana's human rights advocacy has been the work of Pax Romana in opposition to torture, arbitrary detention, and involuntary disappearances. With the radicalization of IMCS member movements in Latin America and Asia, Catholic student activists, chaplains, and former members were among the victims of such practices. Deeply concerned with this context, the international secretariat of Pax Romana collected thousands of individual case reports, lobbied governments, and sponsored victims to speak as part of its delegates at the UN Commission on Human Rights and its Sub Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. The movement was among the first NGOs to sponsor victims and their families to come to the UN to address the commission directly.

Among the representatives of the movement at the UN at this time was Leandro Despouy, a young exiled lawyer from Argentina—who later became the president of the UN Commission on Human Rights (2001-2002) on behalf of Argentina. Over several years, Despouy and other members of the Pax Romana delegation drew public attention to the abuses committed by Argentinean Junta, at a time when the official church was hesitant to condemn a government claiming to act in the interest of “Christian civilization.” Eventually, Pax Romana organized a coalition of other NGOs to publically “name and shame” the regime. In response,

Argentina threatened to withdraw UN consultative status from the small group of human rights NGOs, including the International Commission of Jurists, Pax Romana, the International League for Human Rights, Amnesty International and the International Federation of Human Rights.⁸⁰

Argentina also threatened Pax Romana within the church, demanding that the Vatican denounce the organization, its political activities, and its advocacy on this

⁸⁰ Gaer, “Reality Check,” 54.

issue.⁸¹ While the Holy See did not respond to these requests, it also declined to support the movement on this point. Despite these threats, Pax Romana and the other human rights NGOs continued to speak out on the issues and proposed that a special commission be established to investigate disappearances. Eventually, these efforts resulted in the creation a Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances to help monitor and address these abuses. As the first thematic “special procedure mechanism” within the UN human rights system, the working group made possible the creation of other similar mechanisms to address human rights abuses according to themes or country situations.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Pax Romana’s continued advocacy efforts on behalf of human rights victims angered other governments, including Vietnam, Sudan, Haiti, Guatemala, Indonesia, and Singapore. In 1991, for example, the advocacy of Pax Romana on behalf of student leaders detained in Singapore resulted in a public denunciation by the Singaporean government in a letter circulated in the Commission of Human Rights.⁸² In this same period, Pax Romana was also attacked by Guatemala for interventions made on Pax Romana’s behalf by Bishop Juan José Gerardi Conedera before his assassination in 1998.⁸³

More recently, the focus of IMCS’s human rights advocacy has focused on racism in the preparatory and follow-up process of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance; the rights of human rights defenders; human rights and caste based discrimination; and the impunity of the

⁸¹ Eric Sottas, “Pax Romana et le travail intergouvernemental,” in *Memory and Hope: Pax Romana MIIC - ICMICA: 1947-1987* (Geneva: Pax Romana ICMICA/MIIC, 1987), 23.

⁸² “Lettre datée du 4 Mars 1990. Adressée au secrétaire général adjoint aux droits de l’homme par le représentant permanent de Singapour auprès de l’Office des Nations Unies à Genève,” May 24, 1991, E/CN.4/1991/85, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

⁸³ Gerardi, who was killed in 1998 after releasing a human rights report on the Guatemalan Civil War, served as member of the Pax Romana delegation to the Human Rights Commission from 1991 to 1996.

perpetrators involved in the 1998 political assassination of Fr. Jean Pierre-Louis, the chaplain of the IMCS and IYCS movement in Haiti.

ii. Advocacy for Integral Education

Over the past decade, IMCS has continued to engage intergovernmental institutions on questions of education. As one of only a small number of international student NGOs, IMCS has been a leading voice and champion of student concerns. From its “integral” perspective, IMCS has focused both on questions of access to higher education (education for all) as well as the content of that education (for the whole person).

These concerns have been particularly relevant in its work at UNESCO. Since 1988, IMCS has been a member of the UNESCO/NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education, a “think tank” of sixty NGOs concerned with higher education. The consultation has played an important role in UNESCO’s preparation and implementation of the World Conference on Higher Education in 1998, its follow up meetings in 2003 and 2009 as well as with the World Education Forum in 2000. As a member of this consultation and as an observer at these major intergovernmental meetings on higher education, the movement has lobbied for the promotion of the right of access to higher education based on merit, the role of education in promoting social justice, and the value of youth and student organizations in the promotion of “non-formal education.”

IMCS’s advocacy on issues of higher education, however, has not been limited only to UNESCO. In 2004 at the Commission for Social Development, for example, the movement submitted an official written statement emphasizing the importance of access to higher education as part of the commission’s theme of “improving public-sector

effectiveness.” In the statement IMCS challenged the trends towards privatization within higher education and its negative consequences for an integral approach:

We believe that the role of education goes far beyond creating trained employees and employers for the labor market but has the important role in social development in educating students to be full well rounded citizens... We are especially concerned that the World Trade Organization has listed Education as one of the 12 tradable service sectors... We believe that education cannot be treated or seen as a product to be bought and sold on the open market. In addition to negative impacts on the curriculum, privatization also risks violating the rights of people to higher education on the basis of merit as opposed to economic status. This is guaranteed in Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.⁸⁴

These same concerns for an integral vision of education were also reiterated in IMCS’s written statements at the 2012 Commission on the Status of Women and at the 2012 Commission for Social Development on the theme of poverty eradication.⁸⁵ In the latter meeting, IMCS again stressed the value higher education in relation to wider social issues:

Reducing subsidies to students in higher education is a risky move because it directly affects the future and development of a country. A reduction of subsidies and a growth in enrolment will likely place any financial burdens faced by universities on individual students. This situation gives the wealthier students disproportionate access to education. Students who are economically challenged are automatically disadvantaged. The greatest weapon for defeating poverty in a developing State is an education system that is open to all people, regardless of wealth, gender, religion or ethnicity. If poverty eradication is to be taken seriously by the Member States, Governments must understand the value of an education that is accessible to all members of society.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-governmental Organization in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” January 12, 2004, 2, E/CN.5/2004/NGO/5, United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission for Social Development.

⁸⁵ “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-Governmental Organization in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” December 2, 2011, E/CN.6/2012/NGO/50, United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission on the Status of Women.

⁸⁶ “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-Governmental Organization in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” November 17, 2011, E/CN.5/2012/NGO/13, United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission for Social Development.

Outside the formal structures of the intergovernmental system, IMCS has sharply critiqued the market-based approach to education in its publications and programs, which it sees as opposed to its integral vision (for the whole student and all students). For example, it has organized programs on this theme at the World Social Forums and at the 2005 World Trade Organization Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong where it organized a series of programs on “Student Advocacy for an Alternative Globalization.”

iii. Youth Participation and Empowerment

The efforts of IMCS to promote youth participation and empowerment is a third advocacy area for IMCS. Over the past decade, IMCS has been a leading voice within global civil society on questions related to youth and youth participation. IMCS’s engagement in this area reflects the organization’s inductive and participatory vision. Students and young adults, according to the goals of IMCS’s vision, are not simply the church or world of tomorrow, but must be perceived as members of today’s church and world. Youth and young adults are often disproportionately impacted by major global issues including HIV/AIDS, religious fundamentalism, war, and unemployment. Nevertheless, the voices of youth are often directly excluded from decision-making structures. In light of this, IMCS has recently devoted considerable attention to lobbying for greater the increased participation of young people in the decisions that impact them.

A clear strength of IMCS in these efforts is the way in which it empowers young people themselves to participate in decision-making and representation. This is a key dimension of IMCS’s understanding of evangelization as a movement of the student

apostolate.⁸⁷ Unlike some other youth organizations in civil society and in the church, IMCS is not directed by a board of non-youth disconnected from the base. On the contrary, national, continental, and global decision-making structures are run entirely by student leaders chosen by their peers. With the exception of some chaplains who function in an advisory capacity, the movement's leadership and representatives to inter-governmental bodies are all students or recent students who have been openly elected or designated by national, continental, and global assemblies. This approach gives IMCS a level of legitimacy and accountability lacking in some other international youth NGOs and as a result IMCS is often consulted by intergovernmental agencies on youth issues.

Over the past decade, IMCS has partnered with other youth NGOs in advocating for greater participation with a number of UN agencies. In 2004, IMCS, the European Youth Forum, and the World Organization of the Scout Movement created the International Coordination Meeting of Youth Organisations (ICMYO) to share best practices and to strengthen youth participation within intergovernmental institutions. At present, the ICMYO network gathers the twenty-two major international youth NGOs along with the seven regional youth platforms.⁸⁸

At UNESCO, IMCS served as a member of the Joint Programmatic Commission on Youth and has taken an active role in the UNESCO Youth Forums. In New York, it has chaired the NGO Committee on Youth and has been active in the deliberations of the

⁸⁷ Here IMCS and the other youth movements of specialized Catholic action embody the teaching of the Second Vatican Council's *Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity*, which stressed the responsibility of youth to be apostles to their peers: "The young should become the first apostles to the young." *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, no. 12.

⁸⁸ "About ICMYO," *International Coordination Meeting of Youth Organisations*, 2012, <http://icmyo.wordpress.com/about/>.

General Assembly and Commission for Social Development on questions regarding young people.

Notably, IMCS has been active with the UN system by participating in the periodic World Youth Forums and the follow-up discussions to the World Programme of Action for Youth adopted by the General Assembly in 1995 and revised in 2005. In December 2009, the General Assembly adopted a resolution proclaiming 2010-2011 the International Year of Youth with the theme of “Dialogue and Mutual Understanding.”⁸⁹ The year marked the 25th anniversary of the first youth year in 1985 and included several global events, including a “High Level Meeting on Youth” of the General Assembly.

At the official launch of the celebrations on August 12, IMCS was the only NGO asked to address the General Assembly on the topic. In her statement on behalf of the movement, *Maya Soud, the United Nations delegate of IMCS*, recognized the important potential of young people as agents of dialogue and called upon governments and the UN General Assembly to strengthen the means of youth participation in decision-making:

More often than not, young people are marginalized in our countries. They are pushed to the fringes of society and prevented from making a difference in times of need. Instead of being encouraged to be active agents of change, they are seen as being part of the problem, not the solution. They are silenced or simply neglected. Their skills and capacity for peace building are tragically wasted. But, I have to remind you, that participation is a right that MUST be respected. Participation in the political process is the essence of fairness, of equality. If young people are not treated like viable players in the field of politics then a grave injustice is being committed.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ “Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: Proclamation of 2010 as the International Year of Youth: Dialogue and Mutual Understanding,” February 1, 2010, A/RES/64/134, United Nations General Assembly.

⁹⁰ Ryan Mercieca, ed., “Pax Romana’s Speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Launch of the International Year of Youth,” in *The World Is Youth* (John Paul II Youths, 2011), 5–11, http://issuu.com/ryanmercieca/docs/international_year_of_youth_document.

These concerns for youth participation can also be seen in the work of IMCS on the question of youth employment. Among the themes addressed by the *World Programme of Action for Youth* is the theme of youth employment. At the Millennium Summit in 2000, the heads of states and governments of the world called for action on youth employment as part of the Millennium Development Goals. In response to this target, Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary General, launched the Youth Employment Network (YEN) as a joint effort between his office, the International Labor Organization, and the World Bank. At the first meeting of the ICMYO network in 2004, the youth organizations developed an agreement with the YEN secretariat to create a group of representative organizations to consult with the network. IMCS and twelve other youth NGOs were chosen by the ICMYO network to form a Youth Consultative Group with the aim of representing “the concerns of young people on the functioning and strategic priorities of the YEN whilst supporting youth participation in the development, implementation and review of youth employment policies at the country level.”⁹¹

From 2004 to 2008 Budi Tjahjono, the past president of IMCS and representative of the movement to the YEN, served as the rapporteur and coordinator of the consultative body and in 2007 he coauthored an official toolkit on behalf of IMCS and the network to “facilitate young peoples’ participation in youth employment policy-making, at the UN General Assembly.”⁹² During this same period, IMCS took a leading role as a member of the steering committee for the World Bank’s short-lived Youth Development and Peace

⁹¹ “Youth Employment Gateway,” *United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*, accessed May 24, 2012, <http://social.un.org/index/Employment/YouthEmployment.aspx>.

⁹² Youth Consultative Group of the Secretary-General’s Youth Employment Network (YEN), *Joining Forces with Young People: A Practical Guide to Collaboration for Youth Employment* (Geneva: Youth Employment Network, 2007), http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/yen/downloads/yen_youth_guide_en.pdf.

Network, which sponsored World Bank conferences in Paris, Sarajevo, and Washington to evaluate and help strengthen the role of young adults in the Bank's decision-making and poverty reduction strategies. As a member of the committee, IMCS helped to coordinate youth NGO input to the World Bank's 2007 World Development Report, *Development and the Next Generation*, and the participation of young people in a conference organized alongside the 2008 World Bank Annual Meeting.⁹³ IMCS's leadership in the YEN and the World Bank enabled IMCS to engage directly with World Bank and ILO at a level generally uncommon for NGOs.

B. IMCS and Global Formation

Forming leaders for civil society and engendering a spirit of solidarity among university students is a second major aspect of IMCS's mission as a transnational NGO seeking to transform the social order. As quoted above, the goals outlined at the beginning of the movement's statutes stress the need to "recognize problems of justice" and "encourage pedagogies of action which help students integrate their Christian faith in their efforts to build a more just society." Over its 90-year history, a number of prominent leaders within civil society and the church have been formed by the movement, including three of the "founding fathers" of the European Union, heads of

⁹³ *World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation* (Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2006); "Youth @ Annual Meetings: Partners in Development" (The World Bank, 2008), <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/YouthatMeetings.pdf>.

state/government, heads of UN agencies, and staff of other international NGOs⁹⁴ In general, IMCS, as an international movement, engaged in formation in two ways.

i. International Study Sessions

Within the movement, most formation is done at the local (campus) level by national affiliates of IMCS. These local efforts, however, are strengthened and supported by international programs, which reinforce existing efforts and introduce new perspectives and resources for grassroots organizing. Global and continental study sessions are an essential part of the movement's role as a "middle range" actor. As we saw with John Paul Lederach's "peacebuilding pyramid" in Chapter One, such middle range actors play an important role in communicating information between populations on the ground and high-level decision makers. The formation programs of IMCS, which often take place alongside decision-making structures of the movement, play this double role. On the one hand, they present and discuss social themes of relevance to students from a global perspective. On the other, they serve as the basis of the movement's advocacy work at the global level, ensuring that efforts in New York, Geneva, and Paris are responsive to the reality of students around the world.

Generally, regional and global programs of IMCS gather student leaders from national member organizations to study specific topics. Rather than addressing pastoral issues detached from social questions, most programs since the 1970s, in accordance with its renewed understanding of mission, have addressed questions related to social justice,

⁹⁴ Notable former IMCS leaders and chaplains include several heads of state/government (e.g., Pierre Werner; Alcide De Gasperi, Konrad Adenauer, Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo; Aldo Moro, Giulio Andreotti, Rafael Caldera, Eduardo Frei); influential social-political figures (e.g., Joaquín Ruiz-Giménez Cortés, Giuseppe Spataro, Chico Whitaker) heads of UN Agencies (e.g., Veronese Vittorino, António Guterres) and influential figures in the church (e.g., Blessed Pier Giorgio Frassati, Rosemary Goldie, Pope Paul VI, Bishop Emiliano Guano, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Enrique Dussel, María Pilar Aquino).

integral education, and youth participation. In fact, nearly all the major programs and decision-making meetings organized by this movement of the student apostolate over the past decade have addressed questions related to justice and social transformation.

At the global level, for example the last three World Assemblies have studied the role of students in promoting integral education, dialogue for peace, and solidarity across borders. Regional assemblies have also addressed the role of young people in poverty eradication, good governance, the empowerment of women, and immigration reform. IMCS has also taken advantage of World Youth Days and World Social Forums to organize international programming on issues of social concern. At times, IMCS's programs at the World Youth Day were the only programs to explicitly address issues of social justice.⁹⁵

These assemblies, study sessions and workshops bring together student leaders of IMCS from different national movements to learn about specific issues through a methodology that generally follows an inductive approach such as see-judge-act, action/reflection/action or another social analysis method. They generally begin by focusing on a particular issue in light of the experiences of the participants themselves.

⁹⁵ Themes of major recent programs include: *International Committees/World Assemblies*: "Students Ready for Change in Global Solidarity for an Integral Education" (2003, Barcelona); "Empowering Student Action for Dialogue and Peace" (2007, Kuala Lumpur); "Bridging Our Worlds: Going Beyond Borders" (2011, Cologne). *European Committees*: "Looking at Immigration in Europe through the Human Rights Perspective" (2009, Strasbourg); "Creating Empowered Students in Human Rights through Integral Education" (2012, Strasbourg). *North American UN Study Sessions*: "The Role of Women in Peace Building;" (2008, New York); "Poverty Eradication: The Role of Student Activism" (2012, New York). *Pan African Assemblies*: "Young Africans Engaged in the Fight Against Poverty" (2006, Kabgayi); "Good Governance and Leadership; Our Key to Development: African Youth up Against Corruption" (2010, Arusha). *Pan Asia Pacific Assemblies*: "Towards an Alternative Globalization: Students with the Marginalized" (2004, Penang); "Creating Empowered Students for Social Justice Through Integral Formation" (2009, Quezon City). *World Social Forum workshops*: "Christian Citizenship for Another World" (2006, Bamako); "Students Facing the Damages of Globalization" (2007, Nairobi). *World Youth Days*: "Witness Through Action: Young People and the Millennium Development Goals" (2008, Sydney); "Light of the World: An Interreligious Prayer Service for Justice" (2011, Madrid).

Exposure or immersion programs help to shed light on the issues. Theologians, United Nations staff, academics, and other experts will often serve as resource persons. Before concluding, most sessions result in the drafting of a final statement, which includes commitments made by the participants on the theme and calls for action on the part of government and church leaders.

Beyond these regular formation programs, IMCS also organizes events to address specific concerns of students around the world. In light of the increased tensions between Muslim and Christian communities in the years after 2001, for example, IMCS has developed several projects and formation programs to help university students engage in practices of dialogue locally and globally. As part of these efforts, the movement partnered with the United Nations Alliance for Civilizations, a program created in 2005 by the governments of Spain and Turkey.

With the support of a grant from the Alliance, IMCS organized training programs for Catholic and Muslim student leaders in Sudan, Egypt, and Canada with the theme “Speaking and Listening With Respect: Students, Faith, and Dialogue.” These sessions were organized with the aim to “[r]inforce and sustain meaningful dialogue among and between students of different faith traditions at the university level.”⁹⁶ Lessons learned from these sessions were shared with other IMCS members around the world and highlighted as a best practice during the Second Forum of the Alliance of Civilizations in Istanbul, Turkey, in 2009.

⁹⁶ “Final Report: Speaking and Listening With Respect: Students, Faith, and Dialogue” (International Movement of Catholic Students, 2009), 5, IMCS Archives, Paris.

ii. Publications

Throughout its history the movement has also sought to engage its members with the publication of books, journals, and newsletters. These help to share and disseminate the concerns and ideas of students as well as resources aimed at helping to empower student leadership. In the 1930s the international secretariat launched the *Pax Romana Journal*, which changed its name in 1968 to *Convergence*. The magazine published jointly by IMCS and ICMICA addressed social and ecclesial perspectives and featured articles by politicians, academics, and activists. In 1987, IMCS began publishing *Habari*, later renamed *The Forum*, as a semi-annual global magazine in English, French and Spanish. E-mail newsletters, websites, and other forms of social media also help to educate members about global issues.

IMCS regional secretariats have also published magazines, newsletters, and books. For example, following the council, the Latin American Secretariat's documentation center published over 40 works by major liberation theologians, including Gustavo Gutiérrez, José Comblin, Ignacio Ellacuría, and Leonardo Boff. The secretariat's bimonthly journal *Vispera*, edited by Héctor Borrat and Methol Ferré, also published a number of important articles on developing topics in liberation theology before 1975, when the magazine was closed and Borrat arrested by the Uruguayan government. The impact of these publications can be seen in their frequent citations by Latin American liberation theologians in the 1970s and 1980s.⁹⁷ More recently, publications of regional secretariats have addressed such topics as "Students' Response to Education Crisis: Students' Response on Higher Education Crisis of Asia Pacific in the Context of Neo-

⁹⁷ Dussel, *A History of the Church in Latin America*, 246.

Liberal Globalization” (2004) and *Christian Campus Ministry: A Selection of Experiences and Documents from Chaplains Training Workshops* (2009).

III. IMCS AND THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

This chapter has so far examined the mission of the International Movement of Catholic Students and the ways in which it has lived out this mission as an international NGO. As I have shown, the holistic vision of mission as put forth by the Second Vatican Council and post-conciliar liberation theology led IMCS to revisit what it meant to be a movement of the student apostolate. In redefining its mission in light of the council’s teaching on the people of God and historical consciousness, IMCS developed a new model of mission. According to this framework of integral liberation, the movement articulated a deeper sense of how it participates in the church’s mission in the world.

Formally, IMCS has understood its relationship with the church over the past several decades through the category of “international Catholic organization.” As we briefly saw in Chapter One, the term ICO originated as a formal designation given to those Catholic lay NGOs that formed part of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations (1927-2008). Even within the limited framework of the new Christendom before the council, the label of ICO situated the global public presence of IMCS and other organizations squarely within the structure and apostolate of the church.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Prior to the Second Vatican Council, the Conference of ICOs, as Rosemary Goldie observes, “was the only regular forum where world problems were discussed in all their amplitude as a challenge to the ‘apostolate.’” Rosemary Goldie, “Pax Romana Remembered,” in *Memory and Hope: Pax Romana MIIC - ICMICA: 1947-1987* (Geneva: Pax Romana ICMICA/MIIC, 1987), 17.

In the absence of a sufficient juridical category to classify these associations and federations within *Canon Law*, the term ICO functioned as a formal classification and confirmation of the organizations' ecclesial identity for much of the twentieth century. Following the Second Vatican Council, the newly created Pontifical Council for the Laity outlined the criteria for an organization to be considered for admittance to the Conference in its *Guidelines for the Definition of Catholic International Organizations* (1971).⁹⁹

Drawing from *Apostolicam Actuositatem* and *Gaudium et Spes*, these guidelines clearly perceive the actions of ICOs in the global public square as constituting part the church's mission in the world.¹⁰⁰ Not surprisingly, there are clear links between this document and the letter *Octogesima Adveniens* issued earlier that year by the same authority.¹⁰¹ In both texts collective action for the common good is understood as part of the church's mission. Citing *Gaudium et Spes* no. 90, the *Guidelines* depart from the new Christendom model and its distinction of planes by identifying the public engagement Catholic NGOs in the structures of global governance as a participation of in the mission of the church:

In effect, there exists or may exist many international organizations, and it is important that in this area too, the Church, regardless of some other modes of presence, manifests itself in the world as such. International Catholic Organizations are a form of presence... At the international level, the recognition of an organization as Catholic implies the approval by the Holy See which *authenticates its participation in the mission of the Church* and its hierarchy and confirms its adherence to the doctrinal teaching of the Catholic Church.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Pontifical Council for the Laity, "Respiciens Normas Quibus Instituta Internationalia Catholica Definiuntur," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* LXIII, no. 1 (1971): 948–956.

¹⁰⁰ See Ramon Sugranyes de Franch, *Le Christ dans le monde: Les Organisations internationales catholiques* (Paris: Fayard, 1972).

¹⁰¹ Cardinal Maurice Roy, president of both the Pontifical Council for the Laity and the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace oversaw the writing of both texts.

¹⁰² "En effect, il existe ou peut exister de nombreuses organisations internationales, et il importe que, dans ce domaine aussi, l'Eglise, indépendamment de certains autres modes de presence, se manifeste au monde en tant que telle. Les organisations internationaux catholiques sont une form de presence... Au niveau

In the 1970s, Pope Paul reaffirmed this point in several addresses to the Conference of ICOs. In a 1975 address, for example, he emphasizes the Catholic and ecclesial identity of organizations working for social transformation. According to Paul VI, ICOs have a twofold role in the mission of the church. For him, ICOs have an obligation to “act in the world to transform it into a more just and humane society” while also testifying that these actions are based on “the spiritual and transcendent mission of the Church.”¹⁰³ ICOs, he continues, have a specific social responsibility in their identity as “Church communities, works of the Church.”¹⁰⁴

In his 1977 address to the Conference of ICOs the pope cites the above quote from the *Guidelines* to underscore the ecclesial identity of the ICOs. In contrast to the distinction of planes model, the pope stresses that the public and social actions of ICOs, when rooted in the gospel, are not secondary to the mission of the church.

Through their different temporal activities, [Catholic organizations] are inspired by the Gospel and are concerned to announce it to the world, according to the teaching of the Church that updates its message: thus they participate in the evangelizing mission of the Church. They have, of course, the rightful autonomy of the laity in the apostolate of the Church that the Second Vatican Council recognized, but they act in union with the Bishops whom Christ has entrusted to support the commitment of each and to ensure the dissemination of the Gospel

international, la reconnaissance d'une organisation comme catholique implique l'agrément de celle-ci par le Saint-Siège qui authentifie ainsi sa participation à la mission de l'Eglise et de sa hiérarchie et confirme son adhésion à l'enseignement doctrinal de l'Eglise catholique.” Pontifical Council for the Laity, “Respiciens Normas,” 952. Emphasis added.

¹⁰³ “Ce sont là en effet deux exigences indissociables pour les O.I.C.: agir dans le monde pour le transformer en une société plus juste et plus humaine, et en même temps témoigner que cette action s'inspire de la mission spirituelle et transcendante de l'Eglise... Nous vous le demandons instamment, au nom de la responsabilité pastorale qui nous a été confiée à l'égard de tous nos fils dans l'Eglise et en vertu des liens de communion qui vous attachent à Notre mission apostolique: votre témoignage doit demeurer celui de communautés d'Eglise, d'œuvres d'Eglise.” Paul VI, “Discours aux membres des Organisations internationales catholiques,” December 6, 1975, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1975/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19751206_membri-oic_fr.html.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid

message so that it reaches the knowledge of all men, that is respected and that the whole is always maintained communion with the Church.¹⁰⁵

During the Pontificate of Pope John Paul II, with the promulgation of the revised *Code of Canon Law* (1983), the post-synodal exhortation *Christifideles Laici* (1988), and the apostolic constitution *Pastor Bonus* (1988), the juridical and ecclesial status of the ICOs became somewhat ambiguous. Reflecting the broader social and missiological teachings of Pope John Paul II that we saw in Chapter Two, these documents deemphasize the role of socially engaged organizations as participating in the church's mission.

For example, these texts ignore and ultimately eliminate the status of ICO in favor of a new canonical classification, "international association of the lay faithful."¹⁰⁶ Despite this new classification, IMCS and most ICOs continued to operate under the status granted to them according to the *Guidelines*. According to the older norms, the ICOs, by virtue of their international political engagement, were primarily under the juridical competency of the Vatican Secretariat of State. It was the Secretariat of State, for example, who approved the candidacy of their presidents and appointed their chaplains.

¹⁰⁵ "A travers leurs différentes activités temporelles, elles s'inspirent de l'Évangile et se soucient de l'annoncer au monde, en conformité à l'enseignement de l'Église qui en actualise le message: de ce fait elles participent à la mission évangélisatrice de l'Église. Elles jouissent, certes, de la juste autonomie que le second Concile du Vatican a reconnue aux laïcs dans l'apostolat de l'Église, mais elles agissent en union avec les Pasteurs auxquels le Christ a confié la charge de soutenir l'engagement de chacun et de veiller à la diffusion du message évangélique pour qu'il parvienne à la connaissance de tous les hommes, qu'en soit respectée l'intégralité et que soit toujours sauvegardée la communion avec l'Église." Paul VI, "Message du Pape Paul VI pour le 50ème anniversaire de la fondation de la Conférence des Organisations internationales catholiques," September 12, 1977, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1977/september/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19770912_cinquantenario-oic_fr.html.

¹⁰⁶ See *Code of Canon Law* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983), Can. 298–329, http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_INDEX.HTM. For information on the change of Canon Law on this point see Robert W Oliver, "Developing Criteria of Ecclesiality for Associations of the Faithful" (Doctor of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, 2002).

This changed in the early 2000s when the Pontifical Council for the Laity requested all ICOs to amend their statutes to be in conformity with the new *Code of Canon Law* and (with the exception of Caritas Internationalis) to subject themselves primarily to the authority of the laity council.¹⁰⁷ Unlike the status of ICO, the new category put into question the ecclesial status of some associations.

In this process, the organizations were forced to “choose” between two categories of recognition: “public association” and “private association.” According to the *Code of Canon Law*, only public associations, those established by a “competent ecclesiastical authority,” have the right to teach, speak, and act “in the name of the Church.”¹⁰⁸ Private associations, those established by the lay faithful with the recognition of the ecclesiastical authority, by contrast, do not have the right to speak or act on behalf of the church. Instead, they are seen only to represent the position of the members of the association.¹⁰⁹

Although the new *Code* commends associations that aim to exercise “the apostolate” through works that “animate the temporal order with a Christian spirit,” its sharp distinction between the ecclesial status of public and private associations resembles aspects of the earlier new Christendom model and its distinction of planes.¹¹⁰

In this period, ICOs, including IMCS-Pax Romana, were reluctant to change their status. For many ICOs who understood their role in global public square as participating

¹⁰⁷ The evolving positions of the Pontifical Council for the Laity and the Secretariat of State on the status of the Conference and the ICOs in general can be seen in several Vatican addresses to Conference, including an address by Archbishop Rylko, President of the Pontifical Council for the Laity (CPPL) to the CICO General Assembly in 2003; a letter by Msgr. Pietro Parolin to leadership of the ICOs in 2006; and addresses by Dr. Fermina Alvarez Alonso of the Secretariat of State and Dr. Gusmán Carriquiry of the CPPL to the final assembly of the conference in 2007. These texts are included in the compilation of texts of the CICO: Blin, *Repères pour d’histoire de la COIC*, 241–262. In this same period, the ICO Caritas Internationalis, was placed under the authority of the Pontifical Council *Cor Unum*.

¹⁰⁸ *Code of Canon Law*, Can. 301.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, Can. 299.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Can. 298 See also Can. 327.

in the mission of the church, this change forced them to make an inadequate choice between losing their autonomy (as a public association) and foregoing their identity as a presence of the church in international life (as a private association).

Some ICOs, in particular the movements of specialized Catholic action, looked upon the request for changing the ICO status with suspicion. Since the election of Pope John Paul II, the relationship between a number of these ICOs and the Holy See became strained. After the death of Paul VI, IMCS and the other movements of specialized Catholic action felt increasingly marginalized by members of the hierarchy. Despite the fact that these movements are among the largest lay movements in the church and were among the lead actors in creating the Pontifical Council for the Laity, the laity council and prominent members of the hierarchy focused their attention on the new ecclesial movements that emerged following Vatican II.¹¹¹ For some church leaders, IMCS and other movements of specialized Catholic action went too far in their commitments to justice and peace—what John Paul II called “horizontalism.” The new ecclesial movements, by contrast, were seen as preserving aspects of Catholic identity and spirituality lost in the older more socially concerned movements.

¹¹¹ The lack of attention and support given to the movement of specialized Catholic action in recent decades is evident by the absence of any mention of these movements in many recent programs and publications sponsored by the Pontifical Council for the Laity. While much attention is given to the new ecclesial movements, little to no mention is made of the contribution and presence of ICOs. For example, in his often-cited address to the World Congress of Ecclesial Movements in 1998 (an event that did not include the movements of specialized Catholic action or other ICOs) Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger overlooked completely these movements as he offered an outline of apostolic movements in the history of the church. This is particularly striking given the role played by ICOs including the Young Christian Workers and IMCS in helping to shape the theology of the laity at Vatican II. See his address and the other related presentations in Pontifical Council for the Laity, ed., *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998*, Laity Today 2 (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999). Pontifical Council for the Laity, ed., *The Beauty of Being a Christian. Movements in the Church*, Laity Today 2 (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 2006).

While Tissa Balasuriya, Gustavo Gutiérrez and other chaplains of IMCS were investigated for their positions in liberation theology, the biggest conflict occurred in the mid-1980s when the Holy See withdrew its recognition for one of the largest ICOs, the International Young Christian Workers in favor of a new structure it perceived as less radical, the International Coordination of Young Christian Workers.¹¹²

In the end, however, IMCS, like most ICOs, made the decision to be recognized as an international Association of the Faithful with private juridical personality.”¹¹³ The change of status of ICOs placed into question the mission and purpose of the Conference of ICOs and in 2008, under pressure from the Pontifical Council for the Laity, the “ex-ICOs” dissolved the conference.

Alongside these changes, the Secretariat of State of the Holy See and a group of representatives from different Catholic NGOs (including from IMCS) launched the Forum of Catholic-Inspired NGOs as a way to deepen the networking of “Catholic-inspired” NGOs, including many who were not members of the conference. While the Forum positively aims to continue many of the same modes of networking formerly facilitated by the conference, it has not yet formed a cohesive network.

As with the description “international Association of the Faithful,” the description of “Catholic-inspired NGO,” is not as clear as “international Catholic organization” in situating the actions of IMCS within the overall mission of the church. As Chapter Two

¹¹² After several conflicts relating to the Christian identity of the IYCW in the early 1980, the Pontifical Council for the Laity (PCL) supported several European YCW groups in the creation of a parallel ICO—the International Coordination of Young Christian Workers (ICYCW). While it recognized the ICYCW as a full member, the Conference of ICOs, much to the frustration of the PCL, continued to include the IYCW as an invited member. See Luc Roussel, “The YCW and the Vatican: From Confidence to Incomprehension and Rupture 1945-1985,” in *The First Steps Towards a History of the IYCW* (Brussels: International Young Christian Workers, 1997).

¹¹³ *International Statutes of IMCS Pax Romana*, Article 1. See also, Oliver, “Developing Criteria of Ecclesiality for Associations of the Faithful,” 231–235.

reviewed, Pope Benedict XVI's address to the first meeting of the Forum emphasized how the "the direct duty to work for a just ordering of society is proper to the lay faithful" who participate in international NGOs in a "personal capacity"—language that resembles the distinctions of distinction of planes model.¹¹⁴ Despite these changes and the weakened relationship with the hierarchy, IMCS continues to describe itself as participating in the mission of the church through its international social engagement.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have examined the mission of one of the oldest Catholic nongovernmental organizations, the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana). In particular, I have studied the relationship between the mission of this movement, its actions for justice, and the mission of the church. As a case study, IMCS-Pax Romana illustrates well several aspects of the relationship between Catholic NGOs and the mission of the church.

First, IMCS shows the critically important role played by Second Vatican Council in helping existing Catholic organizations to discover new aspects of their own specific missions and identities. As with other ICOs, IMCS's sense of mission in the world was deeply shaped by the holistic vision of the Second Vatican Council that I highlighted in Chapter Two. The council's embrace of a historical consciousness and understanding of the role of the laity as church, in particular, brought forth for IMCS a new inductive approach to its apostolic mission with students. This new approach, which drew inspiration from liberation theology and the teachings of Pope Paul VI, stands in contrast

¹¹⁴Benedict XVI, "Address to the Forum of Catholic-Inspired NGOs."

to the earlier deductive and defensive models of the student apostolate that were dominant under the frameworks of Catholic Action and the new Christendom. Instead of seeing itself as a passive agent in the face of social issues, IMCS redefined its mission in terms of participation, social transformation, evangelization and integral education.

Second, IMCS shows how it is not just the church as a whole that must be concerned with justice. Organizations and communities within the church must also take into account their obligations to act for justice and social transformation. Together with the other movement of specialized Catholic action, IMCS strongly embraced this new integral model of mission, which, like the 1971 Synod of Bishops, perceives action for justice as constitutive element of the preaching of the gospel.

These developments and new commitments had a significant impact on IMCS's actions and presence as an international NGO. To be authentic to its mission as a church movement, IMCS now believes it must vigorously work for social justice as an NGO engaged in the public square. Supporting and encouraging the pastoral, liturgical, and spiritual needs of students locally remains an important part of this mission, but these efforts are not sufficient to respond to the complex needs and realities of students and the demands of the gospel. Instead, these local or campus level actions of evangelization, according to IMCS, must also be accompanied by actions for social transformation locally, nationally, and globally. Grounded in life of Jesus Christ and Catholic social teaching, IMCS, as the second part of this chapter showed, seeks to live out its mission as an international NGO through actions of global advocacy and student formation.

Finally, the case of IMCS highlights some of challenges facing Catholic NGOs and their actions for social transformation. The evolution in its understanding of mission

has not been welcome in all parts of the church. While IMCS remains the only official movement in the church for university students, not all Catholic student groups and communities are drawn to IMCS's commitment to social action. In Europe, North America and Australia, for example, there are many experiences of campus ministry and the student apostolate that pay little to no attention to questions of social transformation. This resistance is also be seen among some members of the church hierarchy who are critical of the supposed "horizontalism" of IMCS and other movements of specialized Catholic action. While IMCS and other similar movements clearly understand their actions in the world as being rooted in their Catholic ecclesial identity, they receive little explicit support from Vatican and Church hierarchy for their efforts.

In the following chapter, I will investigate an organization with a different experiences, structure, and understandings of mission. These different experiences will offer constructive comparisons to help develop a theological framework that situates the actions of Catholic NGOs and their relationships to the mission of the church.

Chapter Four: Jesuit Refugee Service

The first part of this project offered an overview of the different types of Catholic organizations active in the global public square today and the theological foundations of their work. Chapter Three presented the case study of an international Catholic lay organization (ICO), the International Movement of Catholic Students (IMCS-Pax Romana). Lay apostolic organizations, like IMCS, are not the only transnational Catholic non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Over the past three decades, congregations of vowed religious men and women have taken active roles in the promotion of the global common good directly and indirectly through a sponsored NGO. Among this grouping of Catholic organizations, the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) is one of the most active and effective faith-based civil society actors in the humanitarian field.

Inspired and guided by the mission of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuit Refugee Service has sought to respond to the reality of refugees as an international NGO by addressing both the symptoms and root causes of forced displacement. In its global public engagement JRS is not simply an NGO or development agency associated with the Jesuits. Rather, it acts and understands itself as an apostolic work of the whole Society. In his 2008 address to the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, Pope Benedict XVI singled out the work of Jesuits in this area as an important reflection of the Jesuit mission:

Taking up one of the latest intuitions of Fr. Arrupe, your Society continues to engage in meritorious way in the service of the refugees, who are often the poorest among the poor and need not only material help but also the deeper spiritual, human, and psychological proximity especially proper to your service.¹

¹ Benedict XVI, “Address of Pope Benedict XVI to the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (February 21, 2008),” in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General*

Similarly to IMCS-Pax Romana, the case study of JRS raises a question about its missiological and ecclesiological significance as an organization: does JRS as a transnational NGO working for justice share in the mission of the church?

As the second case study in this project, this chapter will seek to answer this question in three parts. The first part of this chapter will investigate the mission of JRS and its relationship to the mission of the Society of Jesus. To this end, it will identify several theological concepts related to the Ignatian charism that underlie the mission of the organization. Like IMCS-Pax Romana and the other ICOs, the Jesuits were deeply shaped by the holistic vision of mission put forth by the Second Vatican Council. The council's call for congregations and societies of vowed religious to engage in their own process of *ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* inspired the Jesuits to redefine their mission in the world and to see action for justice as an integral aspect. As a work of the Society created in the wake of Vatican II, JRS is a fruit of this process of renewal.

The second section of this chapter will investigate how the threefold mission of JRS is lived in its operational, advocacy, and research activities. In addition to providing an overview of the often-impressive work of this NGO, this section will show how these actions flow from its theological and missiological commitments outlined in part one.

The final section will examine how JRS as an apostolic work of the Society of Jesus relates to the mission of the church. As detailed in Chapter Two, not all in the church recognize collective action for justice as being constitutive of the church's mission. Unlike the lay ICOs, JRS and other NGOs associated with religious

Congregations of the Society of Jesus, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 8.

congregations are confronted with additional questions regarding the role of religious and priests in social action. As a humanitarian NGO, JRS also faces additional pressure from inside and outside the church to limit its activities in the active promotion of justice. The exploration of these issues in the case study of JRS will help us to situate in the conclusion of this project the relationship between Catholic communal action for justice and the mission of the church.

I. THE MISSION OF THE JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE

The mission of the Jesuit Refugee Service according to its *Charter* is threefold, namely to “accompany, serve and defend the rights of refugees and forcibly displaced people.”² This specific mission developed out of the broader mission of the Society of Jesus during the dynamic period of renewal following the Second Vatican Council. As shown in Chapter Two, the reception of the conciliar vision inspired a deeper social and dialogical engagement in the world among Catholic communities. Religious congregations, in particular, responded enthusiastically to the invitations by the council and the post-conciliar decrees to examine how their founding charisms might respond to the needs of the contemporary world. Like other actors in the church, the process of renewal initiated by the council inspired the Jesuits to recognize justice as a constitutive element of their own specific mission. For the Jesuits, this awareness enabled the creative response to a second factor in the establishment of JRS, the lived experience of refugees

² Jesuit Refugee Service, “The Charter of Jesuit Refugee Service,” March 19, 2000, <https://www.jrs.net/assets/Sections/Downloads/char-en2.pdf>, no. 9.

in the late 1970s. The dramatic experience of those fleeing Vietnam, in particular, called for an urgent response.

While distinct, these two factors are interrelated. The response of Pedro Arrupe and the Society to the refugee crisis, as this chapter will show, was only possible because of the dynamic process of *aggiornamento* and *ressourcement* taking place within the Society of Jesus after Vatican II. This is indicated at the very beginning of the organization's Charter, where the mission of the JRS is explicitly linked with the new articulation of the Jesuit mission after the Second Vatican Council: "The mission of the Jesuit Refugee Service is intimately connected with the mission of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) namely to serve faith and promote the justice of God's Kingdom in dialogue with cultures and religions."³

Before examining the specific mission and mandate of JRS as a work of the Jesuits, this section will briefly attend to the developments behind this understanding of mission and in particular the increased awareness within the Society of Jesus about the relationship between action for justice and mission. Appreciating the contours of these broader developments within the Society, even if only briefly, is necessary in order to understand the mission of JRS, the theological principles underlying the organization, and its relationship to the mission of the church.

A. The Society of Jesus After the Second Vatican Council

As with most other congregations of vowed religious, the Society of Jesus took seriously the teachings and insights of the Second Vatican Council and the call of

³ Ibid. no. 1.

Perfectae Caritatis for the renewal of religious life. The council's holistic vision of mission, an understanding that extends beyond any single document, deeply informed and shaped the updating of the Society of Jesus in the wake of Vatican II.

According to Jean-Yves Calvez, a French Jesuit active in the Society in this period, the council's vision both enabled and inspired the new articulation of the Jesuit mission, in which the promotion of justice would be understood as a central element. Vatican II's social and historical consciousness and commitment to dialogue and social action, in particular, helped the Jesuits (among others) situate action for justice within the context of their own charism and the broader apostolic mission of the church.⁴

i. The 31st General Congregation (1965-1966)

This renewal began in 1965, in the midst of the council during the first session of the 31st General Congregation or GC 31, which was organized following the death of the Jesuit Superior General Jean-Baptiste Janssens. Meeting in two sessions, one during the council (May-July 1965) and the other following it (September-November 1966), GC 31 began the arduous process of renewing the largest congregation of vowed religious men in the world in light of the council's teachings. As part of this process, the leaders of the Society elected Pedro Arrupe to succeed Janssens's and implement the needed reforms.

Prior to the council, the social and public action of the Society of Jesus, like many of the international Catholic organizations, was limited largely by the Christendom and new Christendom frameworks. Action for social justice factored little into the Jesuit self-understanding of mission in the decades leading up to Vatican II. This is not to say that social concern did not exist as an important aspect Jesuit life. From the time of St.

⁴ See Calvez, *Faith and Justice*, 13.

Ignatius, Jesuits had been engaged in important apostolic works of charity and Father Janssens had strongly encouraged the formation of a “social apostolate” within the society following the Second World War. As part of Janssens vision of this apostolate, “social centers” were established around the world to study social questions in different contexts.⁵

Before Vatican II, however, these efforts were not explicitly understood in relation to justice. Social questions, when explicitly addressed by the Jesuits under the new Christendom model, were more often seen through the lens of charity, works of mercy, or spiritual assistance to lay groups engaged in society. The Jesuit role was largely indirect. Priests and other religious were to remain detached from directly intervening in questions of temporal justice. Furthermore, while important, the social apostolate was understood only as one sphere of activity alongside other more fundamental areas of engagement (e.g., the educational apostolate). The teachings of GC 31 largely reflect this understanding. Justice is mentioned, but only briefly within the context of the decree on the social apostolate.⁶

ii. The 32nd General Congregation (1974-1975)

Initially, Arrupe and the other leaders of the society continued to perceive justice as a concern of a specific sector of work. Soon after the council and the second session of GC 31, however, as Calvez recounts, “he turned his attention to a more extended social commitment, one able to influence all forms of Jesuit apostolic activity” and not simply

⁵ See General Congregation 31, *Decree 32: The Social Apostolate*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), 181–183. Some of the centers that still exist, such as the Center of Concern or the Indian Social Institute have obtained their own status with the United Nations and other intergovernmental institutions as NGOs.

⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 1; Calvez, *Faith and Justice*, 26.

the social apostolate and social centers.⁷ The experiences of Jesuits around the world in this immediate post-conciliar period together with new emerging theology of liberation indicated to Arrupe and others that a new expression of mission was needed.

This new model of the Society's mission took shape in 1974 and 1975 when Arrupe convened the 32nd General Congregation to continue the work of renewal initiated by GC 31. GC 32 was challenged to offer a new articulation of the Jesuit mission in light of the final texts of the council (including *Gaudium et Spes* and *Ad Gentes*), the new realities facing the world in the 1970s, and the visions of mission emerging in the church at the 1971 and 1974 synods. Utilizing an inductive process where Jesuits around the world were consulted, GC 32 offers a new definition of the mission of the Society of Jesus in *Decree 4*. According to this new model, justice is no longer seen only as a concern of the social apostolate. Rather, it is understood as a constitutive aspect of the whole Jesuit mission in the service of faith. In its most influential paragraph, the congregation explicitly teaches:

The mission of the Society of Jesus today is the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement. For reconciliation with God demands the reconciliation of people with one another.⁸

Importantly, these developments, as Mary Ann Hinsdale writes, "did not appear out of the blue."⁹ Already in 1973, Arrupe indicated this new direction in his controversial address to the Tenth International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe. There, the Father General emphasized the constitutive nature of the promotion of justice

⁷ Calvez, *Faith and Justice*, 26.

⁸ General Congregation 32, *Decree 4*, no. 2.

⁹ Mary Ann Hinsdale, "Jesuit Theological Discourse Since Vatican II," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Jesuits*, ed. Thomas Worcester (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 300.

in the mission of the church and the Jesuit intellectual apostolate in particular. Arrupe lamented the failure of Jesuit education to educate for justice and to form “men [and women] for others.” Drawing heavily from the 1971 Synod of Bishops, in which he participated, Arrupe called for greater to justice in light of God’s apostolic call as understood in the Second Vatican Council and post-conciliar teachings.¹⁰

GC 32 took up this challenge. Echoing *Justice in the World* and the deliberations of the 1974 synod, *Decree 4* argues that the promotion of justice is “an integral part of evangelization.”¹¹ The concern for the promotion of justice, the decree argues, is rooted in the broader mission of the church, the demands of the Gospel and the “priestly service of faith.”¹² In order to respond to contemporary challenges, the Jesuit mission must be “total, corporate, rooted in faith and experience and multiform.”¹³ These efforts must be integrated into all ministries of the society (theological reflection, social action, education, mass media) and not solely one sector.¹⁴

This *promotion* of justice, we read, should not be limited only to education and charity. Rather, this concern, according to GC 32, must manifest itself in action. Citing *Octogesima Adveniens* no. 4, the congregation affirms the see, judge, act methodology

¹⁰ Speaking about the relationship of mission and justice, Arrupe stressed that this awareness “did not originate with the Synod. It began with the Second Vatican Council; its application to the problem of justice was made with considerable vigor in *Populorum Progressio*; and spreading outward from this center to the ends of the earth, it was taken up in 1968 by the Latin American Bishops at Medellin, in 1969 by the African Bishops at Kampala, in 1970 by the Asian Bishops in Manila. In 1971, Pope Paul VI gathered all these voices together in the great call to action of *Octogesima Adveniens*.” Pedro Arrupe, “Men for Others” (presented at the Tenth International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe, Valencia: Creighton University Online Ministries, 1973), www.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html. Not all alumni and Jesuits welcomed Arrupe’s strong appeal to justice for Jesuit education.

¹¹ General Congregation 32, *Decree 4*, no. 30. While Arrupe in 1973 used the wording of the 1971 synod to describe the relationship between justice and the church’s mission (constitutive), GC 32 uses the same wording as Paul VI following the 1974 synod (integral). See Chapter Two of this project.

¹² *Ibid.*, no. 18.

¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 7.

¹⁴ See *ibid.*, nos. 59–60.

first introduced by the specialized Catholic action movements and connects this “constant interplay between experience, reflection, decision and action” with “the Jesuit ideal of being ‘contemplative in action.’”¹⁵ Such action should not be limited only to the personal or private level, but must also involve actions to transform unjust or oppressive social and political *structures*: “The struggle to transform these structures in the interest of the spiritual and material liberation of fellow human beings is intimately connected to the work of evangelization.”¹⁶

Decree 4's definition of the Jesuit mission had a tremendous impact on the life and work of Jesuits around the world. It inspired the creation of new social ministries (such as JRS), transformed existing Jesuit institutions, and encouraged individual Jesuits to undertake creative projects of social action and social analysis. The wording of the decree, as Jesuit Tom Greene has recently pointed out, “has become part and parcel of our Jesuit response when we are asked to define the contemporary mission of the Society.”¹⁷ The wide adoption of justice language by Jesuits around the world represents a remarkable development and illustrates the council's strong impact on religious life.

iii. The 33rd General Congregation (1983)

The wording of *Decree 4* and the awareness of justice as a clear part of the Jesuit mission, as will be detailed toward the end of this chapter, was not welcome by all in the Society and in the church. By the 1980s, conflicts had arisen with some Vatican officials

¹⁵ Ibid., no. 73.

¹⁶ Ibid., no. 40. This understanding is also made explicit in *Decree 2* of GC 32, where the congregation defines what it means to be a Jesuit: “What is it to be a companion of Jesus today? It is to engage, under the standard of the Cross, in the crucial struggle of our time: the struggle for faith and that struggle for justice which it includes.” General Congregation 32, *Decree 2: Jesuits Today*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 2.

¹⁷ Tom Greene, “Observations of the Social Apostolate, Justice and the Decrees of General Congregations 31 to 35,” *Promotio Justitiae* no. 108 (2012): 1.

about this new understanding of mission and some of the different, and sometimes excessive, responses of Jesuits to GC 32. Pope John Paul II was particularly concerned with the direct engagement of Jesuit priests in politics during this period. According to Calvez, for example, there is “a very real connection” between the Vatican’s disfavor with *Decree 4* and the tense situation in the early 1980s when the pope intervened to delay the 33rd General Congregation called to elect a successor to Arrupe.¹⁸

Acknowledging the possibility that *Decree 4* could be misinterpreted as promoting action for justice as something separate from God and the gospel (what some have called horizontalism), the 33rd General Congregation in 1983 both reaffirmed and clarified GC 32’s articulation of mission. According to GC 33, the reception of GC 32 on this point “has at times been ‘incomplete, slanted and unbalanced.’”¹⁹ As a clarification, GC 33 then called for a broad approach to mission, in which justice and faith are more deeply integrated. Despite this more cautionary approach to the language of justice, GC 33 not only affirmed the commitments of GC 32, but also deepened them in light of the preferential option for the poor—which is highlighted as an important part of the Jesuit mission.

iv. The 34th General Congregation (1995)

The 34th General Congregation, convened by Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, reaffirmed the “the promotion of justice” as “an integral part” of the Jesuit Mission.²⁰ Building upon

¹⁸ Calvez, *Faith and Justice*, 3.

¹⁹ General Congregation 33, *Decree 1: Companions of Jesus Sent Into Today’s World*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 32.

²⁰ General Congregation 34, *Decree 3: Our Mission and Justice*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 1.

GC 32 and GC 33, *Decree 3: Our Mission and Justice*, calls Jesuits to combat marginalization and to work in justice “to build up a world order of genuine solidarity, where all can have a rightful place at the banquet of the Kingdom.”²¹ Recognizing that some efforts aimed at promoting justice, had at times “been separated from its wellspring of faith”,²² GC 34 renewed the society’s commitment to a mission that integrates faith and the promotion of justice:

we want to renew our commitment to the promotion of justice as an integral part of our mission, as this has been extensively developed in GC 32 and GC 33. Our experience has shown us that our promotion of justice both flows from faith and brings us back to an ever deeper faith. So we intent to journey toward ever fuller integration of the promotion of justice into our lives of faith, in the company of the poor and many others who live and work for the coming of God’s kingdom.²³

GC 34 linked the promotion to justice to themes of human rights, globalization, the “culture of death,” education, and the environment. It urged a reading of justice in GC 32’s *Decree 4* that “transcends notions of justice derived from ideology, philosophy, or particular political movements.”²⁴ This justice we are told, however, must be expressed in the concrete and not overly spiritualized. NGOs and other “*communities of solidarity*” related to the society are highlighted as playing an important part in this mission toward “total human development.”²⁵ For the first time, Jesuit Refugee Service is mentioned explicitly by name as an apostolic work in the service of migrants: “The Jesuit Refugee Service accompanies many of these brothers and sisters of ours, serving them as

²¹ Ibid., no. 7.

²² Ibid., no. 2.

²³ Ibid., no. 3.

²⁴ Ibid., no. 4. This, however, as Greene points out, can be problematic since the movement “from abstract to concrete means getting involved with ideologies, philosophies and political movements. The social apostolate is generally involved in conflicted areas.” Greene, “Observations of the Social Apostolate, Justice and the Decrees of General Congregations 31 to 35,” 3.

²⁵ General Congregation 34, *Decree 3*, no. 10.

companions, advocating their cause in an uncaring world. The General Congregation appeals to all Provinces to support the Jesuit Refugee Service in every way possible.”²⁶

v. The 35th General Congregation (2008)

The most recent congregation, GC 35, affirms the integral value of justice in light of reconciliation, a theme also present in GC 32’s famous definition of the Jesuit mission. At GC 35, themes of justice, solidarity with the poor, and social engagement are evident throughout the official texts. In its first decree, *With Renewed Vigour and Zeal*, the congregation responds to the address of Pope Benedict and affirms its commitments to refugees, to the promotion of justice, and to the preferential option for the poor as grounded in the Christian faith and the mission of the church.²⁷

In its second decree, *A Fire that Kindles Other Fires: Rediscovering Our Charism*, GC 35 emphasizes the apostolic nature of the Jesuit charism and its desire to follow Christ by participating in the “Church’s universal mission” in the world today. The decree explicitly affirms the Society’s previous commitments to justice and situates this concern in Christian discipleship:

In following this way, Jesuits today affirm all that has been specified regarding the Society’s mission in the last three General Congregations. The service of faith and the promotion of justice, indissolubly united, remain at the heart of our mission. This option changed the face of the Society. We embrace it again and we remember with gratitude our martyrs and the poor who have nourished us evangelically in our own identity as followers of Jesus.²⁸

²⁶ Ibid., no. 16.

²⁷ General Congregation 35, *Decree 1: With Renewed Vigor and Zeal: The Society of Jesus Responds to the Invitation of the Holy Father*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 6.

²⁸ General Congregation 35, *Decree 2: A Fire That Kindles Other Fires: Rediscovering Our Charism*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 15.

In *Decree 3: Challenges to Our Mission Today: Sent to the Frontiers*, GC 32's articulation of the Jesuit mission is reaffirmed with greater attention placed on the task of reconciliation in a divided world: "we now want to deepen our understanding of the call to serve faith, promote justice and dialogue with culture and other religions in light of the *apostolic mandate* to establish right relationships with God, with one another and with creation."²⁹ This task demands, we are told, that Jesuits be prepared to be "sent to the frontiers" and to work for reconciliation with God, between peoples, and with creation.

This mission, according to *Decree 3* is not simply the task of Jesuits as individuals, but must also manifest itself in a "collective witness." The Jesuits, as an "international and multicultural" community "is not just for mission: it is itself mission."³⁰ Importantly, this decree highlights five "global preferences" for the society as a whole, in line with five areas previously indicated by Fr. Klovenbach. These include Africa, China, the intellectual apostolate, inter-provincial institutions in Rome, migration and refugees. JRS here is mentioned explicitly by name and the congregation encourages it to "adhere to its present Charter and Guidelines."³¹

Decree 6: Collaboration at the Heart of Mission, addresses some of the ways in which this mission to faith, justice and reconciliation is put into practice in Jesuit and Ignatian works and the parameters for collaboration with others in the apostolate. Here, the congregation recognizes the possibility and value of non-Jesuits being invited to share

²⁹ General Congregation 35, *Decree 3: Challenges to Our Mission Today: Sent to the Frontiers*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 12.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 41–42.

³¹ The decree reads: "this Congregation reaffirms that attending to the needs of migrants, including refugees, internally displaced and trafficked people, continue to be an apostolic preference of the Society. Moreover, we reaffirm that the Jesuit Refugee Service adhere to its present Charter and Guidelines." *Ibid.*, no. 39.

in the Ignatian and Jesuit mission in the world. The apostolic mission of Society, in other words, is not limited only to vowed Jesuits. Again, JRS is uplifted as an important example of where Jesuits collaborate with one another across provinces and with non-Jesuits in a “common mission.”³²

vi. Service of Faith in the Promotion of Justice

As with other lay and religious communities in the church, the holistic vision of mission put forth by the Second Vatican Council inspired a deeper appreciation for justice and social engagement among Jesuits. With Vatican II, the 1971 Synod of Bishops, and other post-conciliar theological developments, the Jesuits discovered the promotion of justice as a constitutive element of their mission in the service of faith.

This deepened understanding of mission, articulated first in *Decree 4* of GC 32 and reaffirmed by the subsequent general congregations, had a profound impact on Jesuit life, transforming existing social ministries and inspiring the creation of new ones, like JRS. These developments are important for understanding the mission of JRS, the motivation behind its foundation, the theological concepts underlying its work, and its own relationship to the broader mission of the Society and the church.

B. Pedro Arrupe and the Foundation of Jesuit Refugee Service

The Jesuit reception of Vatican II enabled them to see and respond to one of the major humanitarian crises of the twentieth century. The complex global reality of forced displacement in the 1970s demanded a concerted response on the part of the Jesuits given

³² General Congregation 35, *Decree 6: Collaboration at the Heart of Mission*, in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), no. 22.

their renewed commitments to justice and social engagement. The key figure in facilitating the new articulation of the Jesuit mission and its application to the realities of suffering in the 1970s and 1980s was Pedro Arrupe (1907-1991), the 28th Father General of the Society who served from 1965 to 1983. A native of the Basque region, like St. Ignatius, Arrupe entered the Society of Jesus after studying to be a medical doctor.

Following his ordination in 1936, he was sent as a missionary to Japan where he witnessed firsthand the suffering of war and displacement. On August 6, 1945, Arrupe put his medical training to use in the aftermath from the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. Serving in a small Jesuit community only a few miles from the epicenter of the bomb blast, Arrupe was one of the first responders to the calamity, transforming the damaged Jesuit novitiate into a makeshift hospital for the displaced wounded.

Pedro Arrupe's experience as a missionary and provincial in Asia prepared him to take on the challenges of leading the Society through the difficult process of receiving and responding to the teachings of the council. He took to heart the Second Vatican Council's vision of mission. As a formal participant in the final session of Vatican II and the 1971 and 1974 synods, his contribution extended far beyond the Society. Following the council, Arrupe was charged with the task of implementing the process of renewal within the largest Catholic religious community in the world, and for this monumental work he is often credited as "refounding the Society"³³

Although the tragedy of forced displacement had long existed in different parts of the world, the scale of the crisis that emerged in 1970s, particularly in South East Asia,

³³ Mark Raper, "Introduction: The Arrupe Vision in Action," in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 9.

called for new initiatives. Given the renewed understanding of the Jesuit mission articulated by GC 32 and promoted by Arrupe, the Society could not ignore this situation.

During an informal gathering of the Jesuit curia in Rome in late 1979, the plight of the “boat people” was discussed. The following day, Arrupe sent twenty telegrams to Jesuit superiors in Asia, Europe and North America asking how the Society might respond to the crisis and the needs of the people.³⁴ The response to this appeal, as Arrupe himself recalls, “was magnificent. Immediate offers of help were made in personnel, know-how and material.”³⁵

After months of informal efforts, it became clear that a more robust response was both possible and necessary. In September, 1980, he organized a consultation in Rome to reflect on how the Society might develop a coordinated effort to address the growing numbers of refugees in line with the Ignatian charism, the teachings of Vatican II and the directives for mission laid out by *Decree 4* of GC 32. The meeting reviewed the reality and efforts that were already underway by Jesuits to respond to the needs of refugees around the world and explored what could be done to coordinate and strengthen such efforts in the future. For Arrupe, the situation of refugees represented “a new modern apostolate for the Society as a whole.”³⁶ It was a place, he believed, where the Jesuits could respond by offering both humanitarian assistance and pastoral services.

³⁴ Michael Campbell-Johnston, “What Don Pedro Had in Mind When He Invited the Society to Work With Refugees,” in *Everybody’s Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 40. Arrupe also held consultations with Robert McNamera, President of the World Bank accompanied by Dr. Elisabeth Winkler, Secretary General of the International Catholic Migration Commission—an international Catholic organization (ICO) dealing with questions of migration.

³⁵ Pedro Arrupe, “The Society of Jesus and the Refugee Problem: Letter to All Jesuit Major Superiors (14 November, 1980),” in *Everybody’s Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 28.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 29.

Soon after the consultation, Arrupe sent a letter to all Jesuit Major Superiors on 14 November 1980 with the subject “The Society of Jesuit and the Refugee Problem.” The letter updated the Jesuit leadership about the discussions made at the September consultation and announced the establishment of the Jesuit Refugee Service as an international project of the Jesuit Curia, organized (at least at first) by the Social Secretariat. In his letter, Arrupe outlined six aims and objectives for this new apostolic project:

- a. To set up a network of contacts within the Society so that existing work for refugees can be better planned and co-ordinated;
- b. To collect information that might lead to new opportunities for assistance to refugees;
- c. To act as a switchboard between offers of help from Provinces and the needs of international agencies and organisations;
- d. To conscientise the Society about the importance of this apostolate and the different forms it can take both within countries of first asylum and receiving countries;
- e. To direct the special attention of the Society towards those groups or areas that receive little publicity or help from elsewhere;
- f. And to encourage our publications and institutes of learning to undertake research into the root causes of the refugee problem so that preventive action can be taken.³⁷

The establishment of JRS became an important part of Pedro Arrupe’s legacy as recently affirmed by Pope Benedict to GC 35.³⁸ In many ways, JRS could be considered one of the most creative responses of the Society to *Decree 4* of GC 32. With JRS, Arrupe demonstrated how the commitments of GC 32 were not only to be lived out locally through individual Jesuits and Jesuit institutions, but that the entire Society could and should respond to social questions through universal works like JRS. The idea of

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Pope Benedict XVI speaks to the work of the Society with refugees as one of the legacies of Benedict XVI, “Address of Pope Benedict XVI to the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (February 21, 2008).”

having a supra-provincial apostolate like JRS was new for the Society. Although the Jesuits have long operated globally with a universal sense of mission and availability as illustrated by the fourth vow, they, like most religious congregations, operated primarily through provincial structures coordinated by the Father General and curia. Because of its global reality, the plight of forced migrants demanded another type of response that went beyond the local initiatives alone. Arrupe knew that the Jesuits, by virtue of their many institutions, available skilled personnel, and global presence, were in a prime position to respond to this crisis—something that Daniel Villanueva describes as the “Jesuit potential.”³⁹

Beyond offering a much-needed response to urgent humanitarian needs of the people, Pedro Arrupe saw the establishment of JRS as deeply rooted in the Ignatian mission and charism. From his own experiences in Japan, Arrupe believed that JRS could assist Jesuits to become “more in touch with the experiences of Ignatius and his early companions in caring for the needy and destitute.”⁴⁰

Actions and concerns for forcibly displaced people, as Arrupe pointed out at the first consultation, were not new to the Jesuits. Indeed, among the first ministries organized by St. Ignatius were efforts aimed at serving the poor displaced by the 1538 famine in Rome. While teaching has always been seen as a priority in their evangelical mission, Jesuits since the beginning understood that charitable efforts must take

³⁹ Daniel Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global: Outlines for a Public Presence of the Society of Jesus in a Globalized World in the Light of Lessons Learned from the Jesuit Refugee Service” (STL Thesis, Weston Jesuit School of Theology, 2008), 19.

⁴⁰ Edward Brady, “JRS Is a Jesuit Ministry,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 26.

precedence over teaching in situations of urgent need.⁴¹ The Jesuits, as a community, also knew the experience of forced displacement. In many cases, especially during the suppression of the Society in the eighteenth century, thousands of priests and brothers were stripped of their identity and many were displaced from their homes and communities.

In the months following the launch of JRS, Pedro Arrupe actively supported the efforts of the Social Secretariat to mobilize the interests and social capital of the whole Society behind this initiative. This would be among his last major efforts. In August of 1981, after visiting JRS workers in Bangkok, Arrupe suffered a debilitating stroke on his return journey to Rome. While he lived for another few years, he was unable to direct the work of the Society and the next stages in the development of JRS.

C. The Development of JRS

From its foundation in 1980 as “a switchboard” and loose network, Jesuit Refugee Service developed significantly as an NGO with its own programs, structures, and guidelines. In his thesis, Daniel Villanueva outlines four distinct phases of JRS’s development as an international NGO.⁴²

i. 1980 to 1984: Umbrella Coordination

In its initial phase, JRS functioned as a coordinating structure within the Social Secretariat of the Jesuit Curia. Under the leadership of Michael Campbell-Johnston, JRS

⁴¹ “At that first JRS meeting, Fr. Arrupe quoted from the Jesuits Formula of the Institute and from the commentary on it by Fr. Polanco, the first secretary of the Society: *The provision of doctrine and instruction should be preferred to that of food and clothes unless there is urgent need such as hunger, in which case we must insist on trying to remedy it.* For the early Society, preference was to be given to the corporal works in times of catastrophe. So in our day, refugee work must be a priority for the Society.” See Campbell-Johnston, “What Don Pedro Had in Mind,” 41.

⁴² Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global.”

largely operated as a “switchboard” connecting existing efforts of Jesuits in East Asia, Latin America and Africa: “It was a time of gluing bits and pieces of Jesuit-reflected works.”⁴³ While much of the focus was primarily in East Asia, creative efforts were underway in other regions, including the establishment in 1980 of what is now the longest running JRS project, the Centro Astalli in Rome, housed in the same building where St. Ignatius offered refuge to the poor in Rome.

ii. 1984 to 1990: Light and Decentralized Structure

The Second phase of JRS came in 1984 as JRS expanded beyond the Jesuit Social Secretariat. With the support of Peter Hans Kolvenbach, the newly elected Father General, JRS established itself as an autonomous entity with Dieter Sholz as its first director. In this period, the first set of “guidelines” for the organization were approved in 1987 and the first JRS regional structure was established in East Asia.

In this period, the efforts of JRS attracted an increasing number of non-Jesuits. Early on, Fr. Arrupe invited other religious to join with the Jesuits in responding to the refugee crisis. Inspired by JRS and in line with their own efforts at renewal after Vatican II, an increasing number of non-Jesuits (lay and religious) joined the mission of JRS. Other religious communities of women and men also took up the challenge of responding to the refugee crisis from their own charism. The Sisters of Mercy, for example, established Mercy Refugee Service in 1985.

⁴³ Peter Balleis and Elias Lopez, “Sent to the Frontiers on a Mission of Reconciliation: A Vision of JRS Inspired by the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus” (Jesuit Refugee Service, February 11, 2009), 3.

iii. 1990 to 2000: Building up Regions and 1st Structures

In May 1990, Mark Raper succeeded Sholz as the international director. Under Raper's leadership, the organization developed quickly as an NGO with nine regional structures established throughout the world. JRS proved itself capable of responding to the new conflicts and social-political changes of the decade with new projects in response to the Rwanda crisis and the conflicts in southeastern Europe following the breakup of Yugoslavia.

In this period, JRS deepened its efforts in international advocacy. It participated in several important campaigns and established an office in Geneva to directly interface with the United Nations, UN Agencies and other NGOs dealing with refugees.

With this rapid growth, there was a need for greater organizational cohesion. At the end of this period, the leadership of the organization drafted the *JRS Charter* and a new set of *JRS Guidelines*, which were approved by Fr. Kolvenbach and the Vatican on 19 March, 2000.

iv. 2000-today: Global Identity and Structures

Today, JRS is experiencing continued growth, especially in Africa. The overall budget of the organization has doubled and the number of staff (mostly non-Jesuits) "tripled from 450 in 2000 to about 1400 in 2007" with several thousand refugees on stipends for the organization around the world.⁴⁴

Over the past decade, JRS has also expanded its work in advocacy. In 2002, it received consultative status with the United Nation Economic and Social Council

⁴⁴ Ibid., 4.

(ECOSOC) and in 2003 it was granted observer status with the International Organization for Migration. Under the leadership of Lu s Magri a and Peter Balleis, JRS developed its global identity while also maintaining regional structures. Similar to other international NGOs, it moved from a “decentralized” organizational model to what Daniel Villanueva describes as a global coordinated structure.⁴⁵ While largely positive, the rapid growth within the organization has challenged JRS to work to maintain its Jesuit and Catholic identity in the face of many urgent complex humanitarian emergencies and an increasing number of non-Catholic staff members.⁴⁶ In response, increasing attention is being given to ensure that JRS remains a cohesive organization with a shared vision. Maintaining a shared vision and a shared sense of the Jesuit charism is increasingly difficult with only 78 Jesuits on a worldwide staff of more than 1,400.⁴⁷ As part of these recent efforts:

Guidelines, policy papers, standardization and diversification of jobs, in the international, regional, and country offices, with positions for programmes, finance, communications and advocacy officers were put into place. JRS has matured into a well-structured and strong international humanitarian organisation.⁴⁸

The *Charter* and *Guidelines* approved by JRS in 2000, establish the policies for the NGO’s organization. As a work of the whole Society of Jesus, JRS is unique among Jesuit institutions. Its operations, coordinated by an international office in Rome, span existing Jesuit provincial and regional divisions.

⁴⁵ Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global,” 89.

⁴⁶ See Peter Balleis, “The Specific Jesuit Identity of JRS,” in *Everybody’s Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 107.

⁴⁷ “Jesuit Refugee Service International Office: Who We Are,” *Jesuit Refugee Service*, accessed February 7, 2013, <http://www.jrs.net/about>.

⁴⁸ Balleis and Lopez, “Sent to the Frontiers,” 4.

In order to facilitate a greater integration of the work of JRS into the life and mission of local Jesuit communities, the *JRS Guidelines* urge greater lines of communication and put forth two models for JRS's service operations. In some regions, JRS projects are to be coordinated by the local Jesuit province and/or regional assistancies themselves. In places like the United States and Europe where the Jesuits have the resources to do, the local Jesuit structures are charged with organizing programs and appointing regional directors.⁴⁹ In other regions where there are urgent humanitarian needs or where the local Jesuit structures currently lack the resources to adequately serve the forcibly displaced, JRS International will play the primary role in organizing the projects and appointing the regional director. In these cases the JRS International Director, who is appointed by the Father General, appoints regional directors and oversees the operations. Regardless of the model used, the guidelines urge close cooperation and communication between JRS, the local Jesuit communities and the local church. JRS seeks, whenever possible, to empower and support the local Jesuit and church communities to take an active role in serving refugees.⁵⁰

D. A Threefold Mission

Within the broader Jesuit mission of serving faith and promoting justice, JRS's *Charter* describes its specific mission "to accompany, serve and defend the rights of

⁴⁹ Danielle Vella, ed., "Guidelines of the JRS (19 March, 2000)," in *Everybody's Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000* (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 26–27.

⁵⁰ In this way, the structure of JRS shows both the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity as highlighted in Catholic social teaching.

refugees and forcibly displaced people.”⁵¹ In *the Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Right*, approved in 2003, this threefold mission is described in Article 7:

The mission of JRS is to take care of the pastoral needs of the refugees and their religious and spiritual formation. JRS also attend to their human, spiritual, material and cultural needs and defends their human rights.⁵²

While JRS certainly shares many characteristics, approaches and values with other humanitarian organizations, its specific Ignatian approach to this threefold mission makes it distinct from others. Before examining how this mission is expressed in the work of JRS as an international NGO, this chapter will now briefly attend to the theological and Ignatian roots of accompaniment, advocacy, and service.

i. Accompaniment

More than anything perhaps, JRS is defined by the Ignatian principle of accompaniment, which according to its *Charter* is the task of affirming to and with refugees “that God is present in human history, even in its most tragic episodes.”⁵³

Accompaniment involves becoming a companion to another person on a shared journey in life. In many respects, this is the organization’s defining characteristic or “hallmark.”⁵⁴ According to Joe Hampson, accompaniment serves both as principle that underlies everything JRS does as well as a practice or “specific sectoral activity” of the organization.⁵⁵ In a world where many humanitarian organizations maintain a

⁵¹ Jesuit Refugee Service, “Charter,” no. 9.

⁵² “The Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Rite” (Jesuit Refugee Service, 2003), Art. 7, JRS Archive.

⁵³ Jesuit Refugee Service, “Charter,” no. 15.

⁵⁴ Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global,” 79. See Pablo Alonso et al., eds., *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees* (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), chap. 2.

⁵⁵ Joe Hampson, “JRS Accompaniment: A New Way of Being Present?,” December 2, 2009, <http://jrsusa.org/accompaniment?LID=141>.

professional distance from the people they serve, JRS's "style of presence," willingness to be with the displaced, and attention to the whole person oftentimes makes it unique.⁵⁶

As a principle and a practice, accompaniment is rooted in the biblical and Ignatian traditions. The gospel story of the road to Emmaus is often cited (Lk. 24:1-35) as an example of what it means to accompany another. As with the many other stories of Jesus' close and intimate presence among his followers, the Emmaus story offers a model and an invitation to travel with people in need. The story details the experience of the risen Christ accompanying his disciples who following the death of Christ. They only recognize him in the moment when bread is broken and shared.⁵⁷

Within the Ignatian theological tradition, the principle is expressed in the teachings and spirituality of the first Jesuits. The *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, in particular, affirms this principle. During the *Exercises*, exercitants find companionship in spiritual directors who are to travel with them on their spiritual journey of discovering God's presence in the world.

With accompaniment, the apostolic work of JRS goes much deeper than simply providing urgently needed material relief and advocacy. True to its etymological roots, the Jesuit practice of accompaniment often involves "breaking bread" with those in need. It means becoming a companion and friend to the other on a shared journey. It involves being attentive to the integrated nature of the women and men that they serve, including their social, physical, spiritual, and physiological needs.⁵⁸ In the face of the suffering,

⁵⁶ Villanueva, "The Jesuit Way of Going Global," 79.

⁵⁷ See Anne Elizabeth de Vuyst, "Breaking Bread, Sharing Life," in *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees*, ed. Pablo Alonso et al. (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 43–45.

⁵⁸ Mark Raper, "Pastoral Accompaniment Among Refugees: The Jesuit Refugee Service Experience," in *Everybody's Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella

loneliness, and despair of the refugee camp, “the presence” of a compassionate companion can engender hope and contribute to healing.⁵⁹

According to Mark Raper, accompaniment “is an essential element” of JRS’s “mission and...methodology. We are companions of Jesus, so we wish to be companions of those with whom he prefers to be associated, the poor and the outcast.”⁶⁰ For JRS, the principle has a significant impact on both humanitarian and advocacy work of the organization.

At the local level, it encourages specific attitudes and practices including psychological support, pastoral care, compassion, listening, solidarity, respect, capacity-building, and empowerment.⁶¹ Accompaniment acknowledges the dignity of refugees, as created in the image and likeness of God. In this approach they are seen as agents and participants in the common task of social transformation and healing. In the words of Arrupe, “it is the oppressed who must be the principal agents of change.”⁶²

At the international level, this approach helps JRS to keep the refugee at the center of their advocacy and analysis. Given the magnitude, complexities and pains of forced displacement, refugees can often become faceless statistics. The Ignatian principle of accompaniment helps JRS to ensure that the human dimension and dignity of these women and men is not lost. In the words of Michael Schultheis:

(Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 84. Arrupe affirms this in his letter establishing the creation of JRS: “the help needed is not only material: in a special way the Society is being called to render a service that is human, pedagogical and spiritual. It is a difficult and complex challenge; the needs are dramatically urgent.” Arrupe, “The Society of Jesus and the Refugee Problem.”

⁵⁹ Michael J. Schultheis, “Rebuilding the Bridges and Clearing the Footpaths: A Parable of JRS,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 146.

⁶⁰ Raper, “Pastoral Accompaniment Among Refugees,” 2000, 85.

⁶¹ See Hampson, “JRS Accompaniment.”

⁶² Arrupe, “Men for Others.”

JRS is not a response to statistics and numbers but its mission is to accompany persons and communities in need. JRS is not defined by functions but by the faces and features of persons whom we come to identify as part of our family and community. This leads to the importance of analysis and advocacy, but to be effective, these are based on a deep understanding that is obtained from personal presence and shared experiences. .⁶³

Without romanticizing the situation of forced displacement, many working for JRS describe experiences of their own deep personal transformation in their work with refugees, who they often describe as accompanying them. Accompaniment, in other words, is not unidirectional or passive. Like true friendship, it engages and transforms both parties.⁶⁴

ii. Service and the Option for the Poor

Denise Coghlan, a longtime JRS staff member, speaks of the JRS spirituality as fundamentally being a “spirituality of service.”⁶⁵ Like accompaniment, this task is deeply rooted in the Christian and Jesuit tradition. In the bible, service to the poor and those in need is described as a constitutive element of Christian discipleship. This concern is explicit throughout the Gospels and the New Testament. They can be seen in the beatitudes (Mt. 5:3-12; Lk. 6:20-26); the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:29-30); the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-31); Jesus’ description of the last judgment (Mt. 25:31-46); the washing of the feet (Jn. 13:1-17); and in the prophetic denunciations of St. James (Jas 2:14-26)—only to name a few. Here, we read that

⁶³ Schultheis, “Rebuilding the Bridges and Clearing the Footpaths: A Parable of JRS,” 146.

⁶⁴ Denise Coghlan, “Serving With the Eyes and Heart of Love,” in *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees*, ed. Pablo Alonso et al. (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 77–85. See also Roxanne Schares, “Discovering Hidden Treasurers,” in *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees*, ed. Pablo Alonso et al. (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 47–57.

⁶⁵ Coghlan, “Serving With the Eyes and Heart of Love,” 82.

following Jesus involves service to those who are hungry, thirsty, strangers, naked, sick, and imprisoned.

Within this Christian apostolic commitment to service, the forcibly displaced demand specific attention.⁶⁶ The memories of forced displacement and suffering of the Jewish people in Egypt and Babylon and the emigration of the Holy Family after the birth of Jesus deeply shape the Christian commitment to serve the poor. Refugees and aliens, the bible famously instructs, are to be welcomed and treated with respect because “you too were once aliens in the land of Egypt” (Lv. 19:33, Ex. 22:20; 23:9). In this way, the practice of hospitality can be seen as a form of a service to the other.

For many Jesuits, the mission of JRS and its commitment to service and hospitality are also deeply connected to the charism of their founder and his concerns and commitments to the poor, sick and displaced. In the words of one Jesuit, the NGO is “the most Ignatian institution” he has ever known.⁶⁷

In his 1990 letter to the whole society, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach speaks of JRS’s service as having “a characteristically Ignatian approach” that reflects the experience of St. Ignatius and the first Jesuits.⁶⁸ As part of his letter, Kolvenbach urges Jesuits around the world to support JRS “as an apostolic commitment of the whole Society.” This commitment, he recalls is not new. Rather, it dates back to 1537 when, soon after their

⁶⁶ A full treatment of the Christian ethical approach to migration and service to refugees is beyond the scope of this project. See the excellent articles on this by two Jesuits: Drew Christiansen, “Movement, Asylum, Borders: Christian Perspectives,” *International Migration Review* 30, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 7–17; Agbonkhianmeghe E. Orobator, “Justice for the Displaced: The Challenge of a Christian Understanding,” in *Driven from Home: Protecting the Rights of Forced Migrants*, ed. David Hollenbach (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010), 37–54.

⁶⁷ Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global,” 2.

⁶⁸ Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, “Review of the Jesuit Refugee Service to the Whole Society: Extracts of a Letter From Peter-Hans Kolvenbach SJ to the Society, 1990,” in *Everybody’s Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 49.

arrival in Rome, Ignatius and his companions organized relief efforts for thousands of people displaced by famine and disease.⁶⁹

In his book, *The First Jesuits*, John O'Malley details these first works of mercy of Ignatius and his companions. In particular he examines their commitments in ministries to the sick and dying, prostitutes and those in prison. Many of these works, such as the Casa Santa Marta—created to care for women seeking to leave prostitution—may well be described today as nongovernmental organizations.⁷⁰ For Ignatius and the first Jesuits, this commitment to service, often expressed through what Kevin O'Brien calls “ministries of consolation,” was a clear dimension of what it meant to be a companion of Jesus.⁷¹

Moreover, this commitment is evident in the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius where service is expressed as a natural outgrowth of contemplation. According to Wilkie Au, the “Ignatian pedagogy for forming “people for others” is embedded in the Second Prelude of the *Contemplatio*.” Here, one discovers a “there-fold dynamic” of “knowledge, gratitude, and loving service.”⁷² The awareness of God’s gracious actions in the world should evoke both gratitude towards God and loving service in the world. Or in the words of Au, Ignatius’ hope with the *Spiritual Exercises* was that “people might be

⁶⁹ Ibid., 48.

⁷⁰ See John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), chap. 5.

⁷¹ Drawing from his STL thesis, Kevin O'Brien has written on JRS as reflecting the Jesuit commitment to the works of mercy and “ministries of consolation.” Kevin O'Brien, “Consolation in Action: The Jesuit Refugee Service and the Ministry of Accompaniment,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 37, no. 4 (Winter 2005).

⁷² Wilkie Au, “Ignatian Service, Gratitude and Love in Action,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 10.

filled with gratitude and love for God and moved to express that love in acts of service.”⁷³

The Jesuit commitment to service is institutionalized as a central aspect of Jesuit life in the fourth vow that many Jesuits take. Introduced by St. Ignatius, Jesuits who take the vow pledge themselves to be obedient to the pope in responding to the church’s apostolic mission in the world. Importantly for the work of JRS, this central feature of Jesuit life reflects the both the universality of the Jesuit mission through service and the integral relationship between that service and the mission of the church.

The willingness of Jesuits and their institutions to be of service to mission anywhere in the world, as Villanueva examines, reflects the “potentiality” of the Jesuits to have a real impact in the face of the refugee crisis. In calling for the establishment of JRS, Arrupe highlights this “ideal of availability and universality” as making the Jesuits “particularly well fitted” to address the international refugee crisis and “provide services that are not being catered for sufficiently by other organisations and groups.”⁷⁴

Following the Second Vatican Council and the emergence of liberation theology, the Ignatian commitment to service came to be understood in the language of the preferential option for the poor. In a 1997 address, Father Kolvenbach summarizes this connection well. The first Jesuits, he argues, “could not have imagined introducing themselves as companions of Jesus without assuming his preferential love for the poor.

⁷³ Ibid., 14.

⁷⁴ Arrupe, “The Society of Jesus and the Refugee Problem,” 28. See also Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global,” 20–21.

Ignatius wrote to the Jesuits in Padua that our commitment to follow a poor Lord quite naturally made us friends of the poor.”⁷⁵

In summary, the commitment to “service” that underlies the mission of JRS is not new. On the contrary, it is deeply grounded in the Christian commitment to apostolic action and the Ignatian principle of service, which stems from an awareness and gratitude of God’s gracious actions.

iii. The Defense of the Rights of Refugees

The third dimension to JRS’s mission is the defense of the rights of refugees and the forcibly displaced. This mission, as we will see in the next section, is expressed in different ways throughout the advocacy, operational, and research activities of JRS. At its core, this task seeks to go beyond providing temporary relief of suffering to address the root causes of forced displacement. These efforts do not aspire to be “a band-aid” for humanitarian conflicts, “rather they aim at healing the wounds of exile. Above all, they seek to prevent fresh wounds.”⁷⁶

As with accompaniment and service, the defense of the rights of the poor has roots in the Ignatian vision and the tradition of the church. In scripture, for example, believers are challenged to speak out in the face of injustice and “defend the needy and the poor” (Pr. 31:9). Prophets like Amos and Micah speak out against systems of injustice and structures such as the Deuteronomic Code are established in society with the

⁷⁵ Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, “A Paschal Love for the World,” *Promotio Justitiae* 68 (September 1997): 95–103. See also: Adrien Demoustier and Jean-Yves Calvez, “The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 21, no. 2 (1989).

⁷⁶ Christophe Renders, “Speak Out, Judge Righteously, Defend the Rights of the Poor and Needy (Pr 31:9),” in *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees*, ed. Pablo Alonso et al. (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 107.

hopes of breaking cycles of poverty.⁷⁷ The foundation for defending the poor is also seen clearly in the person of Jesus who, as Christophe Renders of JRS Belgium writes, publicly “denounced all mechanisms and structures of exclusion.”⁷⁸ In the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament, Jesus assumed the role as a defender of the poor and the marginalized in his teachings and actions. Through his very public execution on the cross, in particular, Jesus stood up to the presence of sin and evil in the world.

Within the Ignatian vision, the call to advocate on behalf of the poor and those in need is closely associated with the post-conciliar attentiveness to social justice detailed above. In a 2009 article, Frank Turner of the Jesuit European Office defines Ignatian advocacy as being “spiritual, attentive to deep feeling, intellectual, [and] oriented to action.”⁷⁹ For him, this involves speaking out from the “the perspective of the oppressed and excluded;”⁸⁰ an openness to conversion; cooperation with others; and the practice of discernment to uncover the most appropriate way to respond to the experiences of injustice. From this experience of discernment and social analysis, advocacy seeks to uncover and as far as possible address the root causes of injustice and suffering.

JRS’s commitment to defend refugees and address the root causes of forced displacement is deeply associated with its concerns for reconciliation. As previously shown, the theme of reconciliation emerged strongly at the 35th General Congregation.

⁷⁷ See for example the Deuteronomic Code (Deut. 12-26). For commentaries on this, see also Bruce V. Malchow, *Social Justice in the Hebrew Bible: What Is New and What Is Old* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996); J. Pleins, *The Social Visions of the Hebrew Bible: A Theological Introduction* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001); Thomas Louis Schubeck, *Love That Does Justice* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007).

⁷⁸ Renders, “Speak Out, Judge Righteously, Defend the Rights of the Poor and Needy (Pr 31:9),” 114.

⁷⁹ Frank Turner, “A Model of Ignatian Advocacy,” *Promotio Justitiae* 101, no. 1 (2009): 40.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 37.

For JRS, this commitment is reinforced by a desire to break the cycles of violence that often engulf refugees as Peter Balleis and Elias Lopez explain:

In some countries, former refugees and victims of violence become the new violators. These painful experiences of radical evil make the reconstruction of a shared peaceful life impossible and material development unsustainable. The vicious circle of hurt, hatred and new violence can only be broken through reconciliation with one another.⁸¹

In their commitment to reconciliation, JRS seeks to “heal the roots of radical evil and make peace sustainable.”⁸² Recognizing the complexities of task, JRS seeks to build a reconciliation that promotes the values of truth, justice, and forgiveness. To defend the rights of the refugees also involves creating a climate where these values can be fostered and find meaning.

iv. Guiding Values

In its *Strategic Framework 2012-2015*, JRS outlines four goals for the organization informed by its threefold mission and seven “core values that inform all the work” of JRS.⁸³ Inspired by the values of *compassion* and human *dignity*, the first goal calls JRS to be “flexible and focused” in responding to “new emerging situations of forced displacement.”⁸⁴ Concretely, this will mean the development of mechanisms to more rapidly respond to emergency situations, the strengthening of projects with urban refugees; the development of programs aimed at combating human trafficking; and the

⁸¹ Balleis and Lopez, “Sent to the Frontiers,” 24.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸³ *Jesuit Refugee Service: Strategic Framework 2012-2015* (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2012), 7, www.jrs.net/about?LID=526&L=EN.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

organization of orientation programs to introduce “new staff members into the JRS mission and values.”⁸⁵

The second goal in the strategic framework calls JRS to “seek to understand and address the causes of structural inequality” and “work in partnership with others to create communities of justice, dialogue, peace and reconciliation.”⁸⁶ In this goal, the connection between faith, action for justice and the mission of JRS is made explicit. Drawing particularly from the values of *solidarity*, *hospitality*, *participation* and *justice*, this goal challenges JRS to deepen its efforts in inter-faith dialogue; reconciliation; advocacy; the empowerment of refugees to share their own voices; and the promotion of “a spirituality and culture of open doors that embodies hospitality in action.”⁸⁷

The third goal outlined by JRS addresses the value of *hope*, made present through education. In this goal JRS is called to “empower uprooted people through learning, fostering a future filled with hope.”⁸⁸ To this end, the organization is asked to continue and expand its efforts of providing quality education, including higher education, for those on the margins.

Finally, the strategic framework of JRS seeks to create a “stronger, more unified JRS” through the development of “coherent standards in governance and management” in order to ensure that its “work with the forcibly displaced” is both transparent and accountable.⁸⁹ In seeking to strengthen the organizational structure and ethical

⁸⁵ Ibid., 10.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 13.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 14.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 21.

operations, this goal also draws from the value of *participation* in emphasizing subsidiarity in the management of the organization.

II. JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE AS A TRANSNATIONAL NGO

The threefold mission of JRS to accompany, serve and advocate on behalf of refugees, its strategic goals, and its guiding Christian and Ignatian values are expressed in the life of JRS as a transnational NGO in the world through several distinct forms of action.⁹⁰ Broadly, these actions of JRS correspond to the operational, advocacy and analysis functions of transnational NGOs that were highlighted in Chapter One.

A. Operational Program Implementation

JRS's most visible form of action is the field of operational work. While JRS has insisted that it is an apostolic work and not a humanitarian agency, it takes on the functions of an operational humanitarian NGO. The bulk of the organization's energy, staff, and funding is devoted to the direct service of refugees and forcibly displaced people. Guided by the principle of accompaniment and the desire to serve refugee populations neglected by other actors, this work is done not only in refugee camps, detention centers and conflict zones, but increasing in cities with an increasing number of urban refugees.

⁹⁰ The canonical statutes of JRS outline seven means of implementation including pastoral assistance and education; formation for "priests, religious and lay people in the service of refugees;" "social and educational services;" human rights advocacy; research; the promotion of serving refugees by others; and institutional cooperation. "The Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Rite," 7.

In 2011, JRS served over 705 thousand men, women, and children around the world by offering them different services depending upon the specific local contexts.⁹¹ This is certainly an impressive number given the modest size and budget of the organization. In its operational work, JRS intentionally, as its *Charter* affirms, seeks to maintain “a personal style of presence and deliberately keeps its administrative structure as light as possible.” It is not and does not seek to become a humanitarian agency and therefore it has generally refrained from undertaking and engaging “large-scale emergency or infrastructure projects.”⁹² While healthcare and emergency services are part of its work in some areas, JRS’s primary operational presence is through pastoral/psychosocial, educational, and protective services.

i. Pastoral and Psychosocial Services

As an apostolic work, JRS focuses much of its attention to the psychosocial and pastoral accompaniment of refugees. In 2011, JRS supported over 222 thousand refugees in this type of work. Skilled workers with psychological and pastoral training can be a tremendous service for women and men displaced from their homes following a traumatic series of events. As Mark Raper points out, JRS staff are often among “the first and only people whom a refugee can trust after the trauma of flight. They left in fear and live in shock. We have a responsibility not only to listen but also to speak, and to facilitate communication.”⁹³

From its foundation, JRS has committed itself to providing spiritual and pastoral services to refugees and occasionally to other humanitarian workers. These services

⁹¹ Danielle Vella, ed., *Jesuit Refugee Service Annual Report 2011* (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2011), <https://www.jrs.net/assets/Publications/File/ar2011en1.pdf>.

⁹² Jesuit Refugee Service, “Charter,” 18.

⁹³ Raper, “Pastoral Accompaniment Among Refugees,” 2000, 87–88.

include the celebration of the Eucharist and other sacraments in refugee communities; animating prayer and reflection groups; pastoral visits to detention centers; training of other pastoral workers; psychosocial counseling and referral services and community building.

In the United States, for example, JRS/USA's Detention Chaplaincy Program offers religious and pastoral care to non-citizens of all faiths in government detention centers in Arizona, California, New York and Texas. JRS chaplains and volunteers who are part of this program visit detention centers, celebrate Mass, lead ecumenical prayer services, facilitate fellowship, and offer spiritual counseling. Through this service, "JRS/USA's chaplains and pastoral care workers give support to those who find themselves suffering and in crisis. They help individuals who are struggling to find purpose and meaning, value and direction, hope and love in their lives."⁹⁴

In a very different context, JRS Middle East serves urban refugee families through "family visit teams." JRS staff who are on these teams visit the homes of displaced families to "assess their living conditions, spend time with them in a safe place, listen to their concerns and dispel any sense of isolation."⁹⁵ Through these different expressions of psychosocial and pastoral service, one of the most basic things offered by JRS staff is listening and communicating with the refugees in the spirit of accompaniment:

They arrive into emergency situations, with fewer resources than most, and they stay longer. JRS personnel have credibility to speak with authority about the world-wide problem of refugees because its field teams are so authentically

⁹⁴ "Serve: Our Programs," *Jesuit Refugee Service USA*, accessed December 6, 2012, <http://jrsusa.org/services>.

⁹⁵ "Serve: Psychosocial Support," *Jesuit Refugee Service Middle East and North Africa*, accessed December 6, 2012, <http://www.jrsmena.org/services>.

engaged in listening to refugees in so many places. Communication is at the heart of JRS' success. Its elements include hearing the refugees out, reflecting on experience, and developing effective communication within the organisation and a credible voice beyond it.⁹⁶

The success of JRS's service is evident in the ways in which JRS projects are highlighted by the United Nations, governmental agencies, and church officials. For instance, a report by the UN Secretariat to the Security Council on the situation of children and armed conflict in Chad highlighted the work of JRS with girls associated with armed groups.⁹⁷ The work of JRS with child soldiers was also highlighted in the official report of the Holy See to the Committee on the Rights of the Child on its compliance to the Optional Protocol on the Convention on the Rights of the Child regarding children in armed conflict.⁹⁸ In 2007, JRS was honored when Katrine Camilleri, the assistant director of JRS Malta, was awarded with the UNHCR's Nansen Medal for her work with refugees in the Mediterranean on behalf of JRS.

ii. Education

It should not be surprising that the humanitarian NGO of the Society of Jesus would also focus much of its attention on education. The education of refugees can be considered "the mainstay of JRS activities in most regions."⁹⁹ In 2011, nearly 250 thousand refugees were served by JRS's educational projects around the world. In many places, the educational services offered by JRS are among the few services of this kind

⁹⁶ Raper, "Introduction: The Arrupe Vision in Action," 12.

⁹⁷ "Report of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict in Chad," February 9, 2011, no. 55, S/2011/64, United Nations Security Council.

⁹⁸ Holy See, "Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 8, Paragraph 1, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict Initial Reports of States Parties Due in 2003," October 22, 2012, no. 37, CRC/C/OPAC/VAT/1, United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child.

⁹⁹ Vella, *JRS Annual Report 2011*, 16.

offered to refugees. Attention to education says much about the concerns of JRS to address the dignity of the whole person. As Peter Balleis points out, education is not a priority for most other major NGOs and agencies serving refugees, including UNHCR. “Nonetheless,” he writes, “it is very important for camp life itself and for the future of refugee children.”¹⁰⁰

By educating refugees through formal and non-formal projects, JRS offers hope to refugees. From pre-school projects to post-secondary teacher and vocational trainings, JRS helps to break the cycle of poverty and exclusion. Through education projects, thousands of refugees have acquired skills for jobs and many have established their own small enterprises. Education not only brings the promise of a better economic future, but also helps reduce the risk of “forced recruitment of children by armed groups” who often prey on the despair of young men.¹⁰¹

Education aimed at young women and girls has become a priority for JRS in recent years. For young women and girls, the education provided by JRS is critically important especially in places where few of them would have access to such services. For instance, “[i]n South Sudan, where only 37% of girls aged between 6 and 13 go to school, nearly 18,000 girls attended JRS primary and secondary schools in 2011.”¹⁰² Similarly, in Afghanistan, JRS aids young women by empowering them to educate other women and girls in their communities.

JRS’s educational efforts also involve creative projects in areas that few other humanitarian agencies address. In urban areas, JRS helps refugees to access existing

¹⁰⁰ Balleis, “The Specific Jesuit Identity of JRS,” 104–105.

¹⁰¹ Amaya Valcárcel and Danielle Vella, eds., *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service* (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2011), 24.

¹⁰² Vella, *JRS Annual Report 2011*, 18.

educational services and to cover the costs associated with schooling (e.g., uniforms, books). In some places, JRS organizes skills training projects aimed at capacity building to aid refugees find employment. These efforts can contribute much in helping to break the cycle of poverty and conflict by giving refugees opportunities for their future.

Before winding down its presence in South Sudan, JRS worked closely with the local community to develop and support teacher-training projects. The School Development Team, previously sponsored by JRS, effectively trained teachers in Kajo Keji. The effectiveness of this project has been recognized by the local government as 72 teachers trained by JRS were among the best-performing candidates for the 2011 South Sudan Certificate of Education. As with other projects, JRS expects this local initiative to continue to serve the community even after it withdraws from the country.¹⁰³

More recently, JRS has partnered with Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States to offer higher educational opportunities to refugees through online distance learning—an impressive illustration of the Jesuit networking potential. In its second year of operation in 2011, Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins (JC-HEM), offered higher education courses to over 500 refugees in Malawi, Kenya, Syria and Jordan. JC-HEM draws upon faculty from Jesuit colleges and universities to offer a diploma in liberal studies awarded by Regis University in Colorado.¹⁰⁴

In addition to the diploma, the JC-HEM project also offers several “Community Service Learning Tracks” to address “specific needs within the community as identified

¹⁰³ Francis Biryaho, “South Sudan: Teacher Development Is the Backbone of JRS,” *Jesuit Refugee Service Eastern Africa*, September 16, 2012, http://jrsea.org/news_detail?TN=NEWS-20120919060559&L=EN.

¹⁰⁴ See “Homepage,” *Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins*, accessed December 6, 2012, <http://www.jc-hem.org/>.

by the community.”¹⁰⁵ Instead of the 45 credits required for the diploma, refugees receive certificates after 150 hours of learning. Certificates range from community health and community development to business management and performing arts.

For JRS, education offers an important service of empowering refugees not only to help themselves but to also become, in the Jesuit tradition, men and women for others. JRS often helps to train and empower refugees to be of service to their communities in the future when they return home or in the present as JRS staff members:

JRS favors the empowerment of refugees. It does so by focusing on training to develop skills which they can use when they go back home, and especially through education of the young people. In its hiring practices it will give priority to refugees, then to local people and only lastly to international workers. At the same time it holds on to its principle and practice of ensuring that there is significant presence of international volunteers and staff.¹⁰⁶

iii. Protection

While not as easy to qualify, the work of JRS in offering protection to displaced women and men is no less important. Refugees in and out of camps are among the most vulnerable populations in the world. Violence and exploitation in various forms follow them as they leave their homes and seek safety in places where they may not be welcome. Accompaniment inspires JRS to offer protection to refugees in their precarious and dangerous journey.

Drawing from his experience with JRS, Agbonkhianmeghe Orobator writes on the important role played by faith-based humanitarian NGOs in offering protection for

¹⁰⁵ “Community Service Learning Tracks (CSLT),” *Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins*, accessed December 6, 2012, http://www.jc-hem.org/campaign_detail?PTN=PROMO-20120622062130&TN=PROJECT-20120702121445&L=EN.

¹⁰⁶ Jenny Cafiso, “His Hope Had Not Been in Vain,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 276.

vulnerable refugees populations. The mere presence of these actors in refugee communities can offer protection and cover from human rights violations including exploitation by camp officials, rape and unwarranted deportation (refoulement).

JRS and other faith-based NGOs, Orobator argues, “are best placed to provide this cover” for several reasons.¹⁰⁷ Like other faith-based organizations, JRS often enjoys the trust of refugees. In addition to the moral authority and credibility that generally accompanies religious actors, the trust offered to JRS and other similar NGOs is also a result of the fact that they are known as “long-term players” in the community. Religious NGOs are often among the first agencies to respond to a crisis and the last to leave. They often have close ties with people in the community and are drawn to areas of need neglected by larger agencies. Faith-based agencies, including JRS, also play an important role with their international connections. The presence of international JRS staff member can offer protection to refugees from those who wish to avoid embarrassing international attention.

B. Analysis and Research

A second form of action of JRS is its work in analysis and research. As one of the original goals of the organization, research and analysis on policy issues helps to support both its operational and advocacy work.¹⁰⁸ JRS is well suited for this task given the Ignatian intellectual tradition and the global Jesuit network.

¹⁰⁷ Agbonkhianmeghe E. Orobator, “Key Ethical Issues in the Practices and Policies of Refugee-Serving NGOs and Churches,” in *Refugee Rights: Ethics, Advocacy, and Africa*, ed. David Hollenbach (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 227.

¹⁰⁸ Kolvenbach, “Review of the Jesuit Refugee Service,” 53.

JRS has developed partnerships with several Jesuit and non-Jesuit research universities and institutions to study and analyze issues associated with forced displacement and the work of JRS. In the 1990s, it partnered with the Refugee Study Centre (RSC) at the University of Oxford to create the Pedro Arrupe Tutorship. Recognizing the role played by JRS in humanitarian aid to refugees, Oxford created the Tutorship to serve as “a bridge between the RSC and JRS and the operational world of humanitarian organisations, both non-governmental and inter-governmental.”¹⁰⁹

These spaces help contribute to the global common good by furthering debate, discernment, and analysis on pressing social and humanitarian questions. In a field where many actors are consumed by the pressing and urgent needs of displaced people, JRS offers an important contribution in partnering with those engaged in research and analysis.

Taking advantage of the “Jesuit potential,” JRS has also developed relationships with other institutions within the Jesuit network to link social research with on the ground experience. Partnerships with the University of Deusto, Boston College’s Center for Human Rights and International Justice, Regis University, and Georgetown University’s Institute for the Study of International Migration, for example, have helped to deepen the study and awareness of humanitarian questions.

JRS also undertakes its own research on relevant issues. For example, JRS Europe has organized several research projects on the practices and policies of asylum seeker detention in Europe. Working with its JRS country offices and partner NGOs, JRS created a special website (www.detention-in-europe.org) to publish and share its findings

¹⁰⁹ Maryanne Loughry, “The Pedro Arrupe Tutorship in Oxford,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 248–49.

from thirty countries with other advocacy groups and European policy makers. JRS Europe engages in research and policy analysis in two European networks, the Advocacy Network for Destitute Forced Migrants (ANDES) and the Detention for Vulnerable Asylum Seekers (DEVAS).

C. Advocacy on Behalf of Refugees

A third form of action of JRS that is deeply tied to its threefold mission is advocacy. For JRS, advocacy is much broader than the formal lobbying of intergovernmental institutions. Shaped by the Jesuit mission, it begins and finds its meaning with the refugees themselves. The experience of direct service gives rise to advocacy as JRS seeks to find durable solutions for today's refugees while also uncovering and addressing the root causes of forced displacement. Advocacy is an "integral part of the JRS mission" at different levels of work, from pleading the cause of an individual refugee with camp officials to lobbying regional and global inter-governmental organizations on issues impacting whole communities.¹¹⁰

i. Local Advocacy

At the local level, in the field, JRS's advocacy work often involves alleviating the sufferings of individual refugees or certain groups of refugees with specific needs by taking up their cause with outside parties in positions of power. In camps, detention sites, and urban refugee centers, JRS's service of accompaniment is transformed into advocacy in many different ways. JRS staff play a critically important role in helping marginalized individuals and groups find and access a wide range of legal, medical, educational, social and psychological services. For the refugee, who may not know the language of the host

¹¹⁰ Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*, 3.

country or the intricacies of camp life, JRS can serve not only as a voice but also as a guide to help navigate a complex and foreign environment. The 2011 *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service* booklet lists several examples of this local form of advocacy. These include:

helping a refugee enroll in a camp programme from which he/she has been mistakenly excluded; helping a refugee with a disability access specialized care; arranging legal representation for a refugee in trouble.¹¹¹

ii. National Advocacy

At the national level, JRS country offices plead the cause of refugees before host governmental bodies, who determine much in the lives of refugees. Host governments, for example, control borders, define detention policies, determine possibilities for settlement, provide funding for social services, and secure protection around camps. JRS engages national governments as a middle range actor—bringing the often-excluded voices and concerns of refugees and other displaced persons to national attention and reminding governments of their obligations in international humanitarian law. In the United States, for example, JRS works for reforms in government policies concerning the detention of refugees, including the development of special policies to protect children and minors separated from their families and ensuring that the rights of detainees to religious services are met.¹¹²

Though its advocacy with governmental bodies aims at creating constructive change, JRS's strategy may, at times, involve public opposition to government policies. For instance, JRS Australia has recently criticized legal changes that would “remove the

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹¹² “2012 JRS/USA Advocacy Issues,” *Jesuit Refugee Service USA*, accessed December 6, 2012, <http://jrsusa.org/advocacy?LID=504>.

legal advantage afforded asylum seekers who arrive in mainland Australia.”¹¹³ This type of national advocacy, however, is not welcome in all countries.

Country level advocacy also involves engaging the broader national civil society about displacement issues. National campaigns and partnerships with other civil society groups, church structures, and NGOs can often help to raise awareness to the needs of refugees and fight against xenophobia and racism.

iii. Regionally and Globally

At the international level, JRS engages regional and global intergovernmental organizations to bring the experiences of refugees to global attention and to promote and propose policies that “improve conditions affecting refugees...”¹¹⁴ Perhaps more than any other area of international law, global refugee policies have the most immediate impact on the day-to-day lives of vulnerable people on the ground. Decisions made in Geneva, for example, may determine food distribution or resettlement policies in Africa or Asia. In this context, the voice of JRS as a voice for refugees is vital.

In its *Charter*, JRS is explicitly charged to engage and partner with “other international institutions and organisations to combat the injustices which uproot peoples from their land and families.”¹¹⁵ To this end, JRS maintains strong relationships with several intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations and NGO coalitions.

In 2002, JRS received special consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council. This enables JRS to share the concerns of refugees in

¹¹³ Catherine Marshall, “New Refugee Bill ‘Retrograde and Reprehensible’,” *Province Express*, November 6, 2012, <http://express.org.au/article.aspx?aeid=34021>.

¹¹⁴ Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*, 7.

¹¹⁵ Jesuit Refugee Service, “Charter,” no. 12.

different UN bodies and conferences that deal directly and indirectly with relevant questions. As much as possible, JRS seeks to bring the voices and experiences of refugees directly to these international forums. Since 2002, it has participated directly in several meetings of ECOSOC and its related bodies. At the Commission for Human Rights, JRS has used its status to give oral and written interventions on issues related to refugees. In their 2003 statement to the UN Human Rights Commission, for instance, JRS and the International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC) raised concerns for the “institutional gap” whereby forcibly displaced persons are denied access to basic services guaranteed to them by international human rights agreements, including food, healthcare, shelter, and education.¹¹⁶

In 2002 and 2003, JRS and other NGO members of the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers presented written statements to the Commission concerning the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on children in conflict.¹¹⁷ Other interventions have addressed specific country issues in the Universal Periodic Review process, the ratification on the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers, and the situation of refugees in relation to the human rights treaty bodies. In 2011, JRS submitted a written statement to the Economic and Social Council High Level Session and ministerial review. Drawing from their expertise in education, the statement called upon governments to address the educational needs of forcibly

¹¹⁶ “Joint Written Statement Submitted by International Catholic Migration Commission and the Jesuit Refugee Service to the Commission on Human Rights,” March 17, 2003, E/CN.4/2003/NGO/172, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

¹¹⁷ “Written Statement Submitted by Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers) to the Commission on Human Rights,” March 28, 2003, E/CN.4/2003/NGO/58, United Nations Economic and Social Council; “Written Statement Submitted by Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers) to the Commission on Human Rights,” January 24, 2002, E/CN.4/2002/NGO/17, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

displaced children; “extend compulsory free education through secondary school for all children regardless of their status;” and “fully integrate schools in refugee camps into the national system.”¹¹⁸

At the regional level, JRS Europe actively lobbies the European Commission, European Union and other regional bodies on refugee and immigration policy issues. JRS Europe has been particularly active in studying and advocating on issues of migrant destitution, asylum policies, detention, and the implementation of the Dublin Regulation on Asylum.¹¹⁹

Not surprisingly, the bulk of JRS’s intergovernmental engagement is with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). Since the early 2000s, JRS has participated as one of only a handful of organizations with observer status at the IOM. This has enabled JRS to more effectively engage the IOM at both the international level and in the field.

Beyond partnering with UNHCR as an implementing partner in the field, its advocacy office in Geneva engages the High Commissioner directly to lobby the agency and governmental delegations on specific concerns. Within the UNHCR system, the voice of NGOs is most directly facilitated by the UNHCR’s Annual Consultations with NGOs. At the consultations, the organizational partners come together with UNHCR officials to dialogue about common concerns and to draft a common NGO statement to the annual meeting of the Executive Committee (ExCom) Meeting. While the UNHCR is

¹¹⁸ “Statement Submitted by Jesuit Refugee Service to the ECOSOC Substantive Session of 2011.,” May 9, 2011, E/2011/NGO/10, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

¹¹⁹ “JRS Advocacy Work,” *Jesuit Refugee Service Europe*, accessed December 6, 2012, <http://www.jrseurope.org/policycampaigns.htm>.

presently considering greater direct input in the ExCom from individual NGOs, this joint statement from the consultation is the only official voice of NGOs in their meetings.¹²⁰

Over the past decade, JRS has actively participated in these consultations and has been among the group of NGOs charged with drafting of the final statement and report to the ExCom. At the 2011 consultation, JRS helped to organize several events in the consultation, including a thematic session on responding to the specific needs of urban refugees and a side meeting on distant learning.¹²¹

iv. Campaigning

As part of its advocacy efforts, JRS engages in campaigns and focuses on specific areas of concern. In its 2011 advocacy booklet, JRS outlines the following ten themes for the organization's advocacy work: education; internally displaced persons; food security, urban refugees; detention; protection; durable solutions, landmines; child soldiers; sexual and gender based violence; climate-induced displacement; and reconciliation.¹²² Clearly, these very distinct areas call for different forms of advocacy at different levels of engagement.

Appreciating both the demands of charity and justice, JRS seeks to address the root causes of these global challenges with its campaigns. One good example of a constructive advocacy initiative is JRS's work on landmines. In the 1990s, JRS mobilized a campaign within its own network and in partnership with other NGOs to work for international agreement against the use of landmines. Having seen the negative impact of

¹²⁰ Clearly, the formulation of one joint report from over 200 NGOs may result in the loss or "watering down" of the particular concerns of specific organizations.

¹²¹ Linda Bartolomei, ed., *Report On UNHCR's Annual Consultations With Non-Governmental Organizations (28 – 30 June 2011 - Geneva, Switzerland)* (Geneva: UNHCR, 2011), <http://www.unhcr.org/ngo-consultations/ngo-consultations-2011/Final-Full-Report-on-UNHCR-Annual-Consultations-with-NGOs-28-30June2011.pdf>.

¹²² Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*.

landmines in refugee community, Denise Coghlan, the director of JRS Cambodia, helped to mobilize JRS country programs around the world on the issue, helping to make it “one of the most successful NGO campaigns anywhere.”¹²³ Soon after its creation in 1994, the European Regional office of JRS agreed to take on the issue, joined the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, and worked to promote the ratification of anti-landmine legislation throughout Europe. At the same time Coghlan and other members of JRS helped to bring the voices of refugees to global attention. Recalling the success of the campaign, Sister Coghlan writes:

Our interest in banning landmines began during work in refugee camps in the 80s, where we saw first hand the horrific consequences these weapons have on their victims. The Cambodia anti-landmine movement has been very influential in the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. It began with a letter from four soldiers in the JRS Centre of the Dove, a vocational training project that provides landmine survivors with skills...In 1997, one of these former soldiers, Tun Chunnereth, rode his wheelchair onto the stage in Oslo and received the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of the campaign. He is working with JRS in Siam Reap, continuing his crusade against landmines. We have the Nobel Prize on display in our office.¹²⁴

JRS’s advocacy work is respected by many in positions of power because of the organization’s clear commitment to accompanying refugees on the ground. In order to be true to its specific Ignatian approach to advocacy, JRS seeks to ground its advocacy on the lived experience and needs of refugees. At the international level, this commitment to listening to the refugees can often distinguish JRS from other NGOs involved in humanitarian work. For John Dardis the “most valuable asset” of JRS “is not large-scale logistics or huge funding campaigns. What is most valuable about JRS is our on-the-

¹²³ Mark Raper, “Mercy and the National Interest, Keynote Address for the National Conference of Mercy Refugee Service, 22nd November 2002.,” in *Everybody’s Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, ed. Danielle Vella (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000), 65.

¹²⁴ Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*, 23.

ground contact with people in the most remote areas.”¹²⁵ This contact and commitment to listening to refugees serves as a mark of credibility for JRS lobbying and campaigning efforts. For Christine Bloch, who was involved in the advocacy work, the presence of JRS in Geneva only makes sense or has meaning when it is rooted in the work of JRS in the field, “Otherwise, how can one even begin to think we are bringing the voices to Geneva? Only when you have listened to the refugees can you begin to imagine what their lives are like. These are the experiences I can bring back to the decision-makers.”¹²⁶

D. Justice and the Work of JRS

The approach that JRS adopts as a transnational NGO embodies the Jesuit commitment to promote justice. As an apostolic work informed by the Jesuit mission, JRS could not approach its operational work, research, or advocacy in any other way. Not all those in the humanitarian field, however, agree on the value of justice in their service. According to some, advocacy and the promotion of justice violate the traditional humanitarian principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence.¹²⁷ Agencies such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) abide by a strict policy of neutrality and impartiality that often prevents them from engaging in questions of justice.¹²⁸

¹²⁵ John Dardis, “Showing Love and Care to Those Most in Need,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 260.

¹²⁶ Christine Bloch, “Voices of Refugees in Geneva,” in *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*, ed. Amaya Valcárcel (Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005), 283.

¹²⁷ These three principles, along with humanity, voluntary service, unity, and universality were first articulated by Jean Pictet as the seven fundamental principles of the International Committee of the Red Cross. They continue to guide and direct the work of ICRC and many other actors in the humanitarian field today. See Jean Pictet, *The Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross Proclaimed by the Twentieth International Conference of the Red Cross, Vienna, 1965* (Geneva: Henry Dunant Institute, 1979).

¹²⁸ Legitimate questions can be raised as to the feasibility of maintaining a neutral stance in conflict situations. Neutrality, even in “traditional conflict zones” may ultimately mean taking a side in a conflict. See, for example, the critique of the ICRC in the face of the Holocaust. See Jean-Claude Favez, *The Red Cross and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Proponents of this approach, like David Rieff, believe that the impartial and neutral delivery of aid is the most effective way to create a protective “humanitarian space” to serve the immediate and urgent needs of the displaced. Advocacy, long-term strategies for development, advanced educational projects and attention to the rights of refugees are seen as political and thus in violation of humanitarianism’s sacred principles.¹²⁹

Adherence to a position of strict neutrality and independence became increasingly difficult to maintain following the end of the cold war. In the 1990s, an increasing number of “complex humanitarian emergencies” broke out around the world. The experiences of Somalia, Bosnia, Rwanda and other—largely intra-state—conflicts, challenged the traditional approach by many in the humanitarian community.¹³⁰ For some aid agencies, the apolitical delivery of immediate relief was no longer enough. While seeking to uphold the ideal of the “humanitarian space,” many NGOs have adopted a “comprehensive peacebuilding” and rights-based approach. According to Michael

¹²⁹ Rieff explains this position in his book *A Bed for the Night*. In her book *Do No Harm*, Mary Andersen challenges this traditional approach by highlighting the responsibility of humanitarian organizations to develop strategies that minimize and avoid unintended consequences in their aid delivery. Ultimately, however, like the traditional approach of the ICRC, Andersen’s approach remains focused on providing relief to the immediate needs of refugees. See David Rieff, *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002); Mary B. Anderson, *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace-or War* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999). For an analysis of these approaches, see Michael N. Barnett and Jack Snyder, “The Grand Strategies of Humanitarianism,” in *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics*, ed. Michael N. Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss (Ithaca: Cornell University, 2008), 143–71.

¹³⁰ Already in 1971, a group of French doctors working in Biafra, during the Nigerian Civil War, “chose to step away from the classical ICRC approach” of a ‘silent neutrality’” when they established Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF). From its beginnings, MSF’s approach includes witnessing (*témoignage*) and speaking out on behalf of the rights of refugees—something that the ICRC refuses to do. While this approach goes beyond the classical approach, it does not go as far as JRS and other NGOs in adopting a comprehensive peacebuilding approach. Joelle Tanguy and Fiona Terry, “Humanitarian Responsibility and Committed Action: Response to ‘Principles, Politics, and Humanitarian Action’,” *Ethics & International Affairs* 13, no. 1 (1999): 31, doi:10.1111/j.1747-7093.1999.tb00324.x.

Barnett and Jack Snyder, this differs from classic humanitarianism as it seeks to “address not only symptoms but also causes.”¹³¹

Within this context of what Barnett and Thomas Weiss describe as “contested humanitarianism,” the approach of JRS, clearly favors the second position. Inspired by the mission of serving faith through the promotion of justice, five features characterize JRS’s work as a transnational NGO.¹³² First and foremost, JRS national and international actions are rooted in the accompaniment of refugee women and men. The proximity to the reality of the displaced gives meaning and direction to the issues taken up by the organization at the national and international level. Such a perspective gives JRS’s advocacy and research a certain sense of legitimacy that may be lacking in some other larger humanitarian organizations.

According to Dardis the “most valuable asset” of JRS “is not large-scale logistics or huge funding campaigns. What is most valuable about JRS is our on-the-ground contact with people in the most remote areas.”¹³³ As with many other faith-based humanitarian NGOs, JRS has a robust network of Catholic and Jesuit partners in communities around the world. Such long-term relationships with local communities connected together in global networks, according to Elizabeth Ferris, give faith-based NGOs a clear advantage over other humanitarian actors.¹³⁴ In addition to opening doors

¹³¹ Barnett and Snyder, “The Grand Strategies of Humanitarianism,” 150.

¹³² Michael N Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, “Humanitarianism: A Brief History of the Present,” in *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics* (Ithaca: Cornell University, 2008), 8. See also Michael N. Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread*, Global Institutions 51 (Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011).

¹³³ Dardis, “Showing Love and Care to Those Most in Need,” 260.

¹³⁴ Ferris, “Faith and Humanitarianism: It’s Complicated,” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24, no. 3 (2011): 617.

for operational activities, these connections help to keep NGOs grounded and accountable to the people that they serve.

JRS's style of accompaniment and its commitment to listening to refugees serves as a mark of credibility for JRS lobbying and campaigning. For Bloch, who was involved in the advocacy work of the organization, the presence of JRS in Geneva only makes sense or has meaning when it is rooted in the work of JRS in the field, "[o]therwise, how can one even begin to think we are bringing the voices to Geneva? Only when you have listened to the refugees can you begin to imagine what their lives are like. These are the experiences I can bring back to the decision-makers."¹³⁵

Second, JRS's approach involves working with refugees to claim their rights, voice their own concerns and become their own advocates. This approach supports the UNHCR's *Agenda for Protection*'s call to enable refugees "to participate in the design and development" of policies affecting them.¹³⁶ JRS believes that it is essential to see "refugees as subjects rather than objects" in the humanitarian space.¹³⁷ An approach to the refugee crisis through the lens of justice demands that refugees are engaged as active participants rather than passive recipients. This, as Barbara Harrell-Bond and others have underscored, is not easy given the culture of disempowerment that refugees face. Far too often, refugees "are symbolically disempowered through becoming clients of those upon

¹³⁵ Bloch, "Voices of Refugees in Geneva," 283.

¹³⁶ "In JRS, advocacy involves empowering forcibly displaced people to claim the rights to which they are entitled, and assisting them to exercise those rights." Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*, 3.

¹³⁷ Orobator, "Key Ethical Issues in the Practices and Policies of Refugee-Serving NGOs and Churches," 237–238.

whom they are dependent for the means of survival and security.”¹³⁸ JRS works to counter these trends passivity and dependency by empowering refugees to communicate their concerns directly to those in positions of power and to find opportunities through education, training and employment to strengthen effective refugee participation.

Third, JRS’s advocacy and research also involves working to uncover and raise awareness to the underlying issues of displacement. According to Ferris, faith-based humanitarian NGOs have an advantage over their secular counterparts with their developed tradition of approaching their work through the lens of justice. The shift from a narrow approach to charity to one that includes justice, according to Ferris, took place among many faith based organizations in the 1960s decades before it “gained prominence in the secular world.”¹³⁹

For JRS, the justice approach to its work is a clear dimension of its mission. Attention to the “root causes of the refugee problem so that preventative action can be taken” has been one of the goals of the organization since Arrupe first outlined his objectives for the network in 1980.¹⁴⁰ As Kolvenbach put it in his review of JRS, Jesuits working in the camps have become convinced that “*the best service one can offer a refugee is the opportunity to stay at home.*”¹⁴¹ This motivates JRS to engage in “solid research” and to share that research with other involved in the humanitarian regime as well as with those in wider public.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ Barbara E. Harrell-Bond, “Can Humanitarian Work with Refugees Be Humane?,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (2002): 55. Bond presents an important analysis about the power dynamics among aid workers, NGOs, governments, and refugees.

¹³⁹ Ferris, “Faith and Humanitarianism: It’s Complicated,” 618.

¹⁴⁰ Arrupe, “The Society of Jesus and the Refugee Problem,” 29.

¹⁴¹ Kolvenbach, “Review of the Jesuit Refugee Service,” 52.

¹⁴² Valcárcel and Vella, *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*, 3.

Finally, JRS's work as an NGO is aimed at discovering and supporting durable solutions for refugees. Aware of the dangers of a culture of aid-dependency, JRS works to find permanent solutions for refugees. Practically, as is recently the case with the presence of JRS in South Sudan, this will involve ending or transitioning projects to other agencies when there is no longer a pressing need among displaced persons.

III. JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE AND THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

Inspired and guided by the mission of the Society of Jesus in the service of faith and promotion of justice, the Jesuit Refugee Service responds to the reality of forced displacement as an international NGO by addressing both its symptoms and root causes. As with the case of IMCS-Pax Romana, the study of JRS raises a question about the missiological and ecclesiological significance of the organization. In other words, what is the relationship between the actions of JRS as an NGO and the mission of the church?

While it has considered the possibility of becoming an independent agency, JRS has decided to remain dependent upon the mission of the Society. According to the *Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Rite*, approved in 2003, JRS is recognized by the Roman Catholic Church as “an apostolic work of the Society of Jesus, dependent on the Society’s General Curia, established by the Superior General of the Society of Jesus.”¹⁴³ Unlike IMCS-Pax Romana, JRS possesses a public juridical personality under *Canon Law*, which enables it to teach, speak, and act “in the name of the Church.”¹⁴⁴ As

¹⁴³ “The Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Rite,” Art. 1.

¹⁴⁴ *Code of Canon Law*, Can. 301.

an apostolic work of the Society, JRS reports directly to the Jesuit superior general who oversees its relationship to the mission of the church.

In 2005, a “joint letter” between the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life and the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People to the leadership of congregations of vowed women and men stressed the important role played by religious in the pastoral commitment to refugees.¹⁴⁵ Though there is little contention over the place of JRS’s pastoral and charitable services within the mission of the church, this is not the case for JRS’s direct advocacy work and commitments in the promotion of justice.

A. Areas of Resistance to JRS Action for Justice

As highlighted by Chapter Two, not all in the church have welcomed the newfound commitments to justice adopted by communities of vowed religious. Appealing to some elements of the council’s teachings, some in the church have argued that the role of religious, in particular priests, should be primarily in the pastoral, spiritual and charitable fields. The direct action for social transformation is understood by some in the church to be the purview of the laity as citizens and not religious or church communities. Even within the Society of Jesus itself, there has been resistance to the strong identification of justice with mission as articulated by the 32nd General Congregation and cited at the very beginning of the JRS Charter.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁵ Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People and Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, *Joint Letter to the Superiors General of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life*, 2005, www.ofmcap.org/doc/migrantes-en.pdf.

¹⁴⁶ Martin R. Tripole, *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective* (Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), 19. In the 1970s, conflicts emerged in certain Jesuit communities over the implementation

In the late 1980s, Avery Dulles, for instance, expressed concern that the definition of the Jesuit mission put forth by GC 32 would overshadow and diminish the more fundamental spiritual mission of the Society and the role of Jesuits both as scholars and as priests. For Dulles, *Decree 4* represents a reactionary text with multiple defects given its style, lack of precision on terminology and multiple authors. Without denying the role of the social apostolate, Dulles warns against an “apostolate too narrowly focused on social change.”¹⁴⁷

In his 1994 book, *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective*, the American Jesuit Martin Tripole offers one of the most extensive critiques of GC 32s formulation of the Society’s mission. For him, the promotion of justice had been “*raised by GC32 to an inappropriate level of foundational mission principle.*”¹⁴⁸ The promotion of justice, he argues, may be a legitimate response to the charisma of St. Ignatius today, but it does not define the Jesuit mission and must not overshadow, what he sees as, the more fundamental task of serving faith. Throughout his work, Tripole identifies three main problems with GC 32’s formulation of the Jesuit mission and the broader attention given to justice within the church following the 1971 Synod of Bishops.

First, according to Tripole, to make justice—or “any temporal ministry”—“the integrating factor for all other ministries is to usurp the priority that should be given only to evangelization in its first sense.”¹⁴⁹ In other words, the strong focus on justice as a

of *Decree 4*. These were particularly painful in those places where elite Jesuit educational institutions were transformed in light of the new commitments to justice.

¹⁴⁷ Avery Dulles, “Faith, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission,” in *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education* (Washington, DC: Jesuit Conference, 1990), 23. See also the response. David Hollenbach, “Faith, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission: A Response to Avery Dulles,” in *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education* (Washington, DC: Jesuit Conference, 1990), 26–29.

¹⁴⁸ Tripole, *Faith Beyond Justice*, 23.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

temporal task overshadows the deeper more fundamental spiritual mission of the society. Furthermore, the commitment to justice emerging from GC 32, he believes, is “too narrowly focused on human justice” and therefore fails to address key issues related to truth, charity and faith.¹⁵⁰ The mission of the Society and by extension its institutions, is first and foremost spiritual.

Second, Tripole, like Dulles, is concerned that GC 32’s focus on justice “risks undermining the legitimacy of traditionally important apostolates in the Society (such as education).”¹⁵¹ He is particularly concerned that the focus on justice will displace ministries that may not have a clear social focus such as teaching math and pastoral work in developed countries.

Finally, Martin Tripole argues that the concern for the promotion of justice may entail a “confusion” of the Jesuit priestly identity. The primary focus of the Jesuit priest, and Society as a whole, he argues, should be the proclamation of the gospel, which does involve “the promotion of justice in *some sense*.” This action, he admits, may on some occasions extend “to *direct* and concrete efforts.” The direct social engagement, however, is primarily the realm of the lay faithful and not the work of ordained priests.¹⁵²

In this regard, Tripole shares the concerns raised by several Vatican officials over the implementation of GC 32 and the role of Jesuits in political action. Following GC 32, the new formulation of mission and its reception among Jesuits around the world contributed to the tensions between the Society and Pope John Paul II. As we saw in Chapter Two, both John Paul II and Pope Benedict have expressed concerns over the

¹⁵⁰ See *ibid.*, 31–31.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 76. Emphasis added.

direct action for justice by the church. Both have been particularly concerned with the formal engagement of priests and religious in social and political life.¹⁵³

In his often-quoted 1980 address to an ordination ceremony in Rio de Janeiro, John Paul II laid out his understanding of the role of priests in relation to social questions. Against the backdrop of liberation theology, the pope clarified the primarily spiritual role offered by priests:

Let it be quite clear that priestly service, if it is true to itself, is a service that is essentially and par excellence spiritual. This should be emphasized today against manifold tendencies to secularize priestly service, to reduce it to a merely philanthropic function. The priest's service is not that of a doctor, a social worker, a politician or a trade unionist. A priest might give such services in certain cases, but only in a supplementary way. Once priests gave such services in an outstanding manner. But today they are provided adequately by other members of society; ours is being ever more clearly specified as a spiritual service. The priest has his essential function to perform in the field of souls, of their relations with God and their interior relations with their fellows. It is there that he has to accomplish his assistance to mankind of our time. He will do so through works of charity and in defense of justice. Yet, as I said, this is after all a secondary service. It should never be allowed to cause sight to be lost of the main service, which is that of aiding souls to discover the Father, to open up to him and to love him above all.¹⁵⁴

Two years later, in his address to the Jesuit provincials, in the midst of the crisis following Arrupe's stroke, the pope cites at length this section from his Rio address and further attempts to clarify the mission of the Society in the service of faith by emphasizing that "the role of priests and religious is different" from that of the laity.¹⁵⁵ The Society of Jesus as a congregation of religious priests and brothers, he argues, must focus primarily on the care of spiritual life and not human justice.

¹⁵³ In the late 1970s and 1980s, the Vatican cracked down on priests, such as the American Jesuit Robert Drinan, who were elected to public office.

¹⁵⁴ John Paul II, "Who Is the Priest? Remarks of Pope John Paul II During Ordination Ceremonies in Rio De Janeiro," *Origins* 10, no. 9 (July 31, 1980).

¹⁵⁵ John Paul II, "Allocution to the Jesuit Provincials" (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1982), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1982/february/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19820227_provinciali-gesu_it.html.

More recently, these same reservations were expressed in the context of the 35th General Congregation in the homily of Cardinal Franc Rodé at the opening Mass and in the letter addressed by Pope Benedict XVI. In his letter, the pope urged the delegates to clarify and stay true to the *Spiritual Exercises* and the fundamental spiritual dimensions of the charism of St. Ignatius within the context of the church's mission of evangelization.¹⁵⁶ In his address at the audience with the members of GC 35 several weeks later, the pope again urged the society to stay true to its founding purpose of defending and propagating the faith. Though he cites and affirms the importance of Jesuit work and service to refugees, the Jesuit commitment to justice is never mentioned explicitly.¹⁵⁷

Indeed, as the first two chapters have shown, Pope Benedict's instructions on the role of Catholic humanitarian groups in *Deus Caritas Est* and other documents leave little room for these organizations to be directly engaged in collective action for justice. Charitable and humanitarian organizations, according to the 2005 encyclical, should be concerned with offering a "simple response to the immediate needs and specific situations" in a way that is independent from political strategy.¹⁵⁸ No explicit mention is made of the challenge of addressing the root causes of suffering.

In 2011, Pope Benedict XVI's *motu proprio* "On the Service of Charity" reiterated many of these same themes as it addresses the ecclesial identity of Catholic humanitarian organizations, including those sponsored by religious congregations such as

¹⁵⁶ See Benedict XVI, "Letter of Pope Benedict XVI to Father General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, SJ (January 19, 2008)," in *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009), 809–12.

¹⁵⁷ Benedict XVI, "Address of Pope Benedict XVI to the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (February 21, 2008)."

¹⁵⁸ Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, no. 31 See also 29.

JRS.¹⁵⁹ Taking the same line as *Deus Caritas Est*, the pope's letter limits the political role of Catholic charitable institutions as it outlines more explicit lines of accountability of charitable services to hierarchical structures. Charitable agencies of the church should be better ordered to the authority of local bishops, the text instructs, since they have the "primary responsibility for carrying out" the service of charity in their particular churches.¹⁶⁰ Bishops are encouraged to support charitable efforts throughout the church and are instructed to be sure that the agency and their sources of funding conform to Catholic teaching. Here again, there is no explicit mention of justice in society and the role of charitable agencies in addressing the root causes of suffering.

B. JRS and the Church's Mission With Migrants

While there is resistance to Jesuit action for justice in some magisterial texts and statements, other official teachings implicitly and explicitly support the efforts of Catholic organizations, like JRS, to address both the symptoms and the root causes of suffering. As detailed in Chapter Two, the social and missiological teachings of Paul VI and the 1971 Synod of Bishops, among others, encourage the attention to justice and structural changes as embodied by JRS and other NGOs.

Support for JRS's public social engagement on behalf of migrants is clearly evident in the well-established tradition of the church to care for migrants. Rooted in biblical ethics, the Christian community has long recognized its obligations to welcome

¹⁵⁹ Benedict XVI, "*Motu Proprio*" *On the Service of Charity* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012), Art. 1 §4, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20121111_caritas_en.html.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Introduction.

and care for the foreigner and migrant. JRS's threefold mission to accompany, serve and defend the rights of refugees, as indicated earlier, is squarely rooted in this tradition.

Importantly, in its modern teachings on pastoral care for refugees, the Catholic church has consistently stressed that charity and hospitality alone are not enough. Instead, the primary texts of the Vatican concerning the service to refugees have advocated a rights-based approach that also addresses the root causes of migration. Concerns for addressing the injustices and structural inequalities that lie behind these phenomena can be seen in several key Vatican documents. The 1983 document, *Towards a Pastoral Care of Refugees*, by the Pontifical Commission for the Spiritual Care of Migrants and Itinerants calls upon the church and the international community to address the causes and the effects of the refugee problem.

Highlighting the specific contributions of international Catholic organizations, the text affirms the role of the church in both pastoral service and social action.¹⁶¹ Drawing from Pope Paul VI's 1969 *motu proprio De Pastoralis Migratorum Cura*, the Pontifical Commission affirms the role of the church in both pastoral care and efforts to promote the human rights of refugees by "supplying information" and "campaigning for adequate legal measures."¹⁶²

Nearly a decade later, in 1992, the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People and the Pontifical Council "Cor Unum" issued a joint statement on *Refugees: A Challenge to Solidarity*. As with other texts from the Vatican

¹⁶¹ Pontifical Commission for the Spiritual Care of Migrants and Itinerants, *Towards a Pastoral Care of Refugees* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983), no. 7, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_pc_migrants_doc_19830214_refu_past-care_en.html#_ftnref11.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, no. 14. See also Paul VI, *Motu Proprio De Pastoralis Migratorum Cura* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1969), no. 5, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19690815_pastoralis-migratorum-cura_lt.html.

concerning refugees, the statement adopts a rights-based approach to the crisis of forced displacement and urges action on the part of Christians and Church institutions. The reality of suffering that accompanies forced displacement, as the text suggests, is not simply a question of charity whereby the social and pastoral needs of refugees are met after they cross the border. On the contrary, concerns for the plight of refugees must also include attention to the structural inequalities and human rights violations that drive the phenomenon: “The problem of refugees must be confronted at its roots, that is, at the level of the very causes of exile.”¹⁶³

Echoing the teachings of John Paul II in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, the statement calls for greater solidarity as a way to address both the underlying divisions of the crisis and the humanitarian needs of refugees in the world. In the midst of these divisions and sufferings, the church is called itself to be an agent of solidarity. The text highlights different levels of the church’s engagement including the local church, parishes, chaplains working with refugees, volunteers, ecumenical groups and inter-religious organizations. International Catholic organizations and international religious congregations are specifically named. The church, the document stresses, has a responsibility as part of its evangelical mission, to serve the needs of refugees through both works of justice and charity:

She is called on to incarnate the demands of the Gospel, reaching out without distinction towards these people in their moment of need and solitude. Her task takes on various forms: personal contact; defense of the rights of individuals and groups; the denunciation of the injustices that are at the root of this evil; action for the adoption of laws that will guarantee their effective protection; education

¹⁶³ Pontifical Council “Cor Unum” and Pontifical Council For The Pastoral Care Of Migrants And Itinerant People, *Refugees: A Challenge To Solidarity* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992), no. 9, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_pc_migrants_doc_19920625_refugees_en.html.

against xenophobia; the creations of groups of volunteers and of emergency funds; pastoral care...

Here, the Vatican dicasteries concerned with migration and charitable service explicitly highlight the duty of the church and church institutions to act for justice and the promotion of human rights in their service of people who have been displaced.¹⁶⁴ The themes addressed by the 1992 text are developed upon in the 2004 instruction, *Erga Migrantes Caritas Christi*, issued by the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People.

The instruction begins with a brief theological reflection that situates the reality of forced and voluntary migration within salvation history by recalling the experiences of Abraham, Jacob, the Holy Family and others. The church, as a pilgrim people is described as having a special mission to care for migrants:

In migrants the Church has always contemplated the image of Christ who said, “I was a stranger and you made me welcome” (*Mt 25:35*). Their condition is, therefore, a challenge to the faith and love of believers, who are called on to heal the evils caused by migration and discover the plan God pursues through it even when caused by obvious injustices.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ This rights based approach to the reality of forced displacement is perhaps most explicit in the 2000 Jubilee Charter of Rights of Displaced People. Written by a working group of refugees, charitable organizations, including JRS and Vatican officials, the charter supports international human rights instruments concerning refugees and enumerates sixteen rights concerning refugees that ought to be protected. As with other texts produced by the Vatican, the charter also calls upon the international community to “commit itself [to] put an end to those activities that by their nature produce crises of refugees.” Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People, *Jubilee Charter of Rights of Displaced People* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_pc_migrants_doc_20000601_refu_jub-charter_en.html.

¹⁶⁵ Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People, *Erga Migrantes Caritas Christi* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004), no. 12. See also nos. 12–23, 97, and 102, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_pc_migrants_doc_20040514_erga-migrantes-caritas-christi_en.html.

Migrants, the text stress, in all their diverse forms present both an opportunity and a challenge. Positively, migrants can help witness both to the catholicity of the church as well as the diversity and unity of the human race. At the same time, migrants also, reflect injustice and social divisions that the instruction calls upon the church to also address: “the inequalities and disparities behind this suffering. They are thus an urgent appeal for a true fraternity.”¹⁶⁶

The church’s engagement in bringing about such a true fraternity, is not only in the field of charity, education, and pastoral care. The text recalls the efforts of the magisterium in denouncing “social and economic imbalances” and in promoting “policies that effectively guarantee the rights of all migrants.”¹⁶⁷

While the church’s response certainly includes efforts of pastoral care and accompaniment it also, as the text suggests, involves efforts at bringing about structural justice. A “new international economic order for a more equitable distribution of the goods of the earth” is needed to help prevent the suffering that leads to forced migration in the first place.¹⁶⁸

In laying out the norms for the church’s response to the reality of migration and the social divisions behind it, *Egra Migrantes Caritas Christi* highlights the responsibilities of different levels of church bodies in this effort. Religious congregations and international Catholic organizations such as the International Catholic Migration

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., no. 12.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., nos. 29–30. See also no. 36.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., no. 8.

Commission and Caritas Internationals are again cited explicitly as having an important role to play and religious congregations.¹⁶⁹

Religious, the instruction writes, play an important role in the in the care of migrants, especially those communities with a missionary vocation. The instruction offers an “urgent invitation” to all religious communities to consider the plight of migrants and increase their work with them.¹⁷⁰ Here, the instruction’s teaching on the role of religious in the service of migrants follows a joint letter from 1987 between the Pontifical Congregation for the Religious and Secular Institutes and the Pontifical Commission for the Pastoral Care of Migration and Tourism.

In 2005 following the publication of *Egra Migrantes Caritas Christi*, the two dicasteries issued a second “Joint Letter to the Superior General of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life.” Developing themes contained in the instruction, the letter again highlights the needs of not only pastoral care and charity but also justice:

Aware that the Kingdom of God expresses itself towards the human reality and builds up itself from and in that reality, consecrated persons are called to welcome the values that characterize the life of migrants and which constitute their own contribution to the solidarity of all peoples and to the universal brotherhood: the aspirations to dignity, participation and justice.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., no. 33.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., no. 83.

¹⁷¹ Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People and Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, *Joint Letter to the Superiors General of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life*, no. 2.

C. JRS's Work for Justice as Rooted in the JRS Jesuit Mission and Ignatian Charism

Despite these areas of resistance from both inside and outside the church, JRS has continuously reaffirmed the role of justice within its apostolic mission as a Jesuit and Ignatian work. This commitment finds support and theological warrants in the decrees of last general congregation of the Society of Jesus. Highlights its work in more than one decree, GC 35 supports the justice focus of JRS in several important ways.

i. To be Jesuit is to Serve Faith and Promote Justice

First, the congregation, as indicated above, reaffirms the definition of the Jesuit mission as articulated by *Decree 4* of GC 32.¹⁷² In its first decree, issued as a response to Pope Benedict's invitation for the Society to renew its mission, GC 35 stresses that the "service of faith and the promotion of justice must be kept united."¹⁷³ The indissoluble relationship between justice and faith is also stressed in the congregation's second and third decrees. This faith-justice dynamic is described here as being "at the heart" of the Jesuit mission and charism.¹⁷⁴

GC 35 describes the Jesuit charism and "way of proceeding" as a creative process of discerning between several polarities that define what it means to be Jesuit: "[b]eing and doing; contemplation and action; prayer and prophetic living; being completely united with Christ and completely inserted into the world with him as an apostolic body."¹⁷⁵ Such a vision supports the holistic approach to mission outlined in Chapter Two. Mission, as seen in an integral perspective, involves both horizontal and vertical

¹⁷² "The mission of the Society of Jesus today is the service of faith, of which the promotion of justice is an absolute requirement." General Congregation 32, *Decree 4*, no. 2.

¹⁷³ General Congregation 35, *Decree 1*, no. 6.

¹⁷⁴ General Congregation 35, *Decree 2*, no. 15; See also General Congregation 35, *Decree 3*, no. 2.

¹⁷⁵ General Congregation 35, *Decree 2*, no. 9.

dimensions. It means offering response to the different forms of “thirsts” and “poverties” that afflict humanity.¹⁷⁶ Maintaining an integral approach to mission, as the congregation suggests, is not easy but it is an essential aspect of being a companion of Jesus. In the words of *Decree 2*, this integral approach to mission involves paying attention to all dimensions of the human person and takes on different forms in different contexts:

Following Jesus, we feel ourselves called not only to bring direct help to people in distress, but also to restore entire human persons in their integrity, reintegrating them in community and reconciling them with God. This frequently calls for an engagement that is long term, be it in the education of youth, in the spiritual accompaniment of the Exercises, in intellectual research, or in the service of refugees.¹⁷⁷

Such an approach to mission supports the operational efforts of JRS to meet the immediate needs of refugees and its longer term commitments in research and advocacy that seeks to find structural solutions to the problems relating to displacement today. In this JRS is challenged to continue to focus on the holistic service to the refugees in a way that takes into account their social, physical, and spiritual needs. In other words, the care of JRS for refugees cannot be limited only to their spiritual needs. It must also take into account and seek to address their social needs and root causes of forced displacement.

ii. The Mission of Reconciliation Calls for Justice and Advocacy

Locating its mission within the contexts of the present global reality, GC 35 speaks to the “great potential” of the Society’s mission to transform “a fragmented and divided world.”¹⁷⁸ Local action without any coordination is no longer enough to address

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 12–13.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 13.

¹⁷⁸ General Congregation 35, *Decree 3*, no. 43.

the multifaceted problems that divide people across the world. As a global body, the Jesuits highlight their potential and responsibility to restore right relationships.

Of particular concern for *Decree 3* of GC 35 is the challenge of reconciliation. Jesuits, the congregation stresses, are called upon to offer an apostolic response that is not afraid to go “to the frontiers” and to be in solidarity with the marginalized in a spirit of mission. Here, JRS is mentioned as an important expression of this task. Importantly for JRS, the Jesuit “apostolic mandate” to reconciliation involves acting for justice, discerning the root causes of social division and a style of advocacy that brings forth right relationships:¹⁷⁹

The complexity of the problems we face and the richness of the opportunities we are offered demand that we build bridges between rich and poor, establishing advocacy links of mutual support between those who hold political power and those who find it difficult to voice their interests.¹⁸⁰

iii. Participating in the Jesuit Mission

GC 35’s sixth decree, “Collaboration at the Heart of Mission,” situates the work of JRS within the broader mission of the Society to serve faith, promote justice and restore right relationships in the world. *Decree 6* constructively lays out what it means for a work to be called Ignatian or Jesuit. According to the decree, an Ignatian work is one that is related to the spirituality and charism of St. Ignatius and the *Spiritual Exercises*. More concretely, a work can be considered Ignatian “when it intentionally *seeks God in all things*; when it practices Ignatian discernment; when it engages the world through a careful analysis of context, in dialogue with experience, evaluated through reflection for

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., no. 12.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., no. 28.

the sake of action.”¹⁸¹ Ignatian works can operate regardless of the participation of vowed Jesuits.

A Jesuit work, by contrast, is an Ignatian works that possesses “a clear and definitive relationship with the Society of Jesus.” To be considered Jesuit, such works must also have a mission that aligns with that of the Society by “a commitment to a faith that does justice through interreligious dialogue and a creative engagement with culture.”¹⁸² Such works have close ties to the structures of the Society and are ultimately accountable to the Father General.

Unlike other communities of vowed religious, the Jesuits have not sought any official NGO status with an intergovernmental agency directly. In addition to JRS, several other Ignatian and Jesuit works are formally engaged in global civil society through different levels of NGO status. These include Jesuit social centers (Center of Concern, Indian Social Institute); development related agencies and networks (Fe y Alegria; Jesuit European Office; International Jesuit Network for Development); a lay ICO linked to the Society (World Christian Life Community) and umbrella NGOs where Jesuit entities play a critical role (World Organization of Former Students of Catholic Education; Africa Faith and Justice Network). Additionally, several congregations of vowed women with Ignatian charisms actively promote justice as transnational NGOs. In contrast to some other NGOs related to the Society, JRS has resisted the temptation of becoming an “agency” separate from the Society and has maintained “its identity as a Church institution ... [that is] part of the apostolic mission of the Society.”¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ General Congregation 35, *Decree 6*, no. 9.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, no. 10.

¹⁸³ Villanueva, “The Jesuit Way of Going Global,” 71.

For JRS, as a Jesuit apostolic work deeply shaped by the mission of the Society as recently elucidated by GC 35, any approach to the humanitarian crisis that does not take into account the demands of justice and reconciliation is insufficient. Despite the questions raised about the legitimacy of action for justice by an NGO sponsored by a congregation of vowed priests and brothers, JRS, like the Society as a whole, has continued to insist on the integrated relationship between its mission and justice. Fr. Kolvenbach summarizes the value of justice within the work of JRS well in a 2006 address:

the Church discovered only very slowly that charity is not sufficient if there is no justice. What has to be done by JRS is not just charity but also justice. If you really love, you will do justice. You will not do justice out of justice, but out of love... One can say charity just to do something but it is very clear all these people have their rights which need to be attended to. They have the right to go back to their country. They have the right to join in a just society. JRS is called to help do this, not out of legal or juridical motivations but out of Christian love.¹⁸⁴

CONCLUSION

As the second case study in this project, this chapter has examined one of the most active NGOs sponsored by a congregation of vowed religious. For over thirty years, JRS has sought to live out the Jesuit commitment of serving faith and promoting justice among the forcibly displaced around the world. In its first section, this chapter examined JRS's threefold mission of accompanying, serving, and defending the rights of refugees and the relationship of that mission to the broader mission of the Society in the wake of Vatican II. After examining how this mission is put into action through the operational,

¹⁸⁴ Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, "Address" (presented at the Jesuit Refugee Service International Meeting, Santa Severa, Italy, 2006). Quoted in Orobator, "Key Ethical Issues in the Practices and Policies of Refugee-Serving NGOs and Churches," 240. See also the address of Kolvenbach to the JRS leadership the previous year where he refutes

research and advocacy work of JRS, this chapter addressed the relationship between the actions of the organization and the mission of the church.

As a Jesuit apostolic work, JRS clearly understands itself as participating in the mission of the Society and the church as a whole. Inspired by the holistic vision of the Second Vatican Council and the teachings of the post-conciliar general congregations, JRS sees justice as an essential element in order for it to be truly Jesuit and truly Catholic. Its priestly and humanitarian service of refugees, in other words, cannot end only with charity and pastoral work, as might be inferred by some church texts and some traditional understandings of humanitarian aid. Rather, the service and accompaniment of refugees calls for action and advocacy to address the root causes of forced migration, the need for reconciliation, and the rights of the refugees themselves.

The articulation of mission put forth by the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus is critically important in understanding the place of Jesuit Refugee Service both within the mission of the Society and the church as a whole. While a small minority of Jesuits have echoed the concerns of some church authorities about the dangers of horizontalism and the loss of the community's spiritual and priestly identity, the majority of Jesuits, as recently affirmed at GC 35, see action for justice as integral to their apostolic mission in the world.

As a case study, the Jesuit Refugee Service is representative of questions facing other transnational Catholic NGOs. As with other Catholic humanitarian and development agencies, such as Caritas and CIDSE, JRS is challenged to find ways to promote justice in a humanitarian and ecclesial space where such concerns are not always welcome in the service of refugees. At the same time, JRS is also representative of many

trends and developments that have taken place within other communities of vowed religious women and men who, inspired by the Second Vatican Council and the 1971 Synod, established transnational NGOs and leadership positions within their congregations to promote and act for justice. In the previous chapter, this project examined a very different set of organizations by looking at an international Catholic (lay) organization. For both groups of organizations, their engagement for the global common good is deeply rooted in their reception of the council's missiology, ecclesiology, and ethics. The articulation of mission offered by the 1971 Synod, in particular, has had a profound impact on the self-understanding of both groups. In its final chapter, this project will continue to draw upon the insights of these two case studies to examine what it might mean to say that these and other Catholic organizations participate in the mission of the church through their actions for justice.

Part Three:
Conclusions

Chapter Five: The Theological Significance of Catholic NGOs

Inspired by the holistic vision of mission put forth by the Second Vatican Council, Catholic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) contribute in an increasingly self-conscious way to the promotion of the common good locally, nationally, and globally. The study of these organizations and their relationship to the church raises important questions regarding the theological significance of their structures and public engagement. Thus far, this project has addressed these issues by placing theories concerning NGO engagement for social transformation into constructive dialogue with the experiences and theological visions of Catholic organizations themselves.

In part one, this dissertation examined the global context in which these actors are operative and the theological and missiological roots of Catholic NGO action. Chapter One presented an overview of NGO public engagement by outlining three analytical frameworks that address the growing influence of NGOs in global politics. As “middle-range actors” between the local and the global, as participants in the “third UN,” and as agents of multi-track diplomacy, Catholic NGOs and other non-state actors, as the chapter noted, are playing increasingly important roles in influencing global public debates. These and other faith-based organizations are helping to challenge what J. Bryan Hehir calls the “double legacy” of the Peace of Westphalia.¹ In addition to questioning claims of absolute state sovereignty, these agents are also leading observers to rethink those theories of secularization that envision or promote no constructive place for religious actors in public life.

¹ Hehir, “Overview,” 13.

Chapter Two outlined the holistic vision of mission as articulated by the Second Vatican Council and the subsequent modes of reception of this vision in official Catholic teaching. While all who recognize the legitimacy of Vatican II must accept the importance of social concerns in relation to the mission of the church, questions still remain as to the exact nature of church structures acting for justice and social transformation.

In its second section, this dissertation placed the political and theological theories outlined above into constructive dialogue with the praxis and experience of two different case studies. The study of these two distinct organizations – the International Movement of Catholic Students-Pax Romana (Chapter Three) and the Jesuit Refugee Service (Chapter Four) – helps to illuminate experiences shared by other Catholic NGOs. IMCS-Pax Romana is broadly representative of those membership-based organizations of the laity once recognized as international Catholic organizations. Its experience is particularly reflective of the other nine movements of specialized Catholic action. JRS reflects experiences shared by similar NGOs associated with religious congregations and, to a different degree, other Catholic development and relief organizations. The lived realities and specific missions of these case studies help clarify the integral relationship between collective action for justice and the mission of the church.

After examining the theory underlying Catholic NGO engagement and the specific experiences of representative case studies, what conclusions may be drawn about the relationship between the actions of these organizations and the mission of the church? Further, is there anything that can be learned from a more robust theological perspective that could guide the organizations as they seek to live out their mission in the world?

In response to the above questions, this chapter will seek to offer constructive conclusions as a way of illuminating the theological dimensions of Catholic NGO action. To this end, I will outline the missiological, pneumatological and ethical conclusions that surface from this study. It is my hope that these conclusions will not only draw more scholarly attention to these questions but that they will also assist NGOs in developing a more effective and ethical response to suffering and injustice in the world.

I. CATHOLIC NGOS AND THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

1. In their collective action for justice and social transformation, Catholic nongovernmental organizations participate in the mission of the church.

The first set of conclusions that can be drawn from the study of Catholic NGOs and the mission of the church are missiological and ecclesiological. Throughout this project, the underlying question has been how, if at all, do Catholic NGOs participate in the mission of the church as they engage in public action for the global common good?

Responses to this question within the Catholic tradition, as shown in the previous chapters, have at times been ambiguous and even contentious. Chapter Two outlined the differing and somewhat conflicting readings of the conciliar vision of mission and the exact nature of the relationship between mission and social action. While issues of social justice are addressed seriously by the magisterium throughout the post-conciliar period, there are disagreements as to how exactly these teachings should be put into practice. Some recent magisterial texts, for example, are cautious of those expressions of justice that overlook the spiritual dimension of the church's mission—pejoratively termed

horizontalism. Reflecting these concerns, *Redemptoris Missio*, *Deus Caritas Est*, and *Africae Munus* downplay the ecclesial status of collective action for justice. Reflecting a deductive ecclesiology with some elements of the earlier distinction of planes model, these texts argue that it is not the role of the church to be *directly* engaged in the pursuit of justice and social transformation. Rather, the proper role of the church and church structures is more *indirect* as it seeks to educate lay citizens as individuals and to enlighten and inspire them as agents in the ethical engagement of society. Although this question was debated among the participants at the recent 2012 Synod on the New Evangelization, the official texts from the synod appear to support this more limited vision of the church's indirect role in society.

This narrow approach to the role of action for justice and mission comes into conflict with other magisterial teachings and with the self-understanding of Catholic NGOs themselves. For the two NGOs highlighted in this project, public engagement for justice and social transformation is deeply related to their specific ecclesial missions, spiritualities and identities. Representing two very different types of organizations, each case study relates to this question in a different way. As with most of the other formerly recognized ICOs, IMCS-Pax Romana is now categorized as an association of the (*lay*) faithful with *private* juridical status. Founded almost sixty years later, JRS, by contrast, is an apostolic work of a religious congregation with a *public* juridical personality under *Canon Law*. In contrast to private associations (like IMCS), only public associations (JRS) can speak “in the name of the church.”² Despite their differences in status (lay/religious); structure (membership-based/operational agency); age (pre-conciliar/post-

² *Code of Canon Law*, Can. 301.

conciliar); and formal recognition (private/public), the two organizations share several key features in how they approach their ecclesial mission and work of social transformation.

As with most Catholic NGOs, both organizations have been deeply shaped by Vatican II's holistic vision of mission, by the reception of that vision by the 1971 Synod of Bishops, and by liberation theology. For IMCS, the teachings of Vatican II and the experiences of its members at the time propelled it beyond the limitations of the defensive Catholic action model and the distinction of planes framework. IMCS's 1971 and 1974 interfederal assemblies radically rearticulated the mission of the organization in terms of participation, liberation, social transformation, evangelization, and integral education. Rather than taking an indirect role in the temporal sphere, IMCS adopted a "spirituality of action" and a commitment to work for a holistic or integral liberation from within "the student environment and in society as a whole."³ Instead of only seeing its mission as inspiring its members to take action personally, IMCS after Vatican II has understood action on behalf of justice and social transformation to be a definitive aspect of its mission and spirituality as a church apostolic organization.

Although JRS had not yet been created at the time of the council, the organization's mission, spirituality, and identity is deeply formed by the conciliar vision. As argued in Chapter Four, the foundation of JRS is a clear outcome of the renewed understanding of the Jesuit mission laid out by the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus. Under the leadership of Pedro Arrupe, the Jesuits echoed key themes

³ "Resolutions Carried by the Directing Committee of IMCS," *Convergence*, July (1971), 28. The four new objectives enumerated in this period also emphasize the relationship between action for social transformation and its mission as an apostolic work. See Chapter Two.

from Vatican II and the 1971 Synod as they articulated their mission in terms of serving faith and promoting justice. This definition of mission is quoted at the very beginning of the JRS charter and continues to shape its approach to accompaniment, advocacy, and service with the forcibly displaced. For JRS, social action in the promotion of the global common good flows from its identity as a Jesuit apostolic work.

These orientations toward social justice, however, have not been wholly welcomed by all in the church or even by all within the organizations themselves. IMCS and a number of other organizations faced scrutiny over their support for liberation theology, and not all student associations in the church have accepted the commitments to social justice articulated by IMCS's mission. Similarly, not all members of the Society of Jesus have welcomed the new commitments to justice laid out by GC 32 and the subsequent general congregations. As for the mission of JRS, recent instructions on the role of the church's charitable and relief agencies appear to question the legitimacy of the involvement of these organizations in pursuing the root causes of injustice through advocacy and public engagement.

Despite these areas of resistance from within the tradition, both IMCS-Pax Romana and JRS perceive their public actions for justice to be integrally related to their apostolic missions and identity. While there may well have been excesses in how these and other organizations have tried to live out the evangelizing call to justice in the world, both NGOs consciously frame their approach using theological concepts.

Within the tradition, as I have shown, the argument that Catholic NGOs participate essentially in the mission of the church is strongly supported by several key teachings. Both *Gaudium et Spes* and *Apostolicam Actuositatem* speak to the role of

Catholic organizations in public life. The integral framework of *Populorum Progressio* calls the church to take action in the world and emphasizes the intimate connection between mission, efforts aimed at justice, and spiritual progress. *Octogesima Adveniens* develops this further by emphasizing the role and responsibility of Christian organizations “for collective action” in the face of injustice and suffering. Applying this understanding to the role of Catholic NGOs in international life, the 1971 *Guidelines for the Definition of Catholic International Organizations* (like Pope Paul VI’s addresses to the ICOs in this period) clearly state that Catholic NGOs “participate in the evangelizing mission of the Church” in their public engagement within the international institutions. Catholic NGOs, the *Guidelines* write, “are a form of presence” of the church in international life.⁴ Although there are some differences between *Justice in the World* and *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, both the 1971 Synod and Paul VI affirm a close relationship between collective action for justice and the church’s mission. Drawing heavily upon Paul VI’s integral vision of mission, Pope Benedict XVI’s *Caritas in Veritate*, as detailed in Chapter Two, adopts an approach that is somewhat different from some of his own earlier writings by explicitly situating the work of Catholic NGOs within the context of the church’s mission:

*Testimony to Christ's charity, through works of justice, peace and development, is part and parcel of evangelization, because Jesus Christ, who loves us, is concerned with the whole person.*⁵

The ecclesiological and missiological identity of these organizations is evident not only in the ways in which they describe their missions and the support for those

⁴ Pontifical Council for the Laity, “*Respiciens Normas*.”

⁵ Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, no. 15.

frameworks in Catholic teaching, but is also clearly visible in the impact of their work on global policy and, perhaps more importantly, on the lives of people and local communities. It is simply not enough to look at the mission statement and canonical statutes of an organization to see how it participates in the mission of the church. In order to fully appreciate the ecclesiological and missiological dimensions of Catholic NGO social action, one must also critically evaluate what these organizations do and how they do it.

Through advocacy, analysis, formation and operational work, Catholic NGOs are putting their missions into practice in different ways as transnational organizations. When such actions produce fruits related to human dignity, solidarity, and the common good, Catholic organizations witness to the transformative power of the gospel. The case studies of IMCS-Pax Romana and JRS highlight how these and other organizations, while imperfect, participate in the church's fundamental vocation to be like a sacrament in the world, or, in the words of *Lumen Gentium*, its mission to be "a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men."⁶

Missiologists Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder offer a constructive framework that situates the work of Catholic NGOs for justice within the church's mission in a way that also acknowledges the need to balance the horizontal and vertical demands of mission. As detailed at the end of Chapter Two, their model of mission (described as "prophetic dialogue") aims to encapsulate the fullness of Vatican II's integral vision of mission. That mission includes, but is not limited to, collective action for justice. Such a comprehensive framework not only situates the work of Catholic

⁶ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 1.

NGOs within the mission of the church but also challenges socially engaged organizations to avoid the danger of horizontalism by not overlooking the spiritual and *kerygmatic* dimensions of the church's mission.

II. STRUCTURES OF GRACE

2. As participants in the mission of the church and embodiments of specific charisms, Catholic NGOs may analogously be considered "structures of grace."

The first conclusion in this chapter addresses the ecclesiological and missiological dimensions of Catholic NGO action for justice. This, however, is not the only theological conclusion that emerges from this study. The experience of organizations passionately involved in action for social transformation also raises questions of a pneumatological significance. As participants in the mission of the church informed by specific charisms, can these organizations be considered structures of grace in a way analogous to the structures of sin referred to in magisterial teaching? And if so, what might that mean for the organizations themselves and how they approach their social engagement? While a full treatment of these questions calls for a more detailed analysis than can be offered here, some initial conclusions and directions for further reflection surface from this study. Before turning to the implications of what this might mean for Catholic NGOs themselves, this section will examine how organizations, such as those considered in this study, might embody grace as they act against structural sin, reflect charity, and embody specific charisms in their work.

A. Structures of Grace in Actions Against Structural Sin

From one perspective, Christian communities might be seen as reflections of social grace, and thereby collective expressions of the Holy Spirit's activity, in the ways in which their theological and spiritual commitments inspire them to fight against injustice, division and oppressive social structures. In their public actions for justice, many of these NGOs are engaged in efforts to combat and transform manifestations of what the Catholic tradition has described as structural or social sin. Although the tradition has long "recognized the social aspects of sin," explicit attention to sin's structural dimensions emerged only recently alongside the church's renewed vision of mission and justice (as detailed in Chapter Two and illustrated by the case studies).⁷ Before examining how Catholic NGOs might reflect an opposing tendency, a brief sketch of the church's understanding of social sin is constructive.

In the decades leading up to and following the Second Vatican Council, key theological developments challenged excessively personal and act-centered notions of sin that were common before the council by raising attention to its relational and social dimensions.⁸ The inductive social analysis (see-judge-act) methodology employed by the ICOs of specialized Catholic action and adopted by Pope John XXIII and liberation

⁷ Mark O'Keefe, *What Are They Saying About Social Sin?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990), 5. Prior to Vatican II, moral theology, with its strong focus on the sacrament of penance, operated largely in personal and individualistic frameworks. This, as Dermot Lane observes, led to an impression that the "Christian faith was a highly private affair. Christianity seemed to be a religion concerned primarily with the development of 'individual' faith, the elimination of 'personal' sin, and the promotion of the salvation of 'my' soul. Dermot A. Lane, *Foundations for a Social Theology: Praxis, Process and Salvation* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 1.

⁸ These developments include: the theology of the Mystical Body of Christ; the shift away from the moral manuals to a more holistic and relationally focused model of sin and reconciliation; the philosophies of personalism and integral humanism; the appreciation of the role of experience and praxis in theology; a renewed dialogue between theology and the social sciences (especially sociology and psychology); and the return to scripture and virtue in Catholic moral theology that especially highlighted the centrality of caritas and the reign of God. See James F. Keenan, *A History of Catholic Moral Theology in the Twentieth Century: From Confessing Sins to Liberating Consciences* (New York: Continuum, 2010).

theology helped to engender an appreciation for the root causes of suffering and an openness to engage sociological and Marxist theories. Together with the council's holistic vision of mission, these developments inspired theologians and many Catholic communities to consider how institutions and structures perpetuate, sustain, and support situations of injustice and oppression.⁹

This focus on what would be termed “social sin” or sin manifested in “structures of sin” gained official recognition with the renewed vision of ecclesial social engagement taking shape during the pontificate of Pope Paul VI. The final text of the 1971 Synod of Bishops is especially noteworthy in this respect because it situates the evangelical role of action for justice in the face of “networks of domination, oppression and abuse which stifle freedom and which keep the greater part of humanity from sharing in the building up and enjoyment of a more just and more loving world.”¹⁰ Writing shortly after the influential synod, Peter Henriot constructively summarizes the notion of social sin as referring to: 1) structures that oppress human dignity or stifle freedom; 2) situations that promote or facilitate individual acts of sin and selfishness; and 3) the social sin of complicity—when people are aware of an unjust social structure or situation yet do nothing to change it.¹¹

In 1984 Pope John Paul II offers the most explicit treatment of social sin by a pope in his apostolic exhortation on *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia*. While maintaining caution in relation to certain aspects of Marxist thought, the text both draws upon and

⁹ For example, the 1971 and 1974 interfederal assemblies of IMCS and the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus made explicit reference to the need for the church and church structures to respond to structural injustice.

¹⁰ Synod of Bishops, *Justicia in Mundo*, no. 3.

¹¹ Peter J Henriot, “Social Sin and Conversion: A Theology of the Church’s Involvement,” *Chicago Studies* 11 (1972): 120–121.

corrects the insights offered by liberation theology. In the exhortation, later echoed in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, the pope warns against applications of social sin that ascribe moral agency to structures. Social sin, he argues, can only be applied to communities and structures *analogically*. Only persons can have moral agency in the strictest sense. To place blame on “on some vague entity or anonymous collectivity such as the situation, the system, society, structures or institutions” is dangerous because it risks overlooking the moral responsibility for the individual acts of omission or commission.¹² In short, personal responsibility cannot be abrogated when describing complex institutions or systems with the language of social sin.

Nevertheless, the pope does outline three legitimate meanings of social sin. First, by virtue of the interdependence of all humanity, *every* sin, even the most private and personal act, can “undoubtedly be considered as a social sin.”¹³ Second, social sin may also legitimately refer to those sins that are more clearly social by nature, such as attacks or injustices against individuals/groups by other individuals/groups. These attacks would include violations of human rights and those sins that harm the common good. This explication of the meaning of social sin is particularly significant in that the pope applies the concept to traditional themes in Catholic social teaching by emphasizing that social sin extends to those acts of “commission or omission—on the part of political, economic or trade union leaders, who though in a position to do so, do not work diligently and

¹² John Paul II, *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia, Reconciliation and Penance* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1984), no. 16, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_02121984_reconciliatio-et-paenitentia_en.html.

¹³ *Ibid.* See also Pontificium Consilium de Iustitia et Pace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004), no. 117.

wisely for the improvement and transformation of society according to the requirements and potential of the given historic moment.”¹⁴

The final legitimate meaning of social sin according to John Paul II are those sins present in the relationships that exist between different communities, groups or states that “are not always in accordance with the plan of God, who intends that there be justice in the world and freedom and peace between individuals, groups and peoples.”¹⁵ From this perspective, class warfare, racism, gross economic inequalities and obstinate confrontations between nations or groups would be considered socially sinful.¹⁶

In their advocacy, analysis, formation, and operational work, Catholic NGOs such as IMCS-Pax Romana and Jesuit Refugee Service work to combat these manifestations of social sin through the different modes of NGO action outlined in this project. Catholic organizations, among others, oppose the three manifestations of social sin outlined in *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia* in three distinct ways.

i. Ethical Formation and Solidarity

Catholic NGOs help to counteract the first legitimate meaning of social sin as they help individual women and men to flourish and open their consciousnesses to the demands of the gospel in the face of sin and injustice. In *Christifideles Laici*, Pope John Paul II speaks of the important role of Catholic organizations “in the formation of the lay faithful,” especially in relation to social questions.¹⁷ The *Compendium of the Social*

¹⁴ Ibid. See also Pontificium Consilium de Iustitia et Pace, *Compendium*, no. 118.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, no. 36. Later in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* the pope identified the roots of social sin in two typical attitudes that manifest themselves at both the personal and the collective levels: “on the one hand, the all-consuming desire for profit, and on the other, the thirst for power, with the intention of imposing one’s will upon others” (no. 37).

¹⁷ “Groups, associations and movements also have their place in the formation of the lay faithful. In fact they have the possibility, each with its own method, of offering a formation through a deeply shared

Doctrine of the Church affirms this point and highlights the role played by “specialized associations” of the laity in the formation of “mature Christians.”¹⁸

Experience, as the *Compendium* recognizes, shows us that it is often through communities and movements within the church that Christians appropriate the skills and habits that will enable them to respond to God’s grace in the world.¹⁹ In such communities, people encounter and learn to imitate love, mutuality, service, and justice. Clearly, this type of formation is most effective at the local level. Nevertheless, international structures, study sessions, and trainings can go a long way in establishing, supporting, and connecting local communities and projects in this work. Participation in a global structure also adds a crucially broad perspective that is critical for the formation of global leaders.²⁰

Chapter Three highlights the potential of membership-based NGOs, like IMCS, to engage in this type of formation through study sessions, publications, and campaigns. A

experience in the apostolic life, as well as having the opportunity to integrate, to make concrete and specific the formation that their members receive from other persons and communities.” John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 62.

¹⁸ “The Church’s social doctrine must become an integral part of the ongoing formation of the lay faithful. Experience shows that this formative work is usually possible within lay ecclesial associations... The various specialized associations that gather people together in the name of their Christian vocation and mission within a particular professional or cultural field have a precious role to play in forming mature Christians. For example, a Catholic association of doctors forms those who belong to it through the exercise of discernment with regard to the many problems that medical science, biology and other sciences place before the professional competence of doctors, as well as before their personal conscience and faith. The same could be also said of Catholic associations of teachers, legal professionals, businessmen and women, workers, as well as Catholic sports associations and ecological associations and so forth. In this context, the Church’s social doctrine shows that it is an effective means for forming individual consciences and a country’s culture.” Pontificium Consilium de Iustitia et Pace, *Compendium*, nos. 549–50.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 550.

²⁰ For the Jesuit theologian Roger Haight, organizations and communities engaged in this important social and ethical formation may function as “institutionalized forms of love and therefore social grace.” Haight, however, warns that while in many cases the community comes chronologically before the person (e.g., IMCS-Pax Romana and JRS were founded before many of the people they now serve were born), one must always keep in mind that “persons are prior to community. And ontologically, although the individual and the community exist in a mutually causative relation, one should avoid the tendency that flows from this insight to reify community.” Haight, *The Experience and Language of Grace*, 179. See also note 28 on 186.

central facet of IMCS's mission is to empower and form critically engaged students, and the globally focused ethical formation of IMCS and the other international youth NGOs can be especially transformative for young adults during an important stage of human development. Their success can be seen in the many former members of these youth NGOs who hold leadership positions in inter-governmental and non-governmental agencies. This type of moral and ethical formation can have considerable efficacy in counteracting the roots of social sin at the personal level. The role of ethical transformation is also visible in the work of the Jesuit Refugee Service. JRS's pastoral and educational services, as seen in Chapter Four, often include elements of social and ethical formation aimed at empowering refugees to be agents of justice and reconciliation. The recent initiatives of JRS in the fields of reconciliation and higher education are especially noteworthy in this regard. JRS also helps to form the Christian conscience of its staff, donors, and collaborators around the world by raising awareness of the plight of refugees and the demands of the gospel in light of forced displacement.

ii. Accountability Politics

Catholic NGOs also work to counteract *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia*'s second meaning of social sin through advocacy and analysis aimed at holding political leaders and institutions accountable to the demands of the common good. As outlined in the first chapter, this work is most often done in what has been described as the "boomerang pattern of influence," whereby non-state actors challenge structures and office holders, normally seen as "sovereign," to change their practices by bringing the voices of people on the ground to international institutions.²¹ This "soft power" exercised by NGOs in

²¹ Keck and Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders*, 12.

monitoring and “naming and shaming” governments can often lead to more effective implementations of development programs and human rights policies.

As with other NGOs, both IMCS-Pax Romana and JRS are engaged in this type of action in their research analysis and advocacy. While IMCS-Pax Romana has had significant success in the past in relation to some human rights issues, in recent years it has focused more on monitoring and ensuring the accountability of governmental implementation of youth and educational policy. In its own work, JRS plays an important role in keeping political leaders accountable to the needs of refugees who all too often are seen more as problems than constituents by host governments. The voice of JRS helps to ensure that political leaders and institutions fulfill their promises and duties to the common good.

iii. Transforming Social Relationships

Finally, these actors counteract the third legitimate meaning of social sin as they seek to transform social, political, and economic relationships to be more in line with the demands of the gospel. For most NGOs, this is clearly evident in their efforts to draw people’s attention to social injustices and to the importance of engendering solidarity in the world. Both of the case studies in this project highlight strong commitments to peace and reconciliation. IMCS-Pax Romana, as detailed above, began largely as a peace movement following World War I and later expanded its concerns for the poor, the displaced, the marginalized, and victims of human rights violations. Recently, it has focused much of its advocacy attention on issues regarding youth, who are often excluded from decision-making processes, and has encouraged dialogue between students of different religious traditions.

Similarly, JRS's action for social transformation includes efforts aimed at building solidarity and healing relationships between communities. In many countries, particularly in Europe and North America, JRS has become a leading voice for the social integration of refugees and other migrants into their host countries. More recently, such efforts, as detailed in Chapter Four, are understood by JRS through the lens of reconciliation—a key theme addressed by the Jesuit's 35th General Congregation.

In their opposition to the three manifestations of social sin, Catholic NGOs, among other structures, can be seen as *potential* manifestations of what might be called social grace or structural grace. This is not to suggest that these structures have moral agency; nor is it to say that they are perfect. Rather, the language of social grace can help NGOs recognize that their good work only has theological value in light of God's loving action. This is critically important for Christian communities engaged in social transformation since it can help them to avoid both horizontalism and the trap of a "social Pelagianism" by acknowledging the dynamic presence of God's grace in the liberating actions of God's people. In other words, the good work of NGOs, like JRS and IMCS-Pax Romana, in the face of injustice and suffering should ultimately be attributed to the work and presence of God and not simply to the skills and talents of their leadership.

B. Structures of Solidarity and Charity

Through they do not explicitly speak of "structural grace" or even "structures of solidarity" in their official teachings, the idea is implicit in some of the writings of both John Paul II and Benedict XVI. In *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, for example, John Paul II affirms the necessity of grace for transforming unjust personal and social relationships. In

order to overcome the structural sins that divide the human family, he argues, Christians will need “the help of divine grace” to work for solidarity and a true development that is informed by a moral and ethical perspective.²² Indeed, John Paul II is insistent that structures of sin will only be “conquered” by an attitude and virtue of solidarity that is aided by grace.²³ The *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* follows and develops this point as it argues that the moral principle of solidarity must guide and transform social institutions. Oppressive and unjust structures and institutions, it asserts, “must be purified and transformed into *structures of solidarity* through the creation or appropriate modification of laws, market regulations, and juridical systems.”²⁴

In many ways, Catholic NGOs arguably function as structures or agents of solidarity both in their internal efforts to foster this virtue among their members and in their external actions aimed at transforming institutions and social relationships. In *Christifideles Laici*, John Paul II applies his teaching on solidarity to the specific vocation

²² John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, no. 35.

²³ Ibid., no. 38. Here, the pope writes: “These attitudes and ‘structures of sin’ are only conquered - presupposing the help of divine grace - by a diametrically opposed attitude: a commitment to the good of one’s neighbor with the readiness, in the gospel sense, to ‘lose oneself’ for the sake of the other instead of exploiting him, and to ‘serve him’ instead of oppressing him for one’s own advantage (cf. Mt 10:40-42; 20:25; Mk 10:42-45; Lk 22:25-27).” See also John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1991), no. 38,

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html; Daniel J. Daly, “Structures of Virtue and Vice,” *New Blackfriars* 92, no. 1039 (2011): 341–357, doi:10.1111/j.1741-2005.2010.01355.x.

²⁴ Pontificium Consilium de Iustitia et Pace, *Compendium*, no. 193. The wording of “structures of solidarity” in the *Compendium* is not used in any papal encyclical and appears only a few other times in other official texts. The bishops of the United States of America, for example, call for the creation of “structures of solidarity” to address the divisions between the rich and the poor in their 1993 letter on peace. Later, in their joint letter on immigration with the bishops of Mexico, they celebrate the work of God in converting people and bringing about “structures of solidarity to accompany the migrant.” See National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1993), Introduction, <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/the-harvest-of-justice-is-sown-in-peace.cfm>; and United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano, *Strangers No Longer Together on the Journey of Hope* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003), no. 40, <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/immigration/strangers-no-longer-together-on-the-journey-of-hope.cfm>.

of the laity in the church and in the world. Writing a year after the publication of *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, the pope speaks of charity as “The Soul and Sustenance of Solidarity.” All the faithful, he writes, are called to put charity into practice through acts of solidarity both in their personal capacity and “in a joint way by groups and communities.”²⁵

In *Caritas in Veritate*, Pope Benedict XVI develops the integrated relationship between charity and solidarity. In this encyclical, he comes close to identifying organizations working for the common good as structures of grace by speaking of “networks of charity.” Toward the beginning of the text, Benedict considers the relationships between charity, grace, truth, and the church’s response to suffering and injustice in the world. Here, the pope highlights the role of charity and grace at the center of personal and collective social action:

Charity is love received and given. It is “grace” (*cháris*). 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. It is creative love, through which we have our being; it is redemptive love, through which we are recreated. Love is revealed and made present by Christ (cf. Jn 13:1) and “poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit” (Rom 5:5). 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 networks of charity.²⁶

With God’s grace and love as its foundation and driving force, he argues, people are individually and collectively enabled to offer a moral response to the realities of the globalized society in two specific areas: justice and the common good. As detailed in Chapter Two, charity and justice, according to *Caritas in Veritate*, are “inseparable.” While authentic charity “transcends justice” in its call for forgiveness, communion and

²⁵ John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 41.

²⁶ Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, no. 5.

gratuitousness, it nevertheless “demands justice” and social transformation in the world. The grace of charity, Benedict XVI argues, is not something detached from the world. Rather, it “always manifests God’s love in human relationships as well, it gives theological and salvific value to all commitment for justice in the world.”²⁷

According to Benedict, charity and grace also give rise to action for the common good—which, as he writes, is taking on an increasingly global dimension. “To desire the *common good* and strive towards it,” he argues, is in fact “*a requirement of justice and charity.*” Action for the common good, however, will be all the more effective if it is “animated by charity.” Using Augustinian language, the pope argues that such action, when guided by charity and grace, contributes not only to the “earthly city” but also, and perhaps more importantly, to “the universal *city of God*, which is the goal of the history of the human family.”²⁸

This treatment by Pope Benedict constructively grounds the work of Catholic NGOs for justice and the common good in both charity and grace. Animated by grace, Catholic NGOs, as “networks of charity,” not only help to transform society to be more in accord with God’s love, but they also help to contribute to God’s kingdom.

C. Structural Embodiments of Charisms

From a somewhat different perspective, Catholic NGOs may also be considered “structures of grace” in the ways in which they embody or seek to institutionalize specific charisms or “special graces.” As seen in Chapter Two, the renewed vision of the mission of the Second Vatican Council helped to push past the “christomonism” of earlier

²⁷ Ibid., no. 6.

²⁸ Ibid., no. 7.

periods. Beyond recognizing the sacramental presence of the church in the world, the council reclaimed an appreciation for the role of charisms as animating forces within the church and church communities.²⁹ *Lumen Gentium* no. 12, in particular, recovers the Pauline notion of charisms while emphasizing the participation of all the people of God in the threefold office of Christ (priest, prophet and king). God freely distributes such special graces, the constitution teaches, which may be ordinary or extraordinary, to the faithful of every rank *for the common good*. These charisms can express themselves anywhere among the people of God. Nevertheless, those in ecclesial office have a special responsibility to discern their authenticity since not all claims to charisms may be legitimate.³⁰ A robust treatment of the council's recovery of the notion of charism exceeds the scope of this project. Nevertheless, two aspects of this renewed appreciation for charisms that are relevant to the work of Catholic NGOs are worth addressing.

²⁹ The council's recovery of the language of charism surprised many since they were once dismissed by Pope Gregory the Great as ceasing to exist after the "Golden Age of the apostolic era of the Church." Brendan Leahy, *Ecclesial Movements and Communities: Origins, Significance, and Issues* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2011), 83. The key figure in this renewal was Cardinal Leo Joseph Suenens of Belgium. See the collection of articles in Christian Duquoc and Casiano Floristán Samanes, eds., *Charisms in the Church*, Concilium (New York: Seabury, 1978); See also Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, trans. W.J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964); Margaret R. Pfeil, "Called and Gifted: Charism and Catholic Social Teaching," *Horizons* 34, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 222–37; Charles E. Bouchard, "Recovering the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in Moral Theology," *Theological Studies* 63, no. 3 (S 2002): 539–58; Hans Küng, "The Charismatic Structure of the Church," in *The Church and Ecumenism*. (New York: Paulist Press, 1965), 41–61; William Koupal, "Charism: A Relational Concept," *Worship* 42, no. 9 (N 1968): 539–45.

³⁰ With a strong biblical foundation, *Lumen Gentium* outlines several aspects of this new theology of charism: "Allotting his gifts 'at will to each individual' (1 Cor 12:11), he also distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts, he makes them fit and ready to undertake various tasks and offices for the renewal and building up of the church. As it is written, 'the manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit' (1 Cor 12:7). Whether these charisms be very remarkable or more simple and widely diffused, they are to be received with thanksgiving and consultation since they are primarily suited to and useful for the needs of the church. Extraordinary gifts are not to be rashly desired, nor from them are the fruits of apostolic labors to be presumptuously expected. Those who have charge over the church should judge the genuineness and ordinary use of these gifts, and it is especially their office not indeed to extinguish the Spirit, but to test all things hold fast to what is good (see 1 Th 5:12 and 19-21)." *Lumen Gentium*, no. 12.

First, the council's treatment of the role of charisms in Christian life highlights the social and ethical dimensions of these gifts. The special graces or gifts of the Spirit that are charisms are not given solely for the benefit of the individual. Rather, they look outward toward the wider church and society. John Paul II speaks to this as he attempts a definition of charism in *Christifideles Laici*:

Whether they be exceptional and great or simple and ordinary, the charisms are *graces of the Holy Spirit that have, directly or indirectly, a usefulness for the ecclesial community*, ordered as they are to the building up of the Church, to the well-being of humanity and to the needs of the world.³¹

Here, John Paul II highlights not only the internal ecclesial dimensions of these gifts, but also their social dimensions that extend beyond the church and the local community. Charisms, in other words, cannot be detached from the realities and needs of the world. On the contrary, they are gifts given by God to build up the church, promote the common good, and address the needs of people both near and far. From this perspective, it is easy to discern the presence of such special graces at work in those Catholic NGOs that contribute both to the building up of the church and to the common good of humanity.

Second, the conciliar vision, especially in its teaching on religious life, does not only envision charisms in a personal sense. They can, as John Paul II teaches, “even be shared by others in such ways as to continue in time a precious and effective heritage.”³² While some, like Joseph Ratzinger, have sought to define the charism of a community or movement in terms of its relationship to one individual founder or charismatic leader (e.g., St. Francis of Assisi, Chiara Lubich), experience shows that not all movements or

³¹ John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici*, no. 24.

³² *Ibid.*

communities in the church with a charism have individual founders.³³ Furthermore, even among those groups with individual founders, it is clear that the Holy Spirit is active in more than just the one person credited with the movement's establishment.

In other words, charisms may be seen to operate beyond a purely personal sense; they may be taking dynamic forms as corporate bodies adapt to meet the “changing circumstances of place and time.”³⁴ The actions of the Holy Spirit within a community cannot be contained only in the life of the founder; nor does the Spirit cease to be a dynamic presence in the community when its founders die. On the contrary, Christian communities may continue to be guided by their charisms as they continually seek to be placed in the service of the common good.

Catholic NGOs might be seen to manifest social grace in the ways they embody and institutionalize the charisms or “special graces” that animate their missions.³⁵ This is most clearly evident in the NGOs associated with congregations of vowed religious and the new ecclesial movements that have clear charisms associated with their founders. As

³³ Addressing the 1998 World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, the then-Joseph Ratzinger distinguished between what he sees as movements, currents, and actions in the church. For him, a genuine movement is one that derives its “origin from a charismatic leader” whose life serves as a model for the organization and its members. True movements, he argues, seek to live out the Gospel in light of the charism of the founder and in unity with the church. The youth movements of specialized Catholic action, he suggests, are not true movements but “currents” or “actions” that lack a guiding charism and/or the fundamental connection to the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. This, however, appears limited when considering how many lay and religious movements originate around charisms shared by two or more founders. See Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, “The Ecclesial Movements: A Theological Reflection on Their Place in the Church,” in *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998*, *Laity Today 2* (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999), 47–48.

³⁴ This is affirmed by Paul VI in his apostolic exhortation on the renewal of religious life: “In reality, the charism of the religious life, far from being an impulse born of flesh and blood or one derived from a mentality which conforms itself to the modern world, is the fruit of the Holy Spirit, who is always at work within the Church...For while the call of God renews itself and expresses itself in different ways according to changing circumstances of place and time, it nevertheless requires a certain constancy of orientation.” Paul VI, “*Evangelica Testificatio*,” nos. 11 and 12.

³⁵ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 12.

a Jesuit apostolic work, JRS personifies the Ignatian charism in its threefold mission of accompaniment, advocacy, and service with the forcibly displaced.

Despite the fact that international Catholic organizations and Catholic development agencies generally do not have an explicit charism associated with one specific founder, they do possess clear missions that may be seen as guiding gifts offered to them by God. IMCS, as detailed in Chapter Three, for example, has a clear mission to evangelize university students and to empower them to be socially engaged. In many ways, this mission functions in a similar way to the charisms guiding those communities with one specific founder. While more research on the social dimensions of charisms is needed, it seems clear that among Catholic NGOs, at least for those associated with a specific founder, their global social action is one way in which their charisms are expressed in the world.³⁶

D. Toward a Theology of Social Grace

Clearly, a more detailed analysis of the social and structural dimensions of grace is warranted than what is feasible here. Nevertheless, from these three perspectives above, it is possible to envision Catholic NGOs analogously as structures of grace. Already, some theologians have gestured toward a theology of social or structural grace in their work. Inspired by the resistance of communities to social and structural sin and the communal dimensions of the Holy Spirit, some liberation theologians have explored

³⁶ Exploring the phenomenon of the new ecclesial movements, Brendan Leahy comments on the social dimension of charism: “The concept of charism, in other words, was viewed in the Council not only in an individual sense (as in 1 Cor. 12:7-10: ‘to one... to another...’) but also in a communitarian sense, attaching to a community or institution and lasting over time. Tony Hanna writes of new ecclesial movements as ‘collective charisms,’ or founding charisms.” Leahy, *Ecclesial Movements and Communities*, 90; See also Tony Hanna, *New Ecclesial Movements* (New York: Alba House, 2006), 187.

the ways in which the Holy Spirit, grace, and charisms are operative within liberating social structures. Juan Luis Segundo, for example, imagines God's dynamic grace, as a "great wind" at work in history—empowering not only individuals but also relationships and social structures.³⁷ Leonardo Boff, in his provocative book *Church, Charism, and Power*, points to the role of the Holy Spirit in shaping church communities from the margins and reminds his readers of the priority of the charismatic over the institutional element.³⁸

As of yet, the most detailed efforts to explore the social dimensions of grace come from the Belgian-Brazilian missionary, José Comblin, and the American Jesuit Roger Haight. According to Comblin, God's grace manifests itself in history in concrete ways in both persons and in communities. Grace, he asserts, is not some vague, invisible, and ineffective theory. Rather, it is a gratuitous presence of God that manifests itself in movements of people fighting against sin and oppression. It is, he writes, "the force that awakens, animates, and maintains the struggle of the oppressed, who are victims of injustice and evil."³⁹

In his study of the Christian theology of grace, Roger Haight synthesizes many of these explorations as he briefly addresses the social and structural dimensions of grace in his final chapter. Drawing on the work of Karl Rahner, Comblin and others, Haight offers

³⁷ Juan Luis Segundo, S.J., *A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity*, vol.2, *Grace and the Human Condition* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1973), 169.

³⁸ Leonardo Boff, *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*, trans. John W. Dierchsmeier (New York: Crossroad, 1985); See also Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Notification on the Book "Church, Charism and Power" by Father Leonardo Boff O.F.M.* (Rome, 1985), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19850311_notif-boff_en.html.

³⁹ José Comblin, "Grace," in *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, ed. Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993), 530; See also José Comblin, *The Holy Spirit and Liberation*, trans. Paul Burns, *Theology and Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1989).

a more nuanced approach that cautions against blindly ascribing grace to any particular (flawed) human structure but at the same time also acknowledges its social and structural dimensions.⁴⁰ Ultimately, like Comblin, Haight perceives grace as operative in history through people and communities:

It thus appears that saving grace at work in the human personality is not and cannot be a purely personal phenomenon in any individualistic sense precisely because it liberates a person by effecting spontaneous openness to the neighbor. In this way one can see how the whole economy of grace is historical; faith, love and hope are mediated in this world through the agency of people. Not only the message of Christ, but even more fundamentally and beyond the sphere of Christianity, grace itself is mediated historically...God works in the human personality and in history through the agency of human beings.⁴¹

In their actions to counter oppressive and sinful situations, Catholic NGOs (especially when guided by charity and specific charisms) reflect grace socially in a way analogous to structural sin. While John Paul II does not explicitly speak of “structures of grace” in calling for responses to structural sin, such an understanding as detailed above is implicitly present in his writings on structural sin, solidarity, and charism.

To argue for the possibility of social grace is certainly not to suggest that all aspects of these organizations are “graced” or that these organizations possess autonomous moral agency. As human institutions, NGOs are inherently flawed, imperfect, and—as with other ecclesial structures—always in need of reform. Rather, a

⁴⁰ Haight outlines six theses for a theology of social grace that help to situate the theological meaning of collective action for justice. These are worth summarizing: 1) the saving and liberating effects of grace manifest themselves primarily in individual persons; 2) authentic social action aimed at liberation, justice and love for the other and/or the participation in movements with such aims speaks primarily to the salvation of the individual; 3) action on behalf of justice and liberation is a participation in God’s action in the world; 4) the primary objective of grace-filled social action must be love for the other person; 5) salvation and the Kingdom of God cannot be equated with the creation of just social structures since by their very nature human institutions are imperfect; 6) the grace-filled loving actions on behalf of the other persons serve as an invitation to participate in God’s grace “to the extent that it is an offer of altruistic of selfless love that invites a similar response.” *Ibid.*, 174-77.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 178.

framework that acknowledges the pneumatological dimensions underlying their efforts aimed at social transformation can help Catholic NGOs to better discern how best to embody grace/charism in their service of the common good. The next section seeks to substantiate this claim.

III. CRITERIA FOR DISCERNMENT

3. If transnational Catholic organizations share in the church's mission and reflect God's grace, certain ethical values should be reflected in their work.

As with all NGOs, Catholic organizations face several practical and ethical challenges. Regardless of their good intentions, some NGOs may end up doing more harm than good. This is particularly dangerous in the operational work of development and humanitarian organizations where the welfare and lives of vulnerable populations are at stake.⁴² Within the international NGO community as a whole there are a number of ethical perils to which Catholic organizations are not immune. At the end of this project's first chapter, I briefly addressed some of the ethical issues that face transnational NGOs in the world today, namely power and participation, legitimacy, accountability, and effectiveness.

The acknowledgment that Catholic NGOs share in the church's mission and reflect grace in some analogous way illuminates several constructive tensions that may help them to more effectively respond to these ethical issues and the demands of the common good. The task here is not to present clear-cut solutions to the very real

⁴² See, for example, Anderson, *Do No Harm*.

challenges facing Catholic organizations today. That is the responsibility and role of the organizations themselves. Rather, drawing from the previous chapters, I will now outline four sets of polar tensions that I hope can offer these organizations resources to discern and navigate the demands involved in their important task of promoting the global common good.

A. Mission and Institution

In their global public engagement, Catholic NGOs are challenged to find a balance between mission and institution. This tension carries with it a twofold danger for organizations. In speaking of the social and institutionalized forms of church organizations, careful attention must be paid to avoid the danger of falling into the sinful, selfish and destructive patterns of collectivism against which Reinhold Niebuhr warns.⁴³ There has always been, as Brendan Leahy reflects in his study of the new ecclesial movements, a danger for charismatic groups in the church to demonstrate “a certain arrogance by presenting themselves as the perfect Church. Such an attitude reveals a Messianic complex that neglects the insight that God the Father’s house has more rooms, many ways of living the same faith.”⁴⁴ This type of collectivism can often warp the mission of the organization so that it looks more to the organization than to the common good.

A related danger is the tendency for social groups and movements to gravitate toward a stifling institutionalization, which can suppress the dynamic workings of the

⁴³ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).

⁴⁴ Leahy, *Ecclesial Movements and Communities*, 134.

Spirit. As social movements grow and develop and their charisms become routinized, organizational structures are established to engage in effective social action. In this organizational development creative ways are needed to ensure that such structures do not, as Haight warns, hamper the “spontaneity and self-actualized intention of self-transcending love that is the fruit of grace.”⁴⁵

Within the Catholic tradition, the church has always maintained that charism and mission are not in opposition to institutional structures.⁴⁶ Catholic NGOs, not unlike the church as a whole, are therefore charged to ensure that the structures and institutions that are developed are placed in the service of mission and the common good and not the other way around. This means that in order to effectively carry out their specific missions, Catholic NGOs need to find a balance between adaptability and accountability. On the one hand, they must be flexible enough to adapt to the needs of an ever-changing world. On the other, they must develop and attend to participatory structures to guarantee that international actions and advocacy are based on the organization’s mission, the directives of members, and the needs of the common good.

The two case studies in this project highlight this tension in different ways. The decentralized structures of both IMCS and JRS are helpful in keeping the two organizations focused on the needs of their members and the people they serve. IMCS’s membership-based participatory structure enables all members to have a voice in the international life of the movement. In a structure shared with many of the former ICOs,

⁴⁵ Haight, *The Experience and Language of Grace*, 180.

⁴⁶ In speaking of organizational charisms, Pope John Paul II notes, “The institutional and charismatic aspects are co-essential as it were to the Church’s constitution. They contribute, although differently, to the life, renewal and sanctification of God’s People.” John Paul II, “Address of His Holiness Pope John Paul II on the Occasion of the Meeting with the Ecclesial Movements and the New Communities, Rome, 30 May 1998,” in *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998*, *Laity Today 2* (Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999), 221.

the continental and global leadership are chosen directly by the national member associations. Global advocacy priorities are established by the decision-making assemblies and councils, which are made up of students themselves. As with other membership-based NGOs, this often serves as a mark of credibility and legitimacy for their global campaigning and advocacy work. Furthermore, with little overhead and leaders who serve as volunteer missionaries for a short period of time, IMCS and other similar structures can maintain a focus on the mission and on the needs of students.⁴⁷

Like IMCS, JRS has sought to find creative ways to balance the demands of mission and institution. While it maintains a more uniform structure than IMCS, JRS also seeks to empower local, national, and regional structures and since 2000 has developed greater coordination as an international structure. As a humanitarian NGO sponsored by a religious congregation, the structure of JRS is quite different. The professional leadership of JRS is not elected in the same way as in membership-based organizations. The Society of Jesus maintains oversight over JRS and the refugees served by the organization are not in a position to directly choose who will represent JRS internationally and what issues that they will focus on. Nevertheless, JRS maintains legitimacy for its work because of its commitment to empower and accompany the refugees themselves. Perhaps more than anything else, the mission and practice of accompaniment helps to ensure that the organization is focused on the needs of the forcibly displaced and not the trends of the humanitarian professionals. It can also be argued that the intuitional relationship of JRS to the Society of Jesus, which ultimately has oversight over everything JRS does, helps to

⁴⁷ The presence of many structural levels, however, also carries with it the danger of disconnecting members in the movement from one another.

maintain a strong focus on the mission of the organization to accompany, defend, and serve refugees around the world.

B. Unity and Diversity

A second set of poles that need to be balanced in the work of NGOs is the tension between unity and diversity. At one extreme, some organization's excessive focus on unity and uniformity leaves little room for diversity and difference. At the other extreme, the embrace of diversity as a value can make it impossible to agree on a common mission or shared social action plan.

Like most other Catholic NGOs, IMCS and JRS seek to balance the two values of unity and diversity without falling into the trap of either a rigid uniformity or a fragmentation in a common identity. Since its inception, IMCS has brought together a diversity of expressions of the student apostolate around the world and has welcomed members of other faith traditions. For IMCS, particularly in Asia, non-Christian students, and at times non-confessional national student groups, have affiliated with the movement or closely associated themselves with its mobilizing action on social issues. However, IMCS's federative structure (with different names and logos at the local and national levels) makes it difficult to maintain a common sense of mission and a universally agreed upon advocacy platform. While a more centralized and uniform structure might be more effective in some areas, it would conflict with the movement's mission to empower and support the agency of local, national, and regional student groups as they seek to respond to their own contexts. Finding the right balance between unity and diversity is not easy.

The growing accessibility of new forms of social media offers new possibilities for IMCS and other membership-based organizations to meet this challenge.

Of course, IMCS is not the only organization or institution in the church struggling with maintaining unity in mission amidst a diversity of members. Though JRS's local and national structures are much more unified than those at IMCS, there remains a considerable amount of diversity in the work of the organization; only a few local projects do not use the JRS name. Unlike IMCS and other ICOs with a federative model, JRS structures, with only a few exceptions, utilize the JRS "brand" (logo and name) at all levels of the organization. JRS, however, faces additional challenges in relation to unity and diversity around its mission as a Jesuit apostolic work. With an increasing number of non-Jesuit and non-Christian staff members, JRS occasionally struggles to maintain its Jesuit and Ignatian identity in the service of the forcibly displaced. In recent years, the organization has sought to be more intentional about sharing and deepening its Jesuit identity while also welcoming others to join in that mission. As with other organizations and institutions sponsored by religious congregations (e.g., universities, hospitals), this task consumes time, energy and resources. New efforts, such as the identification of core values in the strategic plan and the publication of theological reflections on the work of JRS, may serve as a model for other faith-based organizations seeking to deepen their identity, while also welcoming pluralism.

C. Cooperation and Competition

A third set of poles that NGOs must navigate between are cooperation and competition. On the one hand, the present reality of the global public square demands cooperation among NGOs with similar interests. With over 3,000 NGOs presently accredited to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, for example, only a very small number of highly funded organizations can be effective on their own. In order to have an impact on the global debate, NGOs must join together in campaigns, coalitions, platforms and other collaborative efforts. Partly overwhelmed with the logistical challenges of so many voices, the international institutions themselves, as highlighted in the first chapter, are incentivizing NGO collaboration by giving more time and access to NGO platforms.

The need for cooperation can also be seen at the local and operational level. JRS, for example, often operates in partnerships with other NGOs, church bodies, governments, and UN agencies. In local development projects and international campaigns, it is not uncommon to see a rainbow of logos representing different organizations working together on a common project. Both the case studies highlighted in this project have been active in a number of coalitions of likeminded NGOs. IMCS is active in several coalitions of youth NGOs linked to UN agencies, and it co-founded the International Coordination Meeting of Youth Organizations, which has successfully leveraged the voices of the major global youth organizations. JRS, as seen above, also actively participates in a number of successful networks including the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, and the European Council on Refugees and Exiles.

But collaboration, of course, is not always easy; nor is it always desirable. Working with other organizations takes precious time and energy that these organizations often do not have. Collaboration with other organizations can also often mean that the specific concerns of one's organization are watered down or limited to the lowest common denominator. Furthermore, in a culture where NGOs are often forced to compete against one another for limited funds, there is often considerable pressure for organizational reports to emphasize their distinctive contributions and downplay collaborative efforts.

Like other Catholic NGOs, IMCS and JRS are not immune from these tensions and they are challenged to find a balance between working with others and focusing on their own mission. For IMCS, as detailed in Chapter Three, the contentious relationship with the International Young Catholic Students movement has often been about how far, if at all, should the two very similar—yet distinct—structures collaborate. JRS faces similar questions, albeit at a very different intensity, with the International Catholic Migration Commission, Caritas Internationalis, Mercy Refugee Service and other church bodies working directly on the question of refugees and migrants.

Within the Catholic community, collaboration between organizations is often frustrated by inter-ecclesiological debates and tensions among church organizations and between some of these and the Holy See. Following the dissolution of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations, efforts at launching an action network for all Catholic NGOs (lay and religious) and the Holy See's diplomatic corps has not been as successful as many had hoped. At the 2003 and 2007 large gatherings, the Forum of Catholic-Inspired NGOs showed great potential as it gathered leaders from nearly one

hundred different international NGOs, many with common shared concerns, including JRS and IMCS. Despite the success of these and subsequent smaller events in Rome and Geneva, these gatherings have yet to become a space for effective collaborative action among Catholic NGOs. Much of the reluctance to collaborate in this network often relates to internal church dynamics such as the relationship between the Vatican and women religious; tensions between the new ecclesial movements and the ex-ICOs; differences in NGO cultures between New York-based organizations and Geneva-based groups; differences between development NGOs with professional full-time staff and membership-based NGOs with militant (volunteer) leadership; and differences of opinion on the priorities of social and economic concerns versus “pro-life” and family issues.

While paying attention to their own specific missions, Catholic NGOs are challenged to explore ways to cooperate with each other in areas of common ground, especially when this means a more effective response to questions of social injustice. Given the urgency of the many problems facing the world today, a more effective coordinated response on specific topics is badly needed. As experience shows, organizations can benefit greatly from such collaborative relationships. For example, smaller organizations can benefit much from the support offered by the larger, better-funded groups. These larger NGOs, in turn, can gain new and fresh perspectives from smaller, membership-based groups who are often more flexible and more in touch with specific groups of people on the ground.

A more robust theological perspective on the role of Catholic NGOs can help to negotiate the dangers of forms of cooperation that stifle specific missions and competition. If these organizations do indeed participate in the same mission of the same

church and if they reflect charisms rooted in the same divine source, then Catholic NGOs should be open to exploring ways for cooperating with one another in such a way that respects the specific mission and identity of each party involved.⁴⁸ At times, this may also mean merging two different structures or organizations that have increasingly similar missions and goals. While any process of merging will likely involve painful decisions, a theology of structural grace can help those involved to remain focused on the demands of the common good and the grace-filled mission needed to address those demands.

D. Horizontalism and Verticalism

Over the past thirty years, as I have noted, some church officials have expressed concerns over the dangers of what they call “horizontalism” among NGOs working for justice and peace. Admittedly, these concerns are not without some basis in verifiable facts. Some interpretations of Catholic social teaching have led some actors to disconnect their actions for social transformation from the theological and spiritual core.

⁴⁸ Tension between Catholic organizations, however, are not new in the church. In his 1996 post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Vita Consecrata*, Pope John Paul II addresses this as he recalls the memory of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153): “Fraternal spiritual relations and mutual cooperation among different Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life are sustained and nourished by the sense of ecclesial communion. Those who are united by a common commitment to the following of Christ and are inspired by the same Spirit cannot fail to manifest visibly, as branches of the one Vine, the fullness of the Gospel of love... Saint Bernard's words about the various Religious Orders remain ever timely: ‘I admire them all. I belong to one of them by observance, but to all of them by charity. We all need one another: the spiritual good which I do not own and possess, I receive from others ... In this exile, the Church is still on pilgrimage and is, in a certain sense, plural: she is a single plurality and a plural unity. All our diversities, which make manifest the richness of God's gifts, will continue to exist in the one house of the Father, which has many rooms. Now there is a division of graces; then there will be distinctions of glory. Unity, both here and there, consists in one and the same charity.’” John Paul II, *Vita Consecrata, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation On Consecrated Life and Its Mission in the Church and in the World* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996), no. 52, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031996_vita-consecrata_en.html.

In certain cases attention to social concern has resulted in almost a complete secularization of organizations once founded as church bodies.

Among Catholic organizations, there is also a temptation to another extreme: what might be termed “verticalism,” whereby the social implications of the Christian faith are neglected or ignored in favor of a detached spiritualism. Clearly, it is not the role of every church organization to be involved in social transformation in the same way. Diversity in what John Paul II described as the “single but complex reality” that is mission is valuable and necessary for the church to adequately respond to its evangelical vocation in the world.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, there remain organizations and structures within the church community for which the social dimensions of the church’s mission as highlighted by Vatican II seem irrelevant compared to some supposedly “real” evangelization that is detached from the needs of the world.

In the face of these dangers, Catholic NGOs are challenged to embrace both the horizontal and vertical dimensions of the Christian mission. The framework of mission as “prophetic dialogue,” proposed by Bevans and Schroeder and detailed at the end of the second chapter, can help retain the holistic vision of mission put forth by Vatican II—what Kristin Heyer calls the “fullness of the tradition.”⁵⁰ Attending to this integral vision will help organizations avoid the temptation to separate the Gospel mission from the demands of justice either through a horizontalism or a sectarian withdrawal from the world. Addressing a meeting of the new ecclesial movements, Pope Benedict XVI speaks to this challenge as he reminds the leaders of these organizations of the social implications of mission, charism, and genuine charity:

⁴⁹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio*, no. 41; See also Paul VI, “*Evangelii Nuntiandi*,” no. 24.

⁵⁰ Heyer, *Prophetic & Public*, 187.

Missionary zeal is proof of a radical experience of ever-renewed fidelity to one's charism that surpasses any kind of weary or selfish withdrawal...The extraordinary fusion between love of God and love of neighbor makes life beautiful and causes the desert in which we 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...Become builders of a better world according to the order of love in which the beauty of human life is expressed.⁵¹

IV. BOLD HUMILITY IN MISSION

This concluding chapter investigates the missiological and pneumatological dimensions of Catholic NGO action for the global common good. In the process, it uncovers several underlying tensions that may help these and other organizations respond more effectively to the ethical and structural issues facing their global public engagement. Navigating between the extremes detailed above is not easy and requires constant attention and a proper disposition. In his noteworthy study on mission, David Bosch aptly captures the disposition necessary for organizational discernment as he speaks of the challenging tasks facing Christians who seek to participate in mission today. Participation in the mission of the gospel, he asserts, demands:

an admission that we do not have all the answers and are prepared to live within the framework of penultimate knowledge, that we regard our involvement in dialogue and mission as an adventure, are prepared to take risks, and are anticipating surprises as the Spirit guides us into fuller understanding. This is not opting for agnosticism, but for humility. It is, however, a bold humility—or a humble boldness. We know only in part, but we do know. And we believe that the faith we profess is both true and just, and should be proclaimed. We do this, however, not as judges or lawyers, but as witnesses; not as soldiers, but as envoys of peace; not as high-pressure sales-persons, but as ambassadors of the Servant Lord.⁵²

⁵¹ Benedict XVI, "Message of His Holiness Benedict XVI," in *The Beauty of Being a Christian. Movements in the Church*, ed. Pontifical Council for the Laity, Laity Today 11 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007), 7.

⁵² Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 489.

Bosch's description of what it means to participate in mission strongly reflects the potential and actual experience of many transnational Catholic NGOs who seek to be witnesses, envoys and ambassadors of Christ in an increasingly interdependent world.⁵³

Given the multifaceted challenges facing the human family today, the Christian community, guided by God's grace, is called to respond to the needs of the global common good in a spirit of bold humility. In their actions aimed at social transformation, Catholic nongovernmental organizations are one way in which the church fulfills its sacramental vocation in the world. Attending to the theological dimensions of socially involved Christian organizations will not only help to better appreciate the role of these organizations, but it will also aid in deepening the understanding of what it means to be church in a global world.

⁵³ This same sentiment is expressed by the poem *A Step Along the Way* by Bishop Ken Untener. The poem, often erroneously attributed to Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador, has inspired many involved in the work of Catholic NGOs and reminds those involved in social transformation that their good work is ultimately the work of God. Ken Untener, "Archbishop Oscar Romero Prayer: A Step Along the Way," *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*, 2013, http://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/prayers/archbishop_romero_prayer.cfm.

Appendix: List of Transnational Catholic NGOs in Relationship with the United Nations and Other Intergovernmental Organizations¹

I. CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE LIST OF CATHOLIC NGOS

The following list enumerates Catholic nongovernmental organizations according to the following criteria:

- a. that they maintain an active and formalized relationship with some intergovernmental organization (IGO) as of September 2010; and
- b. that they recognize themselves to be Catholic or are explicitly sponsored by a Catholic organization, congregation, or movement.²

II. CATHOLIC NGOS IN CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The year of obtaining their status and their accreditation with other IGOs are included in brackets.

A. General Consultative Status

1. Association de Volontaires pour le Service International-AVSI (1996) [ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF]
2. Caritas Internationalis (1999) [ILO, FAO, UNAIDS, DPI, UNESCO, WHO]
3. Congregations of St. Joseph (1999) [DPI]
4. Franciscans International (1995) [DPI]
5. New Humanity (2005) [UNESCO, DPI]
6. CIDSE (2007) [ILO, FAO, DPI, WIPO]

B. Special Consultative Status

7. Australian Catholic Social Justice Council (1997)
8. Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII (2006)
9. Association Points-Cœur (2005)
10. Bischöfliches Hilfswerk Misereor e.V. (2004)
11. Brothers of Charity (1995)

¹ Sources: United Nations Economic and Social Council, “List of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council as of 1 September 2010 (E/2010/INF/4)”, 2010; and Forum of Catholic-Inspired NGOs, “Results of the Mapping-Questionnaire”, 2009.

² This list does not include several transnational NGOs related to the Catholic community which are openly hostile to the Catholic Church or which do not publically recognize themselves as being Catholic.² Three of the NGOs included on this list (marked with **), the International Young Christian Workers; St. Joan’s International Alliance; and the International Catholic Union of the Press are no longer recognized by the Pontifical Council for the Laity as being Catholic organizations. They are, however, included here because of their continued identification as being Catholic NGOs, and their historical participation in the Conference of ICOs up until its dissolution in 2008.

12. Catholic Daughters of the Americas (2000)
13. Catholic Institute for International Relations-Progressio (1996)
14. Catholic International Education Office (1998) [ILO, FAO, DPI]
15. Catholic Medical Mission Board (2004)
16. Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid-CORDAID (2006)
17. Catholic Relief Services (United States Catholic Conference) (1978) [DPI]
18. Comité catholique contre la faim et pour le développement (1998)
19. Community of Sant'Egidio (2003) [ECOWAS, UNESCO, WHO, World Bank]
20. Company of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (2007) [DPI]
21. Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd (1996) [DPI]
22. Congregation of Our Lady of Mount Carmel - Carmelite NGO (2009)
23. Covenant House (1985) [DPI]
24. Dominicans for Justice and Peace: Order of Preachers (2002)
25. Dominican Leadership Conference (2002) [DPI]
26. Fondazione Marista per la Solidarietà Internazionale-ONLUS (2011)
27. Indian Social Institute (2004)
28. International Association of Charities (2003) [DPI, UNESCO, CoE]
29. International Catholic Child Bureau (1952) (UNESCO, UNICEF, CoE)
30. International Catholic Migration Commission (1952) [DPI, African Union]
31. International Catholic Union of the Press (1951) [DPI, UNESCO]**³
32. International Confederation of Christian Family Movements (1989) [DPI]
33. International Commission of Catholic Prison Pastoral Care (2000)
34. International Federation of Catholic Medical Associations (1997)
35. Istituto Internazionale Maria Ausiliatrice delle Salesiane di Don Bosco (2008)
36. International Kolping Society (1991) [DPI]
37. International Movement of Apostolate in the Independent Social Milieus-MIAMSI (1996) [CoE]
38. International Presentation Association of the Sisters of the Presentation (2000) [DPI]
39. International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development – VIDES (2003) [DPI]
40. International Young Catholic Students (1998) [DPI, UNESCO, CoE]
41. International Young Christian Workers (1951) **
42. Jesuit Refugee Service (2002)
43. Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers (1998) [DPI]
44. Maryknoll Sisters of St. Dominic (1998) [DPI]
45. MaterCare International (2006) [DPI]
46. National Board of Catholic Women of England and Wales (2001)
47. Partnership for Global Justice (2008) [DPI]
48. Passionists International (2009) [FAO, DPI, UNESCO]
49. Pax Christi International (1979) [DPI, UNESCO]
50. Pax Romana (ICMICA-IMCS) (1949) [ILO, DPI, UNESCO, World Bank, CoE]
51. Priests for Life (2003)
52. St. Joan's International Alliance (1971) **

³ In 2011, the International Catholic Union of the Press changed its name to the International Catholics Organisation of the Media (ICOM).

53. Salesian Missions (2007) [DPI]
54. School Sisters of Notre Dame (1998) [DPI]
55. Sisters of Charity Federation (2001)
56. Sisters of Mercy of the Americas (1998)
57. Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur (2001) [DPI]
58. Society of Catholic Medical Missionaries (2000) [DPI]
59. Swiss Catholic Lenten Fund (2007)
60. Teresian Association (1998) [DPI]
61. UNANIMA International (2005)
62. Vie Montante Intrnationale (2000)
63. VIVAT International (2004) (FAO, DPI]
64. Volontari nel Mondo-FOCSIV (2004)
65. Volontariato Internazionale per lo Sviluppo (2009) [ILO, UNESCO]
66. World Organization of Former Students of Catholic Education-OMAEC (2000) [UNESCO]
67. World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations (1947) [ILO, FAO, DPI, UNESCO, CoE, OAS]

C. Roster⁴

68. Association catholique internationale des services pour la jeunesse feminine (ACIJF) [DPI, UNESCO]
69. Catholic International Union for Social Service (1979)
70. Catholic Women's League Australia (1997)
71. Center of Concern (1974) [DPI]
72. Fe y Alegria (1973)
73. Loretto Community (2000)
74. International Federation of Rural Adult Catholic Movements (1981) [UNESCO]
75. International Movement of Apostolate of Children (MIDADE) (1985) [ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF]
76. International Catholic Committee of Nurses and Medico-Social Workers (CICIAMS) [DPI, WHO, CoE]
77. International Catholic Rural Association [ILO, FAO]
78. International Christian Union of Business Executives-UNIAPAC [ILO, FAO, UNESCO]
79. International Council of Catholic Men-Unum Omnes (FAO]
80. International Federation of Catholic Universities [DPI, UNESCO]
81. International Movements of Catholic Agricultural and Rural Youth-MIJARC [ILO, CoE]
82. International Secretariat of Catholic Technologists, Agriculturalists and Economists of Pax Romana. [ILO]
83. Society of Catholic Social Scientists (2003)
84. World Catholic Association for Communication-SIGNIS [UNESCO, CoE]
85. World Christian Life Community (1975) [DPI]
86. World Movement of Christian Workers [ILO]

⁴ Not all dates for EOCSOC NGOs with Roster status are available.

III. NGOS WITH OTHER STATUS NOT ALSO LISTED ABOVE

A. International Labor Organization (ILO)

87. International Coordination of Young Christian Workers-CIJOC

B. Department of Public Information (DPI)

88. Africa Faith and Justice Network

89. Catholic Near East Welfare Association

90. Congregation of the Mission

91. Congregation of Notre Dame

92. Comision Catolica Argentina Para La Campana Mundial Contra El Hambre, Accion Por el Desarrollo

93. Consejo Latinoamericano De Mujeres Catolicas

94. Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

95. The Christophers

96. Elizabeth Seton Federation

97. Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary

98. International Catholic Organizations Information Center

99. Knights of Columbus

100. Leadership Conference of Women Religious/Conference of the Major Superiors of Men

101. Marianists International

102. Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate

103. Mercy International Association

104. National Catholic Education Association

105. National Council of Catholic Women

106. Order of the Saint Augustine

107. Order of Discalced Carmelites

108. Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary

109. Society of the Sacred Heart

110. Trocaire- The Catholic Agency for World Development

111. United States Catholic Mission Association

112. Ursuline Sisters Congregations of Tildonk

C. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

113. World Union of Catholic Teachers

D. World Trade Organization (WTO)

114. Catholic Agency for Overseas Development-CAFOD

115. International Jesuit Network for Development

116. National Catholic Rural Life Conference

E. Council of Europe (CoE)

- 117. Confédération mondiale des anciens élèves de Don Bosco
- 118. Federation of Catholic Family Associations in Europe-FAFCE
- 119. Jesuit European Office-OCIPE

Bibliography

- “2012 JRS/USA Advocacy Issues.” *Jesuit Refugee Service USA*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://jrsusa.org/advocacy?LID=504>.
- 28th Interfederal Assembly of IMCS (Lima). “Toward a Re-Definition of the Movement.” International Movement of Catholic Students, 1975. AIF 75/312/FES. Pax Romana Archives, University of Fribourg.
- “A Row at the Pantheon: Pilgrims Show Disrespect to the Tomb of King Emmanuel.” *The Atlanta Constitution*. October 3, 1891.
- “About ICMYO.” *International Coordination Meeting of Youth Organisations*, 2012. <http://icmyo.wordpress.com/about/>.
- Alberigo, Giuseppe, and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds. *History of Vatican II*. 5 vols. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Alonso, Pablo, Jacques Hares, Elias Lopez, Lluís Magrina, and Danielle Vella, eds. *God in Exile: Towards a Shared Spirituality with Refugees*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005.
- Anderson, Mary B. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace-or War*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999.
- De Antonellis, Giacomo. *Storia dell’Azione cattolica*. Milano: Rizzoli, 1987.
- Appleby, R. Scott. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Araujo, Robert John, and John A. Lucal. *Papal Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace: The Vatican and International Organization From the Early Years to the League of Nations*. Ann Arbor, MI: Sapientia Press, 2004.
- Armella, María Luisa Aspe. *La formación social y política de los católicos mexicanos : la Acción Católica Mexicana y la Unión Nacional de Estudiantes Católicos, 1929-1958*. Ciudad de México: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2008.
- Arrupe, Pedro. “Men for Others.” Valencia: Creighton University Online Ministries, 1973. www.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html.
- . “The Society of Jesus and the Refugee Problem: Letter to All Jesuit Major Superiors (14 November, 1980).” In Vella, *Everybody’s Challenge*, 28–30.
- Au, Wilkie. “Ignatian Service, Gratitude and Love in Action.” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 40, no. 2 (Summer 2008).
- Aubert, Roger. *Catholic Social Teaching: An Historical Perspective*. Milwaukee WI: Marquette University, 2003.
- Balleis, Peter. “The Specific Jesuit Identity of JRS.” In Vella, *Everybody’s Challenge*, 100–104.
- Balleis, Peter, and Elias Lopez. “Sent to the Frontiers on a Mission of Reconciliation: A Vision of JRS Inspired by the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus.” Jesuit Refugee Service, February 11, 2009.
- Barnett, Michael N., and Jack Synder. “The Grand Strategies of Humanitarianism.” In Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism in Question*, 143-171.
- Barnett, Michael N., and Thomas G. Weiss. “Humanitarianism: A Brief History of the Present.” In Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism in Question*, 1-48.

- . *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread*. Global Institutions 51. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011.
- Barnett, Michael N., and Thomas G. Weiss, eds. *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 2008.
- Bartoli, Andrea. “Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Mozambique Peace Process.” In *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy, and Conflict Transformation*, edited by Raymond G. Helmick and Rodney L. Petersen, 316–381. Philadelphia: Templeton, 2001.
- Bartolomei, Linda, ed. *Report On UNHCR’s Annual Consultations With Non-Governmental Organizations (28 – 30 June 2011 - Geneva, Switzerland)*. Geneva: UNHCR, 2011. <http://www.unhcr.org/ngo-consultations/ngo-consultations-2011/Final-Full-Report-on-UNHCR-Annual-Consultations-with-NGOs-28-30June2011.pdf>.
- Baxter, Michael J. “‘Blowing the Dynamite of the Church’: Catholic Radicalism from a Catholic Radicalist Perspective.” In *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*, edited by William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin, 79–94. Milwaukee WI.: Marquette University, 2001.
- . “Review Essay: The Non-Catholic Character of the Public Church.” *Modern Theology* 11, no. 2 (April 1, 1995): 243–258. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0025.1995.tb00066.x.
- Bellin, Eva. “Faith in Politics: New Trends in the Study of Religion and Politics.” *World Politics* 60, no. 2 (January 2008): 315–347.
- Benedict XV. *Pacem Dei Munus Pulcherrimum*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1920.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xv/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xv_enc_23051920_pacem-dei-munus-pulcherrimum_en.html.
- Benedict XVI. “Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to Representatives of the Holy See; to International Organizations and to Participants in the Forum of Catholic-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations.” *The Holy See*, December 1, 2007. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2007/december/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20071201_ong_en.html.
- . “Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia Offering Them His Christmas Greetings.” *The Holy See*, December 22, 2005. http://www.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html.
- . “Address of Pope Benedict XVI to the 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (February 21, 2008).” In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 822–25.
- . *Africae Munus, On the Church in Africa in Service to Reconciliation, Justice and Peace*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2011. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20111119_africae-munus_en.html.
- . *Caritas in Veritate, Charity in Truth*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009.

- http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.
- . *Deus Caritas Est, God Is Love*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2005. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est_en.html.
- . *Ecclesia in Medio Oriente, The Church in the Middle East*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20120914_ecclesia-in-medio-orientate_en.html.
- . “Letter of Pope Benedict XVI to Father General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, SJ (January 19, 2008).” In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 809–12.
- . “Message of His Holiness Benedict XVI.” In Pontifical Council for the Laity, *The Beauty of Being a Christian*, 5–8.
- . “*Motu Proprio*” *On the Service of Charity*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20121111_caritas_en.html.
- Berger, Peter L. “Religion and Global Civil Society.” In *Religion in Global Civil Society*, edited by Mark Juergensmeyer, 11–22. New York: Oxford University, 2005.
- Bevans, Stephen B. “Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity: *Ad Gentes*.” In *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*, edited by Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, 3–143. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Eleanor Doidge. “Theological Reflection.” In *Reflection and Dialogue: What MISSION Confronts Religious Life Today?*, edited by Barbara Kraemer, 37–48. Chicago: Center for the Study of Religious Life, 2000.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Jeffrey Gros. *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Roger Schroeder. *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004.
- Bidegain, Anna Maria. *From Catholic Action to Liberation Theology: The Historical Process of the Laity in Latin America in the Twentieth Century*. Working Paper 48. Notre Dame, IN: Kellogg Institute, 1985.
- “Bilateral and Multilateral Relations of the Holy See.” *Vatican Website*, October 22, 2009. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_20010123_holy-see-relations_en.html.
- Biryaho, Francis. “South Sudan: Teacher Development is the Backbone of JRS.” *Jesuit Refugee Service Eastern Africa*, September 16, 2012. http://jrsea.org/news_detail?TN=NEWS-20120919060559&L=EN.
- Blin, François. *Repères pour l’histoire de la Conférence des organisations internationales catholiques (1927-2008)*. Paris: Editions Eclectica, 2008.
- Bloch, Christine. “Voices of Refugees in Geneva.” In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 283–84.
- Bodin, Jean. *Les six livres de la République*. Aalen, France: Scientia, 1961.

- Boff, Leonardo. *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*. Translated by John W. Dierchsmeier. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- Bokenkotter, Thomas S. *Church and Revolution: Catholics in the Struggle for Democracy and Social Justice*. New York: Image Books, 1998.
- Bosch, David Jacobus. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. American Society of Missiology Series 16. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.
- Van den Bossche, Peter. "Perceptions of the Legitimacy of International NGOs." In Vedder, *NGO Involvement in International Governance and Policy*, 135–74.
- Boswell, Jonathan. "Solidarity, Justice and Power Sharing: Patterns and Policies." In *Catholic Social Thought: Twilight or Renaissance?*, edited by Francis P. McHugh, Johan Verstraeten, and Jonathan Boswell, 93–116. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 157. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- Bouchard, Charles E. "Recovering the Gifts of the Holy Spirit in Moral Theology." *Theological Studies* 63, no. 3 (S 2002): 539–58.
- Brackley, Dean. *Divine Revolution: Salvation and Liberation in Catholic Thought*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996.
- Brady, Edward. "JRS Is a Jesuit Ministry." In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 24–26.
- Bruhl, Tanja. "Representing the People? NGOs in International Negotiations." In Hahn and Steffek, *Evaluating Transnational*, 181–99.
- Cafiso, Jenny. "His Hope Had Not Been in Vain." In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 273–279.
- Cahill, Edward. "The Catholic Social Movement: Historical Aspects." In *Official Catholic Social Teaching*, edited by Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 3–31. Readings in Moral Theology 5. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.
- Cahill, Lisa Sowle. "Caritas in Veritate: Benedict's Global Reorientation." *Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (June 1, 2010): 291–19.
- Calvez, Jean-Yves. *Faith and Justice: The Social Dimension of Evangelization*. St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1991.
- Campbell-Johnston, Michael. "What Don Pedro Had in Mind When He Invited the Society to Work With Refugees." In Vella, *Everybody's Challenge*, 40–45.
- Cardinale, Hyginus Eugene. *The Holy See and the International Order*. Gerrards Cross, UK: Colin Smythe, 1976.
- Casanova, José. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Catholics for Choice. "CFC See Change Campaign," 2008. <http://www.seechange.org/>.
- Chávez, Joaquín M. "University Apostles: Catholic Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Left, El Salvador, 1950-1970." Toronto, 2010.
- Chen, Martha Alter. "Engendering World Conferences: The International Women's Movement and the United Nations." *Third World Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (1995): 477–93.
- Chiang, Pei-heng. *Non-Governmental Organizations at the United Nations: Identity, Role, and Function*. New York: Praeger, 1981.

- Christiansen, Drew. "Movement, Asylum, Borders: Christian Perspectives." *International Migration Review* 30, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 7–17.
- Ciprotti, Pio. "The Holy See: Its Function, Form, and Status in International Law." *Concilium* 8, no. 63 (1970): 63–73.
- Claude, Inis L. "Peace and Security: Prospective Roles for the Two United Nations." *Global Governance* 2, no. 3 (1996): 289–98.
- . *Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. New York: Random House, 1959.
- Cleary, Seamus. "The World Bank and NGOs." In Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World"*, 63–97.
- Coate, Roger A. "The John W. Holmes Lecture: Growing the 'Third UN' for People-centered Development--The United Nations, Civil Society, and Beyond." *Global Governance* 15 (2009): 153–68.
- Code of Canon Law*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983.
http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_INDEX.HTM.
- Coghlan, Denise. "Serving With the Eyes and Heart of Love." In Alonso et al., *God in Exile*, 77–85.
- Coleman, John A. *An American Strategic Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Comblin, José. "Grace." In *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, edited by Ignacio Ellacuría and Jon Sobrino, 522–531. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.
- . *People of God*. Translated by Philip Berryman. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004.
- . *The Holy Spirit and Liberation*. Translated by Paul Burns. Theology and Liberation. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1989.
- "Community Service Learning Tracks (CSLT)." *Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins*. Accessed December 6, 2012. http://www.jc-hem.org/campaign_detail?PTN=PROMO-20120622062130&TN=PROJECT-20120702121445&L=EN.
- Confoy, Maryanne. *Religious Life and Priesthood: Perfectae Caritatis, Optatam Totius, Presbyterorum Ordinis*. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2008.
- Congar, Yves. *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*. Translated by Donald Attwater. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1956.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Communio Notio, Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfait_h_doc_28051992_communio-notio_en.html.
- . *Doctrinal Note on Some Aspects of Evangelization*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfait_h_doc_20071203_nota-evangelizzazione_en.html.
- . *Dominus Iesus, On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfait_h_doc_20000806_dominus-iesus_en.html.

- . *Notification on the Book “Church: Charism and Power” by Father Leonardo Boff O.F.M.* Rome, 1985.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19850311_notif-boff_en.html.
- Cook, Bernard. “Pax Romana and the Reconstruction of a United Europe Along Christian Lines.” In *Une Europe malgré tout, 1945-1990: Contacts et réseaux culturels, intellectuels et scientifiques entre Européens dans la Guerre froide*, edited by Antoine Fleury and Lubor Jílek, 9:267–279. L’Europe et les Europes. Brussels: Peter Land, 2009.
- Cotler, Irwin. “Jewish NGOs and Religious Human Rights: A Case-Study.” In Witte and Van der Vyver, *Religious Human Rights in Global Perspective*, 235–94.
- Daly, Daniel J. “Structures of Virtue and Vice.” *New Blackfriars* 92, no. 1039 (2011): 341–357. doi:10.1111/j.1741-2005.2010.01355.x.
- Dardis, John. “Showing Love and Care to Those Most in Need.” In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 259–261.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006.
- Days of Reflection of International Movements for Specialized Catholic Action*. Brussels: MIACS, 2002.
- Demoustier, Adrien, and Jean-Yves Calvez. “The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor.” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 21, no. 2 (1989).
- Diamond, Louise, and John McDonald. *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*. Hartford, CT: Kumarian, 1996.
- Donini, Antonio. “The Bureaucracy and the Free Spirits: Stagnation and Innovation in the Relationship Between the UN and NGOs.” In Weiss and Gordenker, *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, 83–101.
- Dorr, Donal. *Option for the Poor: A Hundred Years of Vatican Social Teaching*. Revised. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992.
- Doyle, Dennis M. *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000.
- Dulles, Avery. “Faith, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission.” In *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education*, 19–25. Washington, DC: Jesuit Conference, 1990.
- Duquoc, Christian, and Casiano Floristán Samanes, eds. *Charisms in the Church*. Concilium. New York: Seabury, 1978.
- Dussel, Enrique D. *A History of the Church in Latin America: Colonialism to Liberation (1492-1979)*. Translated by Alan Neely. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1981.
- . “Recent Latin American Theology.” In *The Church in Latin America, 1492-1992*, edited by Enrique D. Dussel, translated by Paul Burns, 1:391–402. A History of the Church in the Third World. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992.
- Egan, Anthony. *The Politics of a South African Catholic Student Movement, 1960-1987*. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1991.
- Elsbernd, Mary. “What Ever Happened to *Octogesima Adveniens?*” *Theological Studies* 56, no. 1 (March 1995): 39–60.
- Evans, John Whitney. *The Newman Movement: Roman Catholics in American Higher Education, 1883-1971*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1980.

- Faggioli, Massimo. *Vatican II: The Battle for Meaning*. New York: Paulist Press, 2012.
- Fanello, Gabriella Marcucci. *Storia della F.U.C.I.* Roma: Editrice Studium, 1971.
- Favez, Jean-Claude. *The Red Cross and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Ferree, William. *Guide to the International Movement of Catholic Students*. Fribourg, Switzerland: International Movement of Catholic Students, 1965.
- Ferriols, Roque. "The Pax Romana Conferences In Manila: A Special Report." *Philippine Studies* 8, no. 2 (1960): 362–69.
- Ferris. "Faith and Humanitarianism: It's Complicated." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24, no. 3 (2011): 606–625.
- "Final Report: Speaking and Listening With Respect: Students, Faith, and Dialogue." International Movement of Catholic Students, 2009. IMCS Archives, Paris.
- Flannery, Austin, ed. *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*. New Revised Edition. Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1996.
- Fogarty, Gerald P. "II. The Council Gets Underway." In Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, translated by Matthew O'Connell, 1:69–106.
- Gaer, Felice D. "Reality Check: Human Rights NGOs Confront Governments at the UN." In Weiss and Gordenker, *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, 51–66.
- Gaillardetz, Richard R. "Shifting Meanings in the Lay-Clergy Distinction." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 64 (1999): 115–39.
- . *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2006.
- Gartlan, Jean. *At the United Nations: The Story of the NCWC/USCC Office for United Nations Affairs (1946-1972)*. Baltimore, MD: Gateway Press, 1998.
- General Congregation 31. *Decree 32: The Social Apostolate*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 181–83.
- General Congregation 32. *Decree 2: Jesuits Today*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 291–297.
- . *Decree 4: Our Mission Today: The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 298–316.
- General Congregation 33. *Decree 1: Companions of Jesus Sent Into Today's World*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 439–55.
- General Congregation 34. *Decree 3: Our Mission and Justice*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 530–535.
- General Congregation 35. *Decree 1: With Renewed Vigor and Zeal: The Society of Jesus Responds to the Invitation of the Holy Father*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 727–732.
- . *Decree 2: A Fire That Kindles Other Fires: Rediscovering Our Charism*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 733–43.
- . *Decree 3: Challenges to Our Mission Today: Sent to the Frontiers*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 744–54.
- . *Decree 6: Collaboration at the Heart of Mission*. In Padberg, *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, 780–88.

- General Secretariat of the Synod of Bishops. *Instrumentum Laboris for XIII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20120619_instrumentum-xiii_en.html.
- Gigacz, Stefan. "The Radical Roots of the New Evangelisation." *CathNews*, August 9, 2012. <http://cathnews.com/article.aspx?aeid=32734>.
- Godin, Emmanuel. "La Fédération française des étudiants catholiques (FFEC). De l'Entre-deux-guerres au Régime de Vichy." *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France* 87, no. 1 (2008): 87–110.
- Goldie, Rosemary. *From a Roman Window: Five Decades of the World, the Church and the Laity*. Melbourne: HarperCollins Melbourne, 1998.
- . "Pax Romana Remembered." In *Memory and Hope: Pax Romana MIIC - ICMICA: 1947-1987*, 14–22. Geneva: Pax Romana ICMICA/MIIC, 1987.
- . "Ramon Sugranyes: Catholic International Organizations, COPECIAL and Vatican II." *Notes and Documents (Institut Jacques Maritain)* no. September-December (1998): 20–27.
- Greene, Tom. "Observations of the Social Apostolate, Justice and the Decrees of General Congregations 31 to 35." *Promotio Iustitiae* no. 108 (2012).
- Grootaers, Jan. "VIII. The Drama Continues Between the Acts: The 'Second Preparation' and Its Opponents." In Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, translated by Matthew O'Connell, 2:359–515.
- Gros, Jeffery. "Declaration on Religious Freedom: *Dignitatis Humanae*." In *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes, Dignitatis Humanae*, edited by Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, 151–249. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- "Guidelines of the JRS (19 March, 2000)." In *Everybody's Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*, 17–25. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000.
- Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988.
- Hahn, Kristina, and Jens Steffek, eds. *Evaluating Transnational NGOs: Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hahn, Kristina, and Jens Steffek. "Evaluating NGOs: Prospects for Academic Analysis." In Hahn and Steffek, *Evaluating Transnational NGOs*, 257–64.
- Haight, Roger. *The Experience and Language of Grace*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Halpin, Darren, and Peter McLaverty. "Legitimizing INGO Advocacy: The Case of Internal Democracies." In Hahn and Steffek, *Evaluating Transnational NGOs Legitimacy*, 55–73.
- Hampson, Joe. "JRS Accompaniment: A New Way of Being Present?," December 2, 2009. <http://jrsusa.org/accompaniment?LID=141>.
- Hanna, Tony. *New Ecclesial Movements*. New York: Alba House, 2006.
- Harrell-Bond, Barbara E. "Can Humanitarian Work with Refugees Be Humane?" *Human Rights Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (2002): 51–85.

- Harris, Sam. *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror, and the Future of Reason*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2004.
- Hehir, J. Bryan. "Overview." In *Religion in World Affairs*, 11–24. DACOR Bacon House Foundation, 1995.
- . "Religious Activism for Human Rights: A Christian Case Study." In Witte and Van der Vyver, *Religious Human Rights in Global Perspective*, 97–119.
- Henriot, Peter J. "Social Sin and Conversion: A Theology of the Church's Involvement." *Chicago Studies* 11 (1972): 115–130.
- Heyer, Kristin E. *Prophetic & Public: The Social Witness of U.S. Catholicism*. Moral Traditions Series. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006.
- Hinsdale, Mary Ann. "Jesuit Theological Discourse Since Vatican II." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Jesuits*, edited by Thomas Worcester, 298–318. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Hitchens, Christopher. *God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*. New York: Twelve, 2007.
- "Hoisting the Sails in the Changing Seventies: The International Movement of Catholic Students in Its 50th Year." *Convergence* no. July (1971): 3–19.
- Hollenbach, David. "Civil Society: Beyond the Public-Private Dichotomy." *Responsive Community* 5, no. 1 (1995): 15–23.
- . ed. *Driven from Home: Protecting the Rights of Forced Migrants*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010.
- . "Faith, Justice, and the Jesuit Mission: A Response to Avery Dulles." In *Assembly 1989: Jesuit Ministry in Higher Education*, 26–29. Washington, DC: Jesuit Conference, 1990.
- . "Gaudium et Spes." In *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries And Interpretations*, edited by Kenneth R. Himes, Lisa Sowle Cahill, Charles E. Curran, David Hollenbach, and Thomas A. Shannon, 266–91. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005.
- . *Refugee Rights: Ethics, Advocacy, and Africa*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008.
- . *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2003.
- Holy See. "Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 8, Paragraph 1, of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict Initial Reports of States Parties Due in 2003," October 22, 2012. CRC/C/OPAC/VAT/1. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child.
- "Homepage." *Jesuit Commons: Higher Education at the Margins*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://www.jc-hem.org/>.
- Horn, Gerd-Rainer, and Emmanuel Gerard, eds. *Left Catholicism, 1943-1955: Catholics and Society in Western Europe at the Point of Liberation*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.

- Hovey, Michael W. "Interceding at the United Nations: The Human Rights of Conscientious Objection." In *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*, edited by Jackie Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, 214–24. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997.
- Hünemann, Peter. "V. The Final Weeds of the Council." In Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, translated by Matthew O'Connell, 5:363–484.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.
- Hutchings, Kimberly. "Can Global Civil Society Civilize the International? Some Reflections." In Storrar, et al., *A World for All?*, 40-58.
- "IMCS and IYCS Policy Paper on Integral Education," 2003. IMCS Archives, Paris.
- Institut Marc Sangnier. *Marc Sangnier en 1910: La lettre Notre charge apostolique et ses suites: Actes de la journée d'études du Vendredi 29 Septembre 2000*. Paris: Institut Marc Sangnier, 2002.
- "Insults by French Pilgrims: Riots Caused in Rome by Acts at Victor Emmanuel's Tomb." *New York Times*. October 2, 1891.
- International Statutes of IMCS Pax Romana*. International Movement of Catholic Students, 2007. <http://www.imcs-miec.org/statutes-English,s,98>.
- "Intervention of H. B. Baselios Cleemis Thottunkal, Archbishop Major of Trivandrum of Syro-Malankars, Head of the Synod of the Syro-Malankar Church (India)." *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 13, 2012). http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b14_02.html.
- "Intervention of H. Exc. Rev. Mons. François Lapierre, P.M.E., Bishop of Saint-Hyacinthe (Canada)." *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 13, 2012). http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b14_02.html.
- "Intervention of H. Exc. Rev. Mons. Jorge Eduardo Lozano, Bishop of Gualaguaychú (Argentina)." *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 12 (October 12, 2012). http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b12_02.html.
- Jesuit Refugee Service. "The Charter of Jesuit Refugee Service," March 19, 2000. <https://www.jrs.net/assets/Sections/Downloads/char-en2.pdf>.
- "Jesuit Refugee Service International Office: Who We Are." *Jesuit Refugee Service*. Accessed February 7, 2013. <http://www.jrs.net/about>.
- Jesuit Refugee Service: Strategic Framework 2012-2015*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2012. www.jrs.net/about?LID=526&L=EN.
- John Paul II. "Address of His Holiness John Paul II to the Representatives of Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental Organizations." New York, October 2, 1979. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1979/october/document_s/hf_jp-ii_spe_19791002_usa-ngo_en.html.
- . "Address of His Holiness Pope John Paul II on the Occasion of the Meeting with the Ecclesial Movements and the New Communities, Rome, 30 May 1998." In Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Movements in the Church*, 219–224.

- . “Allocution to the Jesuit Provincials.” Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1982.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1982/february/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19820227_provinciali-gesu_it.html.
- . *Centesimus Annus*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1991.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html.
- . *Christifideles Laici: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation On the Vocation and Mission of the Laity in the Church and in the World*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1988.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici_en.html.
- . “Discours du Saint-Père Jean-Paul II aux Secrétaires régionaux de la Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique Internationale et aux membres du Conseil directeur du Mouvement International des Étudiants Catholiques.” Vatican City, January 16, 1981.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1981/january/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19810116_studentsi-cattolici_fr.html.
- . “Message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II.” In Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Movements in the Church*, 15–19.
- . *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia, Reconciliation and Penance*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1984.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_02121984_reconciliatio-et-paenitentia_en.html.
- . *Redemptor Hominis, The Redeemer of Man*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1979.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_04031979_redemptor-hominis_en.html.
- . *Redemptoris Missio, On the Permanent Validity of the Church’s Missionary Mandate*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio_en.html.
- . *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, On Social Concern* (1987). In O’Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 424–70.
- . *Vita Consecrata, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation On Consecrated Life and Its Mission in the Church and in the World*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031996_vita-consecrata_en.html.
- . “Who Is the Priest? Remarks of Pope John Paul II During Ordination Ceremonies in Rio De Janeiro.” *Origins* 10, no. 9 (July 31, 1980).
- John XXIII. *Pacem in Terris, Peace on Earth* (1963).” In O’Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 137–170.
- Johnston, Douglas M, and Cynthia Sampson, eds. *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- “Joint Response Letter by IMCS and ICMICA Pax Romana,” 1948. E/C.2/W.20. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- “Joint Written Statement Submitted by International Catholic Migration Commission and the Jesuit Refugee Service to the Commission on Human Rights,” March 17, 2003. E/CN.4/2003/NGO/172. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- “JRS Advocacy Work.” *Jesuit Refugee Service Europe*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://www.jrseurope.org/policycampaigns.htm>.
- Karns, Margaret P., and Karen A. Mingst. *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004.
- Keane, John. “A World for All? Thoughts on Global Civil Society.” In Storrar et al., *A World for All?*, 17–39.
- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Keenan, James F. *A History of Catholic Moral Theology in the Twentieth Century: From Confessing Sins to Liberating Consciences*. New York: Continuum, 2010.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S Nye. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.
- Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans. “A Paschal Love for the World.” *Promotio Justitiae* 68 (September 1997): 95–103.
- . “Address.” Santa Severa, Italy, 2006.
- . “Review of the Jesuit Refugee Service to the Whole Society: Extracts of a Letter From Peter-Hans Kolvenbach SJ to the Society, 1990.” In Vella, *Everybody’s Challenge*, 46–55.
- Korey, William. *NGOs and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: A Curious Grapevine*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998.
- Koupal, William. “Charism: A Relational Concept.” *Worship* 42, no. 9 (N 1968): 539–545.
- Küng, Hans. “The Charismatic Structure of the Church.” In *The Church and Ecumenism.*, 41–61. New York: Paulist Press, 1965.
- Land, Philip. “*Populorum Progressio*, Mission and Development.” *International Review of Mission* 58, no. 232 (October 1, 1969): 400–407.
- Lane, Dermot A. *Foundations for a Social Theology: Praxis, Process and Salvation*. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.
- Leahy, Brendan. *Ecclesial Movements and Communities: Origins, Significance, and Issues*. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2011.
- Leckey, Dolores R. *The Laity And Christian Education: Apostolicam Actuositatem, Gravissimum Educationis*. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2006.
- Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1997.
- Lefèvre, Denis. *Marc Sangnier: l’aventure du Catholicisme social*. Paris: Mame, 2008.
- “Leo’s Life in Danger: The Pope Said to be Threatened with Assassination.” *Chicago Daily Tribune*. October 23, 1891.
- Les Intellectuels dans la Chrétienté*. Fribourg: Pax Romana, 1948.

- “Lettre Datée Du 4 Mars 1990. Adressée au Secrétaire Général adjoint aux droits de l’homme par le représentant permanent de Singapour auprès de l’office des Nations Unies à Genève,” May 24, 1991. E/CN.4/1991/85. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- Levasseur, Jules H. “Pax Romana: Its Higher Educational Role.” Dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1965.
- Loughry, Maryanne. “The Pedro Arrupe Tutorship in Oxford.” In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 248–49.
- Malchow, Bruce V. *Social Justice in the Hebrew Bible: What Is New and What Is Old*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996.
- Mannion, Gerard. *Ecclesiology and Postmodernity: Questions for the Church in Our Time*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2007.
- Marchetto, Agostino. *The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council: A Counterpoint for the History of the Council*. Translated by Kenneth D. Whitehead. Scranton, PA: University of Scranton Press, 2010.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Integral Humanism: Temporal and Spiritual Problems of a New Christendom*. Translated by Joseph W. Evans. New York: Scribner and Sons, 1968.
- Marshall, Catherine. “New Refugee Bill ‘Retrograde and Reprehensible’.” *Province Express*, November 6, 2012. <http://express.org.au/article.aspx?aeid=34021>.
- McDonald, John. “Further Exploration of Track Two Diplomacy.” In *Timing the De-escalation of International Conflicts*, edited by Louis Kriesberg and Stuart J. Thorson, 201–220. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991.
- McEnroy, Carmel Elizabeth. *Guests in Their Own House: The Women of Vatican II*. New York: Crossroad, 1996.
- Melnyk, Roman A. *Vatican Diplomacy at the United Nations: A History of Catholic Global Engagement*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2009.
- Mercieca, Ryan, ed. “Pax Romana’s Speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Launch of the International Year of Youth.” In *The World Is Youth*, 5–11. John Paul II Youths, 2011. http://issuu.com/ryanmercieca/docs/international_year_of_youth_document.
- Minvielle, Bernard. *L’Apostolat des laïcs à la veille du concile (1949-1959): histoire des congrès mondiaux de 1951 et 1957*. Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires, 2001.
- Murphy, Charles M. “Action for Justice as Constitutive of the Preaching of the Gospel: What Did the 1971 Synod Mean?” In *Readings in Moral Theology No. 5: Official Catholic Social Teaching*, edited by Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 150–168. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.
- . “Charity, Not Justice, as Constitutive of the Church’s Mission.” *Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (2007): 274–86.
- Musto, Ronald G. *The Catholic Peace Tradition*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986.
- Muthumbi, Jane W. *Participation, Representation, and Global Civil Society: Christian and Islamic Fundamentalist Anti-Abortion Networks and United Nations Conferences*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010.

- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1993.
<http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/the-harvest-of-justice-is-sown-in-peace.cfm>.
- “National Movements.” *International Movement of Catholic Students*. Accessed July 23, 2012. http://imcs-miec.org/national_movements-English,s,35.
- Neuhaus, Richard John. “Pope Benedict on Love and Justice.” *First Things*, May 2006.
<http://www.firstthings.com/article/2009/03/pope-benedict-on-love-and-justice-32>.
- NGO Branch of the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. “Introduction to ECOSOC Consultative Status.” Accessed August 4, 2011.
<http://csonet.org/index.php?menu=30>.
- Nichols, Aidan. *The Thought of Benedict XVI: An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger*. New York: Burns & Oates, 2005.
- Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
- O’Brien, David J., and Thomas A. Shannon, eds. *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*. Expanded Edition. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1987.
- O’Brien, Kevin. “Consolation in Action: The Jesuit Refugee Service and the Ministry of Accompaniment.” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 37, no. 4 (Winter 2005).
- O’Keefe, Mark. *What Are They Saying About Social Sin?* New York: Paulist Press, 1990.
- O’Malley, John W. *The First Jesuits*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
 ———. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2010.
- Obiezu, Emeka Christian. “A Theological Interpretation and Assessment of the Participation of the Roman Catholic Church and Roman Catholic Church-Inspired Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the United Nations.” Doctor of Philosophy, University of St. Michael’s College, 2010.
- Office of the President of the Millennium Assembly. “Reference Document on Civil Society Participation in United Nations Conferences and Special Sessions of the General Assembly During the 1990s,” August 2001.
<http://www.un.org/ga/president/55/speech/civilsociety1.htm>.
- Oliver, Robert W. “Developing Criteria of Ecclesiality for Associations of the Faithful.” Doctor of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, 2002.
- Orobator, Agbonkhianmeghe E. “Justice for the Displaced: The Challenge of a Christian Understanding.” In Hollenbach, *Driven from Home*, 37–54.
 ———. “Key Ethical Issues in the Practices and Policies of Refugee-Serving NGOs and Churches.” In Hollenbach, *Refugee Rights*, 225–44.
- Padberg, John W., ed. *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees of the 31st-35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*. Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation 25. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2009.
- Paul VI. “Address to United Nations General Assembly.” New York, October 4, 1965.
<http://www.holyseemission.org/about/paul-VI-speech-at-the-un.aspx>.
 ———. “Discours aux membres des Organisations Internationales Catholiques.” December 6, 1975.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1975/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19751206_membri-oic_fr.html.

- . *Ecclesiam Suam, On the Church*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1964. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam_en.html.
- . *Evangelica Testificatio, Apostolic Exhortation on the Renewal of Religious Life*. In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 1:680–706.
- . *Evangelii Nuntiandi, On Evangelization in the Modern World* (1975). In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 321–67.
- . “Message du Pape Paul VI pour le 50ème anniversaire de la fondation de la Conférence des Organisations Internationales Catholiques.” September 12, 1977. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1977/september/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19770912_cinquantenario-oic_fr.html.
- . *Motu Proprio de Pastoralis Migratorum Cura*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1969. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19690815_pastoralis-migratorum-cura_it.html.
- . *Octogesima Adveniens, A Call to Action* (1971). In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 280–303.
- . *Populorum Progressio, On the Development of Peoples* (1967). In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 253–77.
- . “Sodalibus Instituti ‘Pax Romana’ Appellati, Friburgi, in Helvetia, Ex Universo Terrarum Orbe, Conventum Habentibus, Quinquagesimo Volvente Anno Ab Illa Associatione Condita.” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis LXIII*, no. 1 (1971): 687–91.
- Pelegri, Buenaventura. *IMCS-IYCS: Their Option Their Pedagogy*. IMCS Asia Secretariat, 1979.
- Pfeil, Margaret R. “Called and Gifted: Charism and Catholic Social Teaching.” *Horizons* 34, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 222–37.
- Pictet, Jean. *The Fundamental Principles of the Red Cross Proclaimed by the Twentieth International Conference of the Red Cross, Vienna, 1965*. Geneva: Henry Dunant Institute, 1979.
- Pleins, J. *The Social Visions of the Hebrew Bible: A Theological Introduction*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Pochon, Roger. *Les Associations internationales d'étudiants*. Fribourg: L'Oeuvre de Saint-Paul, 1928.
- Pochon, Roger, and Ramon Sugranyes de Franch. *Pax Romana Down the Years (1921-1961)*. Fribourg: Bersier, 1961.
- Pontifical Commission for the Spiritual Care of Migrants and Itinerants. *Towards a Pastoral Care of Refugees*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_p_c_migrants_doc_19830214_refu_past-care_en.html#_ftnref11.
- Pontifical Council “Cor Unum”, and Pontifical Council For The Pastoral Care Of Migrants And Itinerant People. *Refugees: A Challenge To Solidarity*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_p_c_migrants_doc_19920625_refugees_en.html.

- Pontifical Council for the Laity, ed. *Movements in the Church: Proceedings of the World Congress of the Ecclesial Movements, Rome, 27-29 May 1998*. Laity Today 2. Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 1999.
- . “Respiciens Normas Quibus Instituta Internationalia Catholica Definiuntur.” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* LXIII, no. 1 (1971): 948–956.
- . , ed. *The Beauty of Being a Christian. Movements in the Church*. Laity Today 2. Vatican City: Pontificium Consilium pro Laicis, 2006.
- Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People. *Erga Migrantes Caritas Christi*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_p_c_migrants_doc_20040514_erga-migrantes-caritas-christi_en.html.
- . *Jubilee Charter of Rights of Displaced People*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_p_c_migrants_doc_20000601_refu_jub-charter_en.html.
- Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People, and Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life. *Joint Letter to the Superiors General of Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life*, 2005. www.ofmcap.org/doc/migrantes-en.pdf.
- Pontificium Consilium de Iustitia et Pace. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004.
- Pope, Stephen J. “Benedict XVI’s *Deus Caritas Est*: An Ethical Analysis.” In *Applied Ethics in a World Church: The Padua Conference*, edited by Linda Hogan, 271–277. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2008.
- Prost, Antoine. “La Fédération française des étudiants catholiques.” *Académie* (January 1, 1965): 161–66.
- Rahner, Karl. *The Dynamic Element in the Church*. Translated by W.J. O’Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- . “Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II.” *Theological Studies* 40, no. 4 (D 1979): 716–27.
- Raper, Mark. “Introduction: The Arrupe Vision in Action.” In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 9–13.
- . “Mercy and the National Interest, Keynote Address for the National Conference of Mercy Refugee Service, 22nd November 2002.” In Vella, *Everybody’s Challenge*, 65.
- . “Pastoral Accompaniment Among Refugees: The Jesuit Refugee Service Experience.” In Vella, *Everybody’s Challenge*, 84–92.
- Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. “Europe in the Crisis of Cultures.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 32 (2005): 345–56.
- . *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith: The Church As Communion*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- . “The Ecclesial Movements: A Theological Reflection on Their Place in the Church.” In Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Movements in the Church*, 23–51.
- . *Values in a Time of Upheaval*. Translated by Brian McNeil. New York: Crossroad; San Francisco, 2006.

- Rausch, Thomas P. *Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to His Theological Vision*. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Reinhold Niebuhr. *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Renders, Christophe. "Speak Out, Judge Righteously, Defend the Rights of the Poor and Needy (Pr 31:9)." In Alonso et al., *God in Exile*, 107–119.
- "Report of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict in Chad," February 9, 2011. S/2011/64. United Nations Security Council.
- "Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: Proclamation of 2010 as the International Year of Youth: Dialogue and Mutual Understanding," February 1, 2010. A/RES/64/134. United Nations General Assembly.
- "Resolutions Carried by the Directing Committee of IMCS." *Convergence* no. July (1971): 26–28.
- "Review of the Consultative Activities of Non-Governmental Organizations Granted Consultative Status by the Economic and Social Council: Report Prepared by the Secretary-General Pursuant to Council Resolution J225 (XIII)," September 4, 1968. E/C.2/R.38. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- Riccardi, Andrea, Régis Ladous. "I. The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council." In Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, translated by Matthew O'Connell, 1:1–68.
- Riccardi, Andrea, Régis Ladous, and Jean-Dominique Durand. *Sant'Egidio: Rome and the World*. Maynooth: St. Paul's Press, 1999.
- Richard A. McCormick. *Notes on Moral Theology, 1965-1980*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981.
- Rieff, David. *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2002.
- De Rosa, Gabriele. *Storia politica dell'Azione cattolica in Italia*. Bari: Glaterza, 1953.
- Rossi, Joseph Samuel. *American Catholics and the Formation of the United Nations*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993.
- . *Uncharted Territory: The American Catholic Church at the United Nations, 1946-1972*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006.
- Rourke, Thomas R. *The Social and Political Thought of Benedict XVI*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010.
- Roussel, Luc. "The YCW and the Vatican: From Confidence to Incomprehension and Rupture 1945-1985." In *The First Steps Towards a History of the IYCW*. Brussels: International Young Christian Workers, 1997.
- Rush, Ormond. *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles*. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- D' Sami, Bernard. "The Impact of *Gaudium et Spes* on The Social Mission of the Church in Asia with Particular Reference to Catholic Students and Workers Movements." In *The Call to Justice: The Legacy of Gaudium et Spes 40 Years Later*. Rome, 2005.
- Sampson, Cynthia. "Religion and Peacebuilding." In *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques*, edited by I. William Zartman and J. Lewis Rasmussen, 273–316. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1997.

- Sankey, John. "Conclusions." In Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World"*, 270–76.
- Schaes, Roxanne. "Discovering Hidden Treasurers." In Alonso et al., *God in Exile*, 47–57.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *Church: The Human Story of God*. New York: Crossroad, 1993.
- . *The Mission of the Church*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1973.
- Schubeck, Thomas Louis. *Love That Does Justice*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007.
- Schultheis, Michael J. "Rebuilding the Bridges and Clearing the Footpaths: A Parable of JRS." In Valcárcel, *The Wound of the Border*, 146–150.
- Searly, Bill. "The Early History: From the Congress of Vienna to the San Francisco Conference." In Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World": The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, 15–30.
- Second Vatican Council. *Ad Gentes Divinitus, Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity* (1965). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Redmond Fitzmaurice, 1:813–856.
- . *Apostolicam Actuositatem, The Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People* (1965). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Father Finnian, 1:766–98.
- . *Dignitatis Humanae, Declaration on Religious Liberty* (1965). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Laurence Ryan, 1:799–812.
- . *Gaudium et Spes, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* (1965). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Ronan Lennon, 1:903–1001.
- . *Lumen Gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (1964). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Colman O'Neill, 1:350–425.
- . *Perfectae Caritatis, Decree on the Up-To-Date Renewal of Religious Life* (1965). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Austin Flannery, 1:611–623.
- . *Sacrosanctum Concilium, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963). In Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, translated by Joseph Rodgrs, 1:1–36.
- "Serve: Our Programs." *Jesuit Refugee Service USA*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://jrsusa.org/services>.
- "Serve: Psychosocial Support." *Jesuit Refugee Service Middle East and North Africa*. Accessed December 6, 2012. <http://www.jrsmena.org/services>.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. *A New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Christian. *The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991.
- Sottas, Eric. "Pax Romana et le travail Intergouvernemental." In *Memory and Hope: Pax Romana MIIC - ICMICA: 1947-1987*, 23–25. Geneva: Pax Romana ICMICA/MIIC, 1987.
- Spar, Debora, and James Dail. "Of Measurement and Mission: Accounting for Performance in Non-Governmental Organizations." *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 171–181.
- Spiro, Peter J. "Accounting for NGOs." *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 161–169.

- “Statement Submitted by Jesuit Refugee Service to the ECOSOC Substantive Session of 2011.,” May 9, 2011. E/2011/NGO/10. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-Governmental Organization in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” November 17, 2011. E/CN.5/2012/NGO/13. United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission for Social Development.
- “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-Governmental Organization in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” December 2, 2011. E/CN.6/2012/NGO/50. United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission on the Status of Women.
- “Statement Submitted by Pax Romana, a Non-governmental Organization in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council,” January 12, 2004. E/CN.5/2004/NGO/5. United Nations Economic and Social Council: Commission for Social Development.
- Storrar, William, Peter J Casarella, and Paul Louis Metzger, eds. *A World for All?: Global Civil Society in Political Theory and Trinitarian Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2011.
- Suenes, Leon-Joseph. “Introduction: Co-Responsibility: Dominating Idea of the Council and Its Pastoral Consequences.” In *Renewal of Religious Structures: Proceedings of the Congress on the Theology of the Renewal of the Church Centenary of Canada, 1867-1967*, edited by L. K. Shook, 2:7–18. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- Sugranyes de Franch, Ramon. *Le Christ dans le Monde: Les Organisations internationales catholiques*. Paris: Fayard, 1972.
- Synod of Bishops. *Justicia in Mundo, Justice in the World* (1971). In O’Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 304–318.
- . “Message of the XIII Ordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops.” *Synodus Episcoporum Bollettino* no. 30 (October 26, 2012). http://www.vatican.va/news_services/press/sinodo/documents/bollettino_25_xiii-ordinaria-2012/02_inglese/b30_02.html.
- . “The Church, in the Word of God, Celebrates the Mysteries of Christ for the Salvation of the World.” *Eternal Word Television Network*, 1985. <http://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/SYNFINAL.HTM>.
- Tanguy, Joelle, and Fiona Terry. “Humanitarian Responsibility and Committed Action: Response to ‘Principles, Politics, and Humanitarian Action’.” *Ethics & International Affairs* 13, no. 1 (1999): 29–34. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7093.1999.tb00324.x.
- Tanner, Norman P. *The Church and the World: Gaudium et Spes, Inter Mirifica*. Rediscovering Vatican II. New York: Paulist Press, 2005.
- . “V. The Church in the World (Ecclesia Ad Extra).” In Alberigo and Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*, translated by Matthew O’Connell, 5:270–282.
- Teixeira, Faustino Luiz Couto. “Base Church Communities in Brazil.” In *The Church in Latin America, 1492-1992*, edited by Enrique D. Dussel, translated by Francis

- McDonagh, 1:403–418. *A History of the Church in the Third World*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992.
- “The Disorders in Rome.” *New York Times*. October 3, 1891.
- “The Statutes of JRS as a Foundation of Canonical Rite.” Jesuit Refugee Service, 2003. JRS Archive.
- “The Vatican and Italy: A War to the Bitter End Has Been Commenced. The Assaults on the Pilgrims Early This Month Instigated by the Government--the Scandals May Result in the Pope Leaving Rome.” *New York Times*. October 23, 1891.
- Toft, Monica Duffy, Daniel Philpott, and Timothy Samuel Shah. *God’s Century: Resurgent Religion and Global Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011.
- Tripole, Martin R. *Faith Beyond Justice: Widening the Perspective*. Saint Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994.
- Tucci, Roberto. “Introduction historique et doctrinale.” In *Vatican II: L’Église dans le monde de ce temps*, 33–127. *Unam Sanctam* 65. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967.
- Turner, Frank. “A Model of Ignatian Advocacy.” *Promotio Justitiae* 101, no. 1 (2009): 35–40.
- Union of International Associations. *Yearbook of International Organizations 1997/98*. Vol. 1. 4 vols. 34th ed. Brussels: Union of International Associations, 1997.
- . *Yearbook of International Organizations 2011 - 2012*. 6 vols. 48th ed. Brussels: Union of International Associations, 2011.
- United Nations. *Yearbook of the United Nations 1947/48*. Vol. 2. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 1948.
- . *Yearbook of the United Nations 1948/49*. Vol. 3. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 1949.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Forming Consciences for Faithful Citizenship: A Call to Political Responsibility from the Catholic Bishops of the United States*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2007.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. *Strangers No Longer Together on the Journey of Hope*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003. <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/human-life-and-dignity/immigration/strangers-no-longer-together-on-the-journey-of-hope.cfm>.
- Untener, Ken. “Archbishop Oscar Romero Prayer: A Step Along the Way.” *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*, 2013. http://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/prayers/archbishop_romero_prayer.cfm.
- Uvin, Peter. “Scaling Up the Grassroots and Scaling Down the Summit: The Relations Between Third World NGOs and the UN.” In Weiss and Gordenker, *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, 159-76.
- Valcárcel, Amaya, ed. *The Wound of the Border: 25 Years With the Refugees*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2005.
- Valcárcel, Amaya, and Danielle Vella, eds. *Advocacy in Jesuit Refugee Service*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2011.

- Vedder, Anton, ed. *NGO Involvement in International Governance and Policy: Sources of Legitimacy*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2007.
- Vedder, Anton. "Questioning the Legitimacy of Non-Governmental Organizations." In Vedder, *NGO Involvement in International Governance and Policy*.
- Vella, Danielle, ed. *Everybody's Challenge: Essential Documents of Jesuit Refugee Service, 1980-2000*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2000.
- . , ed. *Jesuit Refugee Service Annual Report 2011*. Rome: Jesuit Refugee Service, 2011. <https://www.jrs.net/assets/Publications/File/ar2011en1.pdf>.
- Vidler, Alexander Roper. *A Century of Social Catholicism: 1820-1920*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Villanueva, Daniel. "The Jesuit Way of Going Global: Outlines for a Public Presence of the Society of Jesus in a Globalized World in the Light of Lessons Learned from the Jesuit Refugee Service." STL Thesis, Weston Jesuit School of Theology, 2008.
- De Vuyst, Anne Elizabeth. "Breaking Bread, Sharing Life." In Alonso et al., *God in Exile*, 43-45.
- Wapner, Paul. "Introductory Essay: Paradise Lost? NGOs and Global Accountability." *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 155–60.
- De Weck, Guillaume. *Histoire de la Confédération internationale des Étudiants Catholiques "Pax Romana" 1887-1921-1946*. Fribourg: Max Jendly, 1946.
- Weiss, Thomas G., Tatiana Carayannis, and Richard Jolly. "The 'Third' United Nations." *Global Governance* 15 (2009): 123–42.
- Weiss, Thomas G., and Leon Gordenker, eds. *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*. Emerging Global Issues Series. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996.
- Weiss, Thomas G., and Leon Gordenker. "NGO Participation in the International Policy Process." In Weiss and Gordenker, *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, 209–221.
- . "Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimensions." In In Weiss and Gordenker, *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*, 17–47.
- "What It May Lead To: An Influential Cardinal Talks About the Pantheon Incident." *The Atlanta Constitution*. October 23, 1891.
- Willetts, Peter. "Consultative Status for NGOs at the United Nations." In Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World"*, 31–62.
- . "Introduction." In Willetts, *The "Conscience of the World": The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*, 1–14.
- . *The "Conscience of the World": The Influence of Non-Governmental Organizations in the UN Systems*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1996.
- Witte, John, and Johan David Van der Vyver, eds. *Religious Human Rights in Global Perspective: Religious Perspectives*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1996.
- World Congress for the Lay Apostolate, and Comité permanent des Congrès internationaux pour l'Apostolat des laïques. *Actes du 1er congrès mondial pour l'apostolat des laïques*. Roma: Palazzo delle Congregazioni, 1951.

- World Development Report 2007: Development and the Next Generation*. Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2006.
- “Written Statement Submitted by Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers) to the Commission on Human Rights,” January 24, 2002. E/CN.4/2002/NGO/17. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- “Written Statement Submitted by Friends World Committee for Consultation (Quakers) to the Commission on Human Rights,” March 28, 2003. E/CN.4/2003/NGO/58. United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- XXIX Interfederal Assembly. “Document Sur L’Identite Du MIEC.” International Movement of Catholic Students, 1978. IMCS Archives, Paris.
- XXXI Interfederal Assembly. *Study Session 4: Movement*. Paris: International Movement of Catholic Students, 1986.
- “Youth @ Annual Meetings: Partners in Development.” The World Bank, 2008. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/YouthatMeetings.pdf>.
- Youth Consultative Group of the Secretary-General’s Youth Employment Network (YEN). *Joining Forces with Young People: A Practical Guide to Collaboration for Youth Employment*. Geneva: Youth Employment Network, 2007. http://www.ilo.org/public/english/employment/yen/downloads/yen_youth_guide_en.pdf.
- “Youth Employment Gateway.” *United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*. Accessed May 24, 2012. <http://social.un.org/index/employment/YouthEmployment.aspx>.
- Zahn, Gordon C. “Social Movements and Catholic Social Thought.” In *One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Thought: Celebration and Challenge*, edited by John A. Coleman, 43–54. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.
- Zuckerman, M.J. “Track II Diplomacy: Can ‘Unofficial’ Talks Avert Disaster.” *Carnegie Reporter* 3, no. 3 (2005). <http://carnegie.org/publications/carnegie-reporter/single/view/article/item/136/>.