

社 会 正 義

紀 要

11

目 次

現代世界における解放の神学の役割

—レオナルド・ボフの貢献 ……………山田 經三……1

聖イグナチオのカリスマと今日のイエズス会の使徒的挑戦

……ペーター・ハンス・コルベンバッハ……17

The New and the Old: One Hundred Years of

Catholic Social Teaching

……………Sergio Bernal……29

The Church's Social Doctrine Dynamism from *Rerum Novarum*

—A Consideration from the Latin American Perspective

……………Juan Carlos Scannone……51

〈活動報告〉

上智大学社会正義研究所活動報告（1991 年—1992 年） ……………71

Institute for the Study of Social Justice, Sophia University (1991-92)

…………… 85

現代世界における解放の神学の役割

——レオナルド・ボフの貢献——

山 田 經 三

目 次

- はじめに
- I. レオナルド・ボフの経歴
- II. ブラジルの現状
- III. 解放の神学の背景
- IV. ラテンアメリカにおける解放の神学の貢献
- V. レオナルド・ボフの業績
- VI. 筆者の、解放の神学との出会い
- VII. レオナルド・ボフの苦悩と評価
- おわりに

はじめに

ラテンアメリカをはじめとする第三世界民衆が、人権、人間の尊厳、正義に基づく真の解放、民主主義を実現するために、思想的裏づけを与え、民衆の解放運動を支え、力づける大きな役割を果たしているのが解放の神学である。

その体系的理論づけは、1968年グスタボ・グティエレス（Gustavo Gutiérrez）による『解放の神学』（邦訳，1985年，岩波現代選書，関望・山田経三訳）にはじまる。ところで，G.グティエレス師については別の機会（拙稿「解放の神学—グスタボ・グティエレスの著書をふまえて」，『社会正義』紀要4，1985年，81-95頁）に既に詳しく紹介した。同師は1985年，上智大学社会正義研究所，日本YMCA同盟共催の国際シンポジウム『解放の神学』の基調講演者として来日した（G.グティエレス，A.マタイス共編『国際シンポジウム 解放の神学』明石書店，1986年，他に拙訳『ヨブ記』教文館，1990年参照）。

ジョン・ソブリノ（Jon Sobrino）師（イエズス会神父）についても既に紹介

した。1987年、上記研究所、国際基督教大学社会科学研究所共催の国際シンポジウム『万人に経済正義を』の基調講演者として来日した(磯村尚徳、A.マタイス共編『今こそ経済正義を』みくに書房、1988年、他に拙訳『エルサルバドルの殉教者—ラテン・アメリカ変革の解放の神学』柘植書房、1992年参照)。

そこで今回は、主にレオナルド・ボフ (Leonardo Boff) を紹介することとする。

I. レオナルド・ボフの経歴

レオナルド・ボフは1938年12月14日、南ブラジル、サンタカタリナ州の小さな町コンコルディアのイタリア系の家庭に生まれた。フランシスコ会に入会後、彼は哲学と神学を、今、彼が教えているリオデジャネイロ州ペトロポリスの神学校で勉強した。1964年、司祭叙階のあとで、彼はドイツ、ヴュルツブルク大学、ベルギー、ルーヴァンのカトリック大学、イギリス、オックスフォード大学で神学の上級コースに在籍した。1965年から1970年まで彼は、ミュンヘン大学で著名なカトリック神学者カール・ラーナー (Karl Rahner) のもとで勉強、1972年に博士号を取得した。

ボフの博士論文は、教会の秘跡性についてである。この論文の主旨は、「第二バチカン公会議の公式文書にあるように、叙階された司祭だけでなく、洗礼を受けたすべての信徒は、聖霊によって塗油されたことによって霊的家族に迎えられ、そして聖なる司祭職に聖別される。そして彼らすべての人びとは、物質あるいは現世の次元の中でふさわしいキリスト教徒として働くことを通じて、闇の中から彼らを呼び出した主キリストの力を述べ伝えることができる」というものである。

論文を完成させたのち、ボフはリオデジャネイロの町から西へ40マイル離れたペトロポリス哲学・神学研究所・神学校の教授陣に加わり、以後、今日に至るまで同所に在住、教鞭をとっている。指導、教育と著作に加えて、彼はブラジル教会雑誌『ブラジリアン・エクレシアスティカル・レビュー』 (Brazilian Ecclesiastical Review) の編集者となり、『ブラジル神学紀要』 (Theological Journal in Brazil)、『コンキリウム』 (Concilium) のポルトガル語版の中心人物でもある。

II. ブラジルの現状

ボフの故郷ブラジルは、世界で最も多くのカトリック信者、1億950万4,000人をおかえ、また人口の大多数90.1%が小作人、インディオ、そして都市の貧しい人びとで構成されている。神学の分野では多作の著者である修道司祭ボフは、1970年代に特に「解放者としてのキリスト論」の研究に対して高い学問的評価を得ている。

ところが、ボフは国際的にはほとんど知られていなかった。1984年、バチカン教理省が解放の神学について消極的見解を表明しはじめるが、その過程において、やがてボフを標的とし、ついにバチカンで審問し、彼に対して1年間著作活動を禁止するに至った。ここに至って一躍ボフは世界的に有名になった。

バチカン教理省が標的にしたのは彼の著作『教会・カリスマと権力』(*Church, Charism and Power*)であった。これはポルトガル語から英語に翻訳されている7冊目の著書である。この著書の中でボフは、教会制度のエリート主義的ヒエラルキー構造を批判した。バチカン教理省が彼を標的とし、非難したことによって逆にボフは、数百万人にもものぼるブラジル教会の草の根の信徒たちに英雄視され、彼の著書はかえって世界的な評価を得る結果となった。

ブラジルのカトリック教会のうち、特に社会的に積極的に取り組んでいる人びとは、7万以上を越える草の根的団体、キリスト教基礎共同体(BCC: Basic Christian Community)を構成する運動を拓いている。この運動は、ブラジル司教団の認可を得ている。しかし、ボフが属しているリオデジャネイロ教区の非常に保守的な大司教エウジェニオ・サレス(Eugenio Sales)枢機卿は、この運動に対していくつかの問題点を指摘している。

III. 解放の神学の背景

昨年(1991年)は社会回勅『レールム・ノヴァルム(労働者の境遇)』発布百周年を祝う年であった。教皇レオ13世はこの回勅の中で、マルクス主義社会主義を拒絶したが、同時に資本主義をも非難した。そして1931年発布の回勅『クアドラジェジモ・アンノ』の中で、教皇ピオ11世も社会的不正

を非難し、拒絶すると同時に積極的に「カトリック・アクション」を促進した。

これら諸回勅は既に、解放の神学を予期させるものである。しかし、世界のカトリック司教たちが参集し、教会の歴史に新しい時代を開いた画期的な第二バチカン公会議までは、解放の神学は、教会の中ではさほど注目されることのない一見解に留まっていた。公会議は、1962年教皇ヨハネ 23 世によって招集されたが、その意図は教会の刷新と現代社会の中における教会の位置づけ(アジョルナメント)を再確認することであった。公会議が終って2年後の1967年、教皇パウロ 6 世は回勅『ポプロールム・プログレシオ (諸民族の進歩)』を公布し、特に第三世界諸国に与える資本主義の弊害を鋭く非難した。

第二バチカン公会議の決定を、ラテンアメリカ大陸の、構造的・社会経済的不正による諸問題の解決のために適用し、正義を促進し、人権を擁護するために、ラテンアメリカの司教団は、1968年コロンビアのメデジンで会議を行なった。マルクス主義に対する注意喚起もその一項目ではあったが、司教団はそれ以上に強く、自由主義的資本主義、とりわけ名指しこそしなかったが、米国による搾取を標的とし、非難した。特に司教団は、ピオ 11 世とパウロ 6 世両教皇によって厳しく非難された「国際的帝国主義的な資本」と経済的独裁政治へと導く、無制限な利潤追求主義によって支配される「権力」と「従属」とを、厳しく拒絶した。

しかも、この点つまり、帝国主義・植民地主義による誤った「開発」による「搾取」と「従属」は現教皇のヨハネ・パウロ 2 世の回勅『真の開発とは』(1987年)と新回勅『新しい課題』(1991年)によっても、改めて厳しく批判されていることをつけ加える。

ラテンアメリカ司教団によって採択された議案の一つは「真の正義の実現をめざして、社会変革を追求している人びと自らがつくりあげ、促進している草の根組織、BCC の運動を力づけ、支援すること」である。とりわけ、司教団は、キリスト教信徒たちの信仰を深め、強め、そして社会、経済の真の発展のために献身する「キリスト教基礎共同体：BCC」を正式に承認した。

IV. ラテンアメリカにおける解放の神学の貢献

1970年代と1980年代に入ると、レオナルド・ボフはしばしばブラジル全土、そして他のラテンアメリカ諸国を訪れた。キリスト教基礎共同体(BCC)を訪問することは、以前は支配者階級の側に身をおいていたカトリック教会を変革するための力となった。

かつては、政治・社会問題に積極的に取り組んでいた「社会派」といわれる行動的なグループや指導者たちは、ラテンアメリカ教会の指導者からは「反逆者」とみなされていた。ところが、第二バチカン公会議後、ラテンアメリカの司祭たちが、教会の最大の関心事を「特に抑圧されている、貧しい人びと、弱い立場に追いやられている人びとすべてを最優先して選択する」ことに置くように方向転換したことは、ボフの解放思想の発展に大きな影響をもたらした。ボフは、これらのグループや指導者たちを訪れ、接触することによって彼の解放の神学をさらに豊かなものとしていった。やがてボフは、共同体を訪れ、励ますことによって、今度は逆にBCCのさらなる成長を助けていくことになる。

『ニューヨーカー』(*The New Yorker*)誌(1987年3月2日付)のジェーン・クラメール(Jane Kramer)は、ブラジルの民衆教会共同体についてまとめたレポートにおいて、「それらのほとんどは『政治的』である。ただし、それは、彼らの取り組んでいる雇用、土地、住宅といった問題が、それ自体『政治的』問題であるからに過ぎない」と伝えている。

解放の神学がブラジルにおいて強力な勢力を誇るに至った理由の一つは、1964年の軍隊のクーデターである。このクーデターはその後、21年間にもおよぶ腐敗した独裁的支配とその目にあまる人権侵害をもたらした。伝統的に中産階級に属し、保守的なカトリック教会の指導者層の多くは、最初はこのクーデターを支援していた。ところが、自分たちよりも過激な司教、司祭たちが、左翼ゲリラに対する政府の軍事弾圧によって迫害されていることを知ったとき、彼らはもはや軍事政権への支持を公言することはできなかった。こうした状況については、1989年11月、政府軍兵士によって虐殺されたエルサルバドルの6名のイエズス会神父の状況を考え合わせると、よく理解することができる(ジョン・ソプリノ著、拙訳『エルサルバドルの殉教者—ラテン・アメリカ変革の解放の神学』柘植書房、1992年

を参照のこと)。

1960年代の終りまで、ブラジル教会とその司教団は、軍事政権を批判する中心的な声であり、労働者のストライキや労働組合をも支援してきた。

軍事政権が、ブラジルが世界 15～18 位の工業国に発展したことを、「経済の奇跡」と称しておごっていたとき、ブラジル教会司教委員会は、「富がごく少数の支配者に集中され、反面、大多数のブラジル人は経済的にさらに悪くなっている」と指摘し、政権を厳しく非難した。

1970年代、政府の軍事弾圧強化と、これに対する民衆側の過激な抵抗という両極化がさらに加速化していく中で、ますます多くの司祭、修道女そしてカトリック信徒が、抑圧されている多くの貧しい人びととの連帯のためにゲリラになっていった。

独裁政治の最後の 15 年間、500 人以上もの行動派カトリック信者が逮捕された。この他、政府の公式記録には残されていない、数多くの人びとが拷問にかけられ、虐殺されている。前述のジェーン・クラメールは『ニューヨーカー』誌の社説で次のように詳しく述べている。「この地の司教たちは、彼らの教区の司祭や修道女を保護しようとしてきた。しかし、1970 年代後半をすぎると、ブラジルの司教たちは自らの身の安全を図らなければならなかった。なぜなら、彼らは既に民衆の教会に関係していたからだ」。

レオナルド・ボフの著作が十分に理解されるようになるということは、それを読んだ人びとが、こうした経済的搾取と政治的抑圧の背景にあるものに、真っ向から対決することである。

ボフの著書は、ラテンアメリカの神学に最も求められることとは、今この現場で苦しんでいる大多数の貧しい人びとが現在、緊急に必要としていることを、真実に基づいて正確に伝えることであると述べている。

V. レオナルド・ボフの業績

ボフの著書は当初、ブラジルのフランシスコ会出版、ボゼス (Vozes) によってポルトガル語で出版された。ここでは入手が比較的容易な英訳された本に絞って紹介したい。

1) 英語に翻訳された最初の本は『解放者イエス・キリスト』(*Jesus Christ Liberator*)である。版元のオルビス (Orbis) 出版社は、1978 年、同書の出版にあたって、「この書物は、われわれの時代に対する一つの批判的キリスト

論である」と紹介している。この著書は、解放の神学の中で、キリスト論を体系的に扱った最初の著作である。

『クリスチャン・センチュリー』(*The Christian Century*)誌(1978年11月1日号)の書評で、リチャード・ケベドックス(Richard Quebedeaux)は同書を「創造的で力強い聖書解釈」と指摘している。『テヤード・レビュー』(*Teilhard Review*)誌(1980年夏季号)で、アンソニー・ダイソン(Anthony Dyson)は同書について、「現代世界において、特に物質的繁栄・豊かさと快楽を享受している国々において、個人も組織も、回心と生活の刷新をしなければならないとする神学的かつ、人間的挑戦である」と述べている。

英語版の序章で、ボフは、「原版の出版当時、ブラジルにはびこっていた厳しい政治的抑圧のために、自分が実際に書きたかったことのすべてを伝えることができなかった」と述べている。彼は英語版の序章に、ラテンアメリカの現状に関する明確な論述を挿入している。それによると、ラテンアメリカの貧困とは単に、その土地固有の経済問題ではなく、発展途上国の経済構造と関係している。そしてそれはさらに現存する神学的そして政治的姿勢によって増強されている、と彼は述べている。

2) 英訳された二番目の作品は、『解放する恵み』(*Liberating Grace*)(オルビス出版社、1979年)である。『セオロジー・トゥデー』(*Theology Today*)誌(1981年秋期号)掲載の記事で、エーリッヒ・シュロフナー(Erich Schrofer)は、経験と恵みの関係に関するボフの見解を、カール・ラーナーの見解と比較した。それによると、ラーナーが恵みを個人的なものとして強調しているのに対し、ボフは、恵みは歴史と社会に明らかにされている共同的な経験として理解される必要のあることを、聖書に基づいて強調している。この点でボフは彼の指導者カール・ラーナーを越えている。

次の3冊の英訳書は、いずれも、従来は緊張・対立関係にあると考えられていた二つのテーマを、実は一つのものであると論証する手法で書かれている。

3) 『十字架の道、正義の道』(*Way of Cross, Way of Justice*)(オルビス出版社、1980年)では、ボフは社会正義を達成するために闘っている現代のラテンアメリカのキリスト教徒の道は、キリストの十字架の道にほかならないことを述べている。

4) 『聖フランシスコ人間解放のモデル』(*Saint Francis: A Model*

for the Human Liberation)(クロスロード出版社, 1982年, 石井健吾訳, エンデルレ書店, 1985年)では、ボフは現代の問題に対する関わりの道しるべとして、フランシスコ会創立当時の、聖フランシスコとその同僚たちの生活を取り上げて、聖フランシスコの急進主義と権威に対する彼の従順の間に、そしてまた、彼の貧しい人びとへの関わり方と教会権威への忠誠心の間に、緊張関係はなかったと述べている。

5)『主の祈り』(*The Lord's Prayer*)(オルビス出版社, 1983年, 拙訳, 教文館, 1991年)では、ボフはキリスト教徒の解放は、ただ単に個人の精神的王国の出来事に限られるべきではないということを、主の祈りに照らして、その一つ一つの願いに沿って論証している。

6)『教会の生成：基礎共同体が教会を再生させる』(*Ecclesiogenesis : The Base Communities Reinvent the Church*)(オルビス出版社, 1986年)については、『カナディアン・カトリック紀要』(*Canadian Catholic Review*)(1987年4月号)の中で、ノーマン・キング(Norman King)が次のように述べている。「この書物は、価値ある神学的歩みであり、基礎共同体の指導者による問題点の明確化の挑戦であり、さらに私たち自身の立場、位置づけを明確にさせるものである」。

ボフはこの著書の中で、草の根のキリスト教基礎共同体(BCC)の一つ一つの細胞が、祈り、聖書研究、そして社会活動にいかに関心し、そして民主的に取り組んでいるかを述べている。キリスト教徒による積極的な社会的行動の必要性だけでなく、女性の司祭叙階などについても述べている。

7)『教会・カリスマと権力』(*Church, Charism and Power*)(クロスロード出版社, 1985年, 石井健吾他訳, エンデルレ書店, 1986年)は、ボフの著作の中で最も議論を引き起こしたものである。「誰もボフほどに、カトリック教会の非常に権威ある構造を攻撃したものはいなかった」とクロスロード出版社は紹介している。

事実、本書の副題は「闘争的教会論」という、きわめて論争的なものとなっている。彼は本書に、マルクス主義による資本主義批判を取り入れている。彼は「キリストの聖なる力」を取り上げるためには、教会制度のヒエラルキー(位階制度)が明らかにされる必要のあることを強調する。伝統的ヒエラルキー構造は、支配者階級を正当化する社会と同じ体質をもっている。こうした支配階級の正当化によって、労働を搾取されて苦しんでい

る貧しい人びとは、革命的教会によって支援された「階級意識」を発展させるべきであると議論している。

ボフは教会内の人権侵害に一章をさいている。そして彼は「権力の集中」をテーマにし、教会制度には支配者階級の体質のあることについて論述する。

聖霊はヒエラルキーだけに存在するのではなく、全キリスト共同体に存在する。従って、基本的に聖霊と復活したキリストからもたらされた力に依拠することによって、教会はもっと民主的な構造となる—というのが、ボフの描いている教会論である。彼の描く教会は、単に教義(ドグマ)や儀式典礼に安住する権威主義的なものではなく、順応性に富み、変化に対して柔軟なものである。

VI. 筆者の、解放の神学との出会い

最終章では、ボフの著書『教会・カリスマと権力』ゆえに、バチカン教理省との間に緊張が起こったその内容について述べるが、その前に筆者自身の解放の神学との出会いについて若干述べてみたい。

筆者は、1982年～83年3月の1年間、アメリカで在外研究していたが、その折、イエズス会の各大学付修道院の図書室で見つけたボフの、特に最初に紹介した2冊の本が、筆者がラテンアメリカの解放の神学に目を開くきっかけを作ってくれた。

解放の神学に対する関心について今少し詳しく述べると、次の通りである。筆者は1960年代はじめから、東南アジア諸国民衆と日本の経済活動との関係について関心をもち、研究・調査活動をして現在に至っている。1972年より特にマルコス戒厳令下のフィリピン民衆との連帯をもち続けている。

その当時、既に抑圧されているフィリピンの民衆の間では、解放の神学とBCCが実践されていた。筆者としては、書物ではなく、キリスト者の実践の場の体験から、キリスト教基礎共同体の意義を理解した。それを基礎とし、前述の通り、米国滞在中に、解放の神学に関するほとんどの書物を読むことができた。

帰国後間もなく、これほどまでに価値のある解放の神学、第三世界民衆の解放の支えとなるBCCが、バチカン教理省によって消極的にしかとら

えられていないことが、1984年の第一番目の指針によって明らかになった。しかも、この指針がマスコミ報道では意図的にわい曲され、ラテンアメリカをはじめとする第三世界の抑圧されている人びと、そして彼らと連帯している解放の神学が、日本の教会内にさえある、意図的誤解ゆえに不利を蒙っている事実遭遇した。

ちょうどその折に、日本の報道陣に対して解放の神学を正しく紹介してほしい旨、日本の司教団の依頼を受けた。その目的で資料を作り、紹介を続けていく中で、若干の書物にもなり、1984年から現在に至るまで、第三世界民衆に大きな力、勇気、光を与えている解放の神学を紹介し続けている。

Ⅶ. レオナルド・ボフの苦悩と評価

ボフがバチカン教理省から審問を受けるに至った経緯は、次の通りである。まず、『教会・カリスマと権力』が出版された1981年に、前述のリオデジャネイロ教区の大司教エウジェニオ・サレス枢機卿がボフを教区で審問した。さらに、ボフの「プロテスタント主義」の問題について、バチカンに注意を促した。

1984年5月、バチカン教理省のラッツィンガー（Joseph Ratzinger）枢機卿から、彼の著書『教会・カリスマと権力』の内容に関連し、特に教会の構造、位階制度（ヒエラルキー）の権威、教義と啓示について質問する書簡がボフのもとに届いた。これらの疑問点について議論するためにバチカンから「招待」されたボフは、彼の立場を支援するブラジルのアルンス（Evaristo Arns）、ローシャイダ（Aloísio Lorscheider）両枢機卿と共に「自費」でバチカンに出かけた。

1984年9月7日、ボフは4時間にわたりラッツィンガーならびにバチカン教理省の数名と「会談」した。ちなみに、以前ボフがカール・ラーナーのもとで博士論文を書いていた時、当時のラッツィンガーはむしろ非常に進歩的な神学教授としてボフを支援していた。この両者の会談の合同声明の中で、両者は、この会議を「兄弟的なものであった」と述べている。この会談の3日前に、教理省による36頁にのぼる文書『解放の神学の一側面に関する指針』が出された。その内容は、解放の神学の一部が信仰の霊的側面をうすめ、政治的側面だけに目的を限定し、社会問題の解決のために、

十分に批判的方法を用いないまま、マルクス主義の分析を用いている、さらに教会の位階制度的構造に挑戦しているとして、こうした傾向は、危険であると注意を喚起している。同時に、ラテンアメリカにおける政治的、経済的に抑圧的な制度に対しても、この『指針』は非常に強い調子で非難している。

ボフと彼の兄弟クロードビス(Clodovis:彼も解放の神学者である)との共著『解放の神学:対話から対決へ』(*Liberation Theology: from Dialogue to Confrontation*)は、バチカン当局に対する非常に強い公けの返答である。解放は本来行動であり、単なる学問的な論考ではないにもかかわらず、ただ単に考え方の議論だけに終始するバチカン当局の姿勢は、彼には耐えられないことを述べている。ボフは自らを擁護することに雄弁であり、バチカン教理省の文書の判断が、解放の神学を自らの利権を守るために意図的に陥れようとする権力者側からの一方的情報だけにに基づいていること、ラテンアメリカの教会と何らの相談もないまま、またこの地の人びとの現実の理解、認識もないまま、ただヨーロッパのものの見方、視点だけで解放の神学を片づけてしまっていること、貧しい人びとに対する従来通りの、当局の家父長的態度が結果として、ラテンアメリカの人びとを「従属」の位置に追いやり続けていること、などを厳しく批判している。かつて、G.グティエレスがボフと同じように、バチカンから攻撃の標的となった際、その徹底的調査を依頼されたカール・ラーナーはグティエレスの業績すべてを調査したあとで送ったバチカンへの報告の結論で、次のように結んでいる。これは彼の死の直前(1984年3月)の、遺言とも言うべき言葉である。「私たちは、私たちの小市民的な裕福な環境からして、解放の神学者たちを中傷してもよいのでしょうか。海の向こうのラテンアメリカでは、解放の神学の判決は、現実には彼ら神学者たちに対する死刑判決であり得るのです。...私たちは私たちの僅かな施しと立派な神学の勧告を第三世界に輸出してはならず、むしろ第三世界から学ぶべき時がそろそろ来ています」。

さらにボフは、解放の神学の中身を、ビンのコルクを抜いて味わおうともせず、単にビンの外側のレッテルだけで判断しているバチカン当局の姿勢と、マルクス主義についての浅薄なとらえ方に対しても、鋭く非難している。この地域においては、貧困をつくり出し、永続させている構造その

ものの不正、「構造的罪」（現教皇が自ら、その回勅『真の開発とは』において、ラテンアメリカで生まれたこの言葉を引用している）を正確に認識しなければならない。そのためには、マルクス主義的分析は一つの有効で、重要な道具、「隅の親石」であると、ボフは結論づけている。

ラッツィンガーと相対立していることが公けになるに至って、逆にボフは自分の修道院に静かに留まることを許されなくなった。種々の大学や、労働者、農民の集会に、またブラジルのテレビやラジオへの出演も要請された。また欧米の諸大学からも次々と講演依頼を受けているが、ボフはブラジルに留まることを選んだ。ブラジルにおいて今や、彼は何千万人もの人びとから英雄とみなされている。

1985年3月、「あなたの著書は、伝統的権威の受容と信仰にとって危険なものである」というバチカン教理省からの通告が、ボフのもとに届いた。ボフは「自らの神学を一人で歩むよりも、教会と共に歩むことを望む」と言って、この通告を静かに受けとめた。しかし同時に、自らの神学探求は今後とも続けると言っている。同年5月、バチカンはボフに対して、公けの講話、会議への出席、執筆を、さらに編集者となることも慎しむ、「償いの沈黙」を守るよう命じた。これはボフが「教義的過ち」を犯したからであり、しばらくの沈黙の期間をもって、「真剣な反省」をするためであると、バチカンは説明している。

ボフはこの命令を受け入れたが、ブラジルの10名の司教は、直ちに反対の声明に署名してバチカンに送り届けた。10近いブラジルの市は、ボフに名誉市民の称号を授与した。

このようにして、バチカン当局からのボフに対する残酷な仕打ちは、彼を一層世界的に有名な者とし、かえってボフとその解放の神学に対する支援を何倍にも増やす結果を生み出した。この沈黙の期間が一体、いつまでなのか、については正式には知らされていなかった。非公式には1986年5月までの1年間とみなされていたが、実際には1ヶ月早く、1986年4月に禁止命令が解除された。それは、ブラジルの21名の長老司教が教皇ヨハネ・パウロ2世と会見した2週間後であり、『キリスト教的自由と解放』というバチカン教理省の2番目の指針が出る1週間前のことであった。この文書は、「社会の政治・経済的営みは、教会の役割の範囲を越えるもの」と言いながらも、前回の文書と比し、解放の神学に対する批判は弱まり、む

しろ積極的な評価もみられる。例えば、キリスト教基礎共同体(BCC)を神学的準備不足と批判するよりも、「教会のために非常に大きな希望の源」として評価している。また、社会正義の源泉として、皮肉なことにボフ自身の語句である「全面的な解放」(integral liberation)という用語を承認し、使用している。

この新しい『指針』は、全般に解放の神学に対して積極的支援を与えており、建設的な文書である。当初は第三世界の状況においてのみ価値のあった解放の神学が、この文書により世界にとって普遍的な価値あるものとして評価されたことに対して、ボフはバチカン当局に謝意を表してさえいる。ちなみに、同時期に、現教皇はブラジルの司教団に「解放の神学と BCC は今や、第三世界に限らず、世界の全教会に対して大きな貢献を果たしている」という書簡を送り届けている。

おわりに

レオナルド・ボフの英語版の著書には、さらに二冊ある。一つは、『キリストの受難、世界の受難』(*Passion of Christ, Passion of the World*) (オルビス出版社, 1987 年)であり、今一つは、『三位一体と社会』(*Trinity and Society*) (オルビス出版社, 1988 年)である。

ボフは今、兄弟のクロードビス (マリアのしもべ修道会司祭 = Servants of Mary Order) との共著で、ラテンアメリカの民衆が簡単に読める分かりやすい本を書いている。その一冊は、信徒がどのようにして共同体をつかっていくかという指導書であり、今一つは、奴隷、インディオ、貧しい人びとの視座からの、もう一つのブラジルの歴史に関する本である。

この小論で紹介したボフのほとんどの書物を読み進めていくにつれ、彼の霊的深さに筆者は感銘をおぼえざるをえない。彼のすべての著書を心の糧、精神的なよりどころとして、つまり霊的読書として、読者にお薦めしたい。特に、今紹介した *Trinity and Society* はじめ、ボフの業績紹介の章で紹介した最初の 2 冊の本 (*Jesus Christ Liberator, Liberating Grace*) を薦めたい。

ボフの業績を紹介する、この小論の最後に彼の心優しさを垣間見ることのできる小さな逸話を紹介したい。ボフの著書『主の祈り』を訳し終え、教文館から出版の運びとなった少し前に、彼に手紙を書き、日本の読者へ

のメッセージと彼の略歴を依頼した。多忙なボフのことゆえ、このように唐突な勝手な願いを出したことをむしろ恐縮し、返事は半ばあきらめていた。ところが、思いがけなく、非常に早く、しかも丁寧な返事が届いた。この『主の祈り』の「日本の読者へのメッセージ」の中に、彼の優しさにじみ出ているので、教文館の承諾のもとに、ここに紹介させていただいて、この小論の結びとしたい。

日本の皆さまへのメッセージ

ブラジルには日本人の2世、3世がたくさん居ます。私の妹は日系2世と結婚し、3人の混血の子供が居ます。ブラジルでは、日本人の子孫たちはみな勤勉で新しい生活状況に積極的に適応していくというよい評価を得ています。私個人として日本の禅、仏教に対して強い興味を持っています。そこには西洋のギリシャ的人間観よりも、総合的で精神的な人間像がみられます。日本の文化の精神的エネルギーから私たちは多くのことを学ぶことができます。

アッシジの聖フランシスコについて本を書きました時、私は彼の優しさとしなやかさを強調しました。その時、日本の哲学についてよく考えました。日本の哲学には非常に繊細な感覚、優しさとしなやかさ、一貫性が見事に調和していると思います。私の考えでは、日本が私たちに教えてくれるいま一つのことは、科学的精神と大自然の調和との統合、人間の努力と神の恵みとの統合であります。

キリストと日本文化の出会いによって、日本の先達の霊性につねに伴っていた洞察がいつそう深まっていくことでありましょう。この出会いのために、私のこの本が少しでもお役に立つことができれば、これ以上の幸いはありません。

どうか日本の皆さまの上に、神様の恵み、祝福が豊かにありますように。

ブラジル、ペトロポリスにて

レオナルド・ボフ

1990年5月3日

(筆者は上智大学社会正義研究所員、経済学部経営学科教授)

The Role of the Theology of Liberation in the Modern World

— The Contribution of Leonardo Boff —

Keizō Yamada

SUMMARY

On the occasion of the publication of a new Congregation Document “Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation,” Pope John Paul II sent the letter to the Bishops Conference of Brazil encouraging the contribution of the Theology of Liberation to the World as well as to Latin America.

This was just at that time that the Vatican lifted the ban of “penitential silence” on Boff one month sooner than expected, in April 1986.

The document describes the Basic Christian Communities (BCC), for example, as “a source of great hope for the church,” and it approved of “integral liberation” (ironically, one of Boff’s own phrases) in the cause of social justice.

The new Instruction was generally seen as a conciliatory document, and Boff was grateful to the Vatican for giving universal significance to values that initially were only those of the Third World.

I have already introduced Liberation Theologians like Gustavo Gutiérrez and Jon Sobrino. Here I would like to present the contribution of Leonardo Boff in the following order.

- I . The Career of Leonardo Boff
- II . The Situation of Brazil
- III . The Background of the Theology of Liberation
- IV . The Contribution of the Theology of Liberation in Latin America
- V . The Contribution of Leonardo Boff
- VI . The Encounter of the Author with the Theology of Liberation

VII. The Suffering and Good Reputation of Leonardo Boff

On this occasion, I would like to introduce Leonardo Boff's books which were translated into English as relevant spiritual readings, as follows:

1. Jesus Christ Liberator
2. Liberating Grace
3. Way of Cross, Way of Justice
4. Saint Francis: A Model for Human Liberation
5. The Lord's Prayer
6. Ecclesiology: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church
7. Church, Charism and Power
8. Passion of Christ, Passion of the World
9. Trinity and Society

聖イグナチオのカリスマと 今日のイエズス会の使徒的挑戦*

ペーター・ハンス・コルベンバツハ
(イエズス会総長)

主において親愛なる兄弟の皆さん。あなた方、全日本管区の方々と再び会う機会を持つことができ、大きな喜びに満たされています。皆さんの招待と歓迎に感謝いたします。私は管区集会のすべてに参加し、また日本にもっと留まり東京以外の所も知ろうと考えていました。しかし、その考えは教皇ヨハネ・パウロ2世によって妨げられてしまいました。というのは、12月31日に教皇様が聖イグナチオの部屋を訪問された際、1月9日に大切な用務があるから私に来るようにと話されたのです。そこで私は私たちの第4誓願¹⁾によって従わねばならなくなったというわけです。

私は「聖イグナチオと今日のイエズス会の使徒的挑戦」について皆さんと分かち合う機会を持つことができとても嬉しく思います。イグナチオの記念の年²⁾に私たちは非常に多くの出版、会議、集会を行ない、イグナチオに関する映画やビデオまで制作しています。そして如何にイグナチオがその時代において先駆的であったか、今日の主の教会における修道生活と使徒的生活にとっても如何にイグナチオが新しい人であるか、に気づき始めています。

皆さんがご存じのように、イグナチオが主との出会いを一信徒として経験したことを忘れてはなりません。イグナチオが回心し、キリストの愛に目覚めたとき、彼は勉学、教育、司祭職、修道生活について考えていませんでした。彼がこの賜物を受け取ったとき、彼の応答はこの賜物を他の人びとに分かち合おうというものでした。それは他の人びとが主との出会いにおいて、主に奉仕するために彼らが自分たちの個人的な召し出し(信徒、司祭、修道者としての)と派遣を見出すのを助けるためでもありました。イ

* 本稿は1991年1月5日、本学におけるイエズス会日本管区集会にて行なわれた講演の要旨である。

グナチオが勉学、修道生活を選んだのではありません。そうではなく、主が彼に求められたのです。イグナチオにとり、使徒的な交わりは活動的であることを意味しません。そうではなく、それはイエスと個人的に関わりを持つ使徒として、仲間として、生活し、祈り、働くことを意味したのです。イエズス会員は主の個人的な働きを続けるように主によって遣わされるのです。そこでイグナチオは自らのカリスマと個人的な主との関わりに基づいて、教育、司祭職、修道生活を選んだのです。彼にとり司祭職は使徒的となります。すなわち、使徒的清貧、使徒的貞潔、使徒的祈り、使徒的応需性です。主はイグナチオに新しいものを求められ、彼は修道生活に新しい次元を持ち込みました。主はイグナチオにこの世で徹底した生き方をしよう求められました。イグナチオはこの世のすべての人びとの希望と困難を分かち持ちながら、この世で修道生活を営んだのです。この召命は易しいものではありません。私たちは福音に従う私たちの生活を常に刷新してゆかねばなりません。イグナチオは、そのための明確な諸規範を与えはしませんでした。ただ聖霊のもとに生きようチャレンジを与えたのです。彼は私たちが文化受肉(インカルチュレーション)されるよう、しかし同時に、普遍的な応需性も持つよう求めました。彼はまた、徹底して貧しくあること、私たちの清貧を使徒的要請に応じて選ぶよう求めました。共同生活に関しては、彼は私たちが使徒的からだであること、主の派遣を続けるよう送り出されることを望みました。これらの挑戦は今日も残っています。私たちはこれに答えなければなりません。

会憲の中で、『靈操』のより大きな献げものである、マジス³⁾についてイグナチオは語りました。それはより大きく、より重要なニーズのある場所へと行くためであり、それはただ一層効率的であるというのではなく、一層普遍的であるということです。私たちは諸問題を主の目を持って見なければなりません。それは単に一つの観点、一つの次元、あるいは一つの仕事との関連で事柄を眺めるということではありません。イグナチオは全体的であること、すなわち、すべての種類の仕事、人びとに開かれること、つまり全人類に開かれることを求めたのです。

私たちはイエズス会の共同的働きを強調しなければなりません。すなわち、イエズス会員各人は自分のために働くのではなく、教会とイエズス会の名において働くのです。私たちは他の修道会より共同生活が少ないと言

えますが、たとえイエズス会員が一人で働いていても、彼はなお教会とイエズス会の名において働いているのです。イグナチオは教会の人であったのです。イエズス会の実際の長上は教皇です。総長はいわば、教皇を通して教会が与える務めのコーディネーターにすぎません。

今日のイエズス会員とはどのような者でしょうか。その答は第32総会議⁴⁾の第4教令にあります。そこには、イエズス会の使命は「信仰への奉仕と正義の促進」であると述べられています。これは絶対的な要請です。これは歴代の教皇が既にその諸回勅で述べてきたことの繰り返しにすぎません。それゆえ、この目標に関して聖座との間に何の論争もありません。問題は、如何にしてこれを成し遂げるか、またこれをどのように考えるかということです。私たちはどのように考え、何をなすべきでしょうか。これはイグナチオの時から伝統であり、教会が私たちに求めるものです。私たちはこれを、如何に最もうまく成し遂げられるかになお取り組んでいます。ロヨラの管区長会議⁵⁾でも、この問題の指標の深さを見出そうとし、探究していました。それは単に貧しい人びとへの愛徳の問題ではなく、この世の構造的な罪への直面という問題です。私たちはこの問題と戦うために系統立った恵みと愛を必要とします。この指標はどこでも十分には受け入れられていません。ある人びとは、教皇は霊的事柄だけに専念すべきであり、政治、貧困などについて語るべきではないと感じています。教皇は香部屋に留まるべきだということです。しかし、イエスは香部屋に留まりはしませんでした。ある司教たちは教皇に、「あなたはここに来てこれらの問題について話した後、去られるが、私たちはここに留まってあなたが提起した問題と取り組まねばならないのです」と述べたそうです。他の人びとは、私たちイエズス会員はこの問題を多く語るが、時々それに十分に取り組んでいないと感じています。

もし「貧しい者の側に立つ選択」を行なわないとするなら、どうして私たちは使徒、キリストに従う者であり得るのでしょうか。今日、信仰と正義は分離されています。例えば、マルキストや共産主義者は嫌悪と主人・奴隷関係について演説しています。私たちは信仰と正義の問題を彼らがするように話すべきではありません。信仰と正義を成就することは、主のみ旨です。それは私たちの働きのすべての根本です。これは、教会が私たちに求めるものと一致し、またイグナチオの伝統でもあります。しかし時に、

私たちが福音において結びついていたものを分離したことも本当です。しかしこの傾向は乗り越えられつつあります。社会的急進主義はその使命に助けとはなりません。

必要なものは時のしるしを読む識別です。私たちが働くのは何のためでしょうか。それは時代を助けるものとなっているでしょうか。それは主が今ここで私たちに求めておられる必要に応えているでしょうか。時のしるしを読むことは、主が今ここで教会に対して求めておられることを見出すことです。それは時代の分析を提示することではなく、主の望みが何かを知ることです。人間社会の一般的な趨勢、例えば消費主義、快楽主義、市場経済などが常に時のしるしであるわけではありません。

時のしるしはこれらの問題に答えることにあります。それは福音とイエスの言葉に鼓舞された答です。それゆえ、私たちの仕事は時代の趨勢に立ち向かってゆくものです。時のしるしを読むとは、これらの不正の問題について福音が何を言っているのかを見ることです。イエズス会と会員各人は識別のための、時のしるしを真に見るための、私たち個人の生活、共同生活、私たちの仕事、私たちの管区を検討するための勇気を必要とします。

私は時のしるしのすべてがネガティブではないことも強調したいと思います。そこには希望の大きなしるしもあります。世界中の若者は信仰と正義の問題、環境問題などに関心を持っています。マス・メディアの影響によって、あらゆる人びとは直ちに、中国、東ヨーロッパなど、世界中で生じる出来事を知るのです。

「正義」という言葉はイエズス会員の集う所では何処でも常に語られています。しかし、その言葉を私たちがどのように用いているのかに注意を払うべきです。例えば、ラテン・アメリカのように、ある地域で用いられているその仕方を、他の地域に適用することはできません。「正義」は難しい言葉です。言葉というものは耐える存在です。私たちが言葉を何らかの意味で用いるとき、また言葉を何の意味も持たせず用いるときでも、言葉は沈黙しています。神の正義、社会正義、法的正義など様々な用法があります。「正義の促進」という言葉は、その意味を失いかねないという危険を常に持ちながら使われています。時に言葉は、その反対の言葉から、例えば正義について言えば、「不正」からダイナミズムを得ます。今日、「正義」に関する議論の多くは「不正」から始められています。その種の過程は怒

りを助長します。その結果、正義はただ不正との関わりだけに帰せられることになります。

ヤンセンス総長⁶⁾は社会的なものの見方について語っています。彼は、私たちは人間的条件が与えられる限り、正義のために戦わなければならないと話しました。理想的な世界を作ることが不可能であっても、私たちはできるだけのことをしなければならないのです。第32総会議はより楽天的に考えました。望むようにではなくても、人間は世界を変えることができるということです。技術的にそれは可能ですが、人間はそれをしようとしません。今振り返ってみるとその言葉は余りに楽天的すぎたようです。

正義の促進は社会経済的プログラムではなく、霊的問題です。正義の促進は福音宣教の統合的部分です。その中心には心の回心があります。これがポイントです。

イエズス会のすべての仕事は、この方向で働いています。多くの人びとは私たちの学校は目標を持っておらず、ただ特権階級のためにだけ設けられていると考えています。これは誤りです。エルサルバドルを見るとわかります。殺されたイエズス会員たちは大学の教授でしたが、彼らは福音に与かる人びとと共に、その人びとのために働いていたのです。私たちの学校がただ特権階級のためにだけあるということはできません。

『霊操』の観点からすると、すべての人は罪の歴史に立ち向かう個人的な責任と、個人的な恵みの歴史を造り出すという責任を負うべきです。

教会が貧しい者の側に立つ選択について語る一方、イエズス会は正義の促進について語っています。イエズス会は選択を行なわねばなりません。私たちが貧しい人に対する愛について語るとき、そこには、ただ施しものを与えるか、言葉をもてあそぶに終わるという危険があります。しかし、正義の促進について語ることは、私たちが具体的な行動を取らねばならないことを意味します。もし私たちがただ貧しい者の側に立つ選択だけを強調するなら、富んだ者や悲惨のうちにない者は教会の外に残されたと感じるかもしれません。この点で、正義の促進は一層全体的なもの、すべての人びとが関わるものとなり得ます。もしそうであるなら、私たちはどのようにすれば、貧しい者と共にあるという選択を行なうことができるのでしょうか。答えは単純です。聖書の中で、イエスは、他の人びとを排除することなく、貧しい人のための人として知られています。イエスは病む人と苦

しむ人のために来たのです。イグナチオは、イエズス会員は貧しい人のために忙しいはずであり、また金持ちのためにも忙しいはずだ、しかし金持ちに彼らは貧しい人に関心を抱かねばならないとはっきりと語っています。

福音化は、正義の促進を統合する部分です。今日、福音化について明確に語っていない、あるいは全く福音化を行っていないと私たちに警告するいくつかの声があります。

イエスにとって、福音化と回心の唯一の目的は愛でした。イエスはペトロに「あなたは私を愛するか」と尋ねます。ペトロは「はい」と答えました。「それでは、福音化を果たしなさい」、これが答でした。すべてのものは既に土の中で準備されています。私たちはそれに実をもたらさねばなりません。これは愛が求めるものです。

イグナチオは何時でも、何処へでも行くことのできる人を求めました。時々、私たちは制度などに、余りに縛られ過ぎていると感じます。そして時代の本当の挑戦に尻込みしがちです。どうか、このイグナチオの年に、そしてまた日本管区に、キリストの呼びかけと聖霊による励ましによって、私たちのビジョンが刷新され、奉獻の態度を新たにしてゆけるように、そしてそれを通して信仰への奉仕と正義の促進への常に新たな道を切り開いてゆけるように願います。より大いなる神の栄光のため、またすべての場所の人びとを助けるために。

編集部注

- 1) 教皇に対する従順の誓い。
- 2) 1991年がイグナチオの生誕500年になる。
- 3) magis=「より大いなる」の意。
- 4) 1974年～75年に開催。
- 5) 1990年9月に開催。
- 6) 1946年～64年に総長在職。

The Charism of St. Ignatius and Some Apostolic Challenges to the Society of Jesus Today*

Peter-Hans Kolvenbach**

Dear brothers in the Lord, it is for me a great joy to once again have the opportunity to meet you and practically the whole Japanese Province. I thank you for your welcome and invitation. I would have liked to attend the whole meeting and then to stay longer in Japan and know more than Tokyo. But I was blocked by the Holy Father's visit because on the 31st of December he came to visit the rooms of St. Ignatius and said that on the 9th of January my presence would be essential and so I had to obey according to our vows.

I am grateful to have this opportunity to share with you some thoughts about the charism of St. Ignatius and some apostolic challenges to the Society today. More and more we advance in the Ignatian year with so many publications, conferences, meetings, even films and videos about Ignatius, and we become aware how new Ignatius was in his time and how new he is today for religious life and for the apostolic life in the Church of the Lord. As you know we should never forget that Ignatius received his experience, his encounter with the Lord as a lay person. At the moment he converted, became aware of the love of Christ he wasn't thinking about studies, about education, about priesthood, about religious life. He received this gift and his answer was that he should share this gift with others, so that they also would be helped in their personal encounter with the Lord to help them discover their personal mission and vocation—lay, priestly, religious—in the service

* This article is the summary of an address to an assembly of the Japanese Province of the Society of Jesus at Sophia University, January 5, 1991.

** Jesuit Superior General.

of the Lord. But Ignatius didn't choose studies, religious life, but because the Lord asked him. For Ignatius apostolic involvement didn't mean to be active, but to live, to pray, to work as an apostle, as a companion with a personal relationship with Jesus. A Jesuit is sent in a personal way by the Lord to continue his personal work. Then Ignatius took up education, priesthood, religious life based on his charism and personal experience of the Lord. Priesthood becomes apostolic—poverty, chastity, prayer, availability. The Lord was asking Ignatius something new. Ignatius gave a new dimension to religious life. The Lord asked Ignatius to live radically in the world. Ignatius lived religious life in the world, sharing the hopes and difficulties of all people in the world. This vocation of ours is not easy—we have to constantly reinvent anew our life in the Gospel. Ignatius gave us not a clear set of rules, but only challenges to live under the Spirit. He asked us to be inculturated, but to have universal availability. He asked us to be radically poor, and to adopt our poverty to apostolic needs. As for community life he wanted us to be an apostolic body, to be sent out to continue the Lord's mission. These challenges remain, they remain today, and we must answer them.

In the Constitution, Ignatius spoke of the Magis, a greater offering of the Spiritual Exercises, to go to places where the needs are greater and more important, not to just be more efficient, but to be more universal. We must look at problems with the eyes of the Lord, not to look at things with only one viewpoint, or dimension, or in terms of one work. Ignatius asks us to be holistic—to be open to every kind of work, people, to the whole person.

We must stress the corporate work of the Society—that the individual Jesuit never works for himself, but in the name of the Church and Society. We have less community life than other orders, but even if a Jesuit is working alone, he is still working in the name of the Church and Society. For Ignatius we are Churchmen. The real superior of the Society is the Pope. The General is there only to be the coordinator for

the work, as it were.

What is a Jesuit today? The answer lies in Decree 4 of the 32nd General Congregation, where it says that the mission of the Society of Jesus today is the service of faith for which the promotion of justice is a requirement. This is just repeating what the Popes have already said in the encyclical. Thus there is no controversy with the Holy See in this goal. The problem is how we accomplish this, and how we see this. What do we think and what do we do with this? This is from Ignatius' tradition, this is what the Church asks of us. We're still struggling with how to best accomplish this. Even at the Provincial Congregation at Loyola we are still discovering and investigating the depth of this orientation. It is not just a question of charity to the poor, but to face up to the structures of sin in the world. We need structures of grace and love to combat these. This orientation is not well-received everywhere. Some feel that the Pope should stick to spiritual affairs, and not speak out about politics, poverty, etc. He should remain in the sacristy. But Jesus didn't remain in the sacristy. Some bishops comment to the Pope, you come and talk about these problems and then leave, but we have to stay and deal with the problems you have raised. Some others feel that we talk about this problem a great deal, but we don't do enough about it sometimes.

How can we be an apostle and a follower of Christ if we don't have a preferential option for the poor? In our time faith and justice have been separated, by the Marxists, communists, etc. who preach hate and master/slave relationship. We should not speak of faith and justice issues as they do. To bring about faith and justice is the will of the Lord; it is the root of all we are doing in our work. This is in agreement with what the Church is asking of us, and is also in the Ignatian tradition. But it is true sometimes that we separate what is united in the Gospel, but this tendency is being overcome. Social radicals aren't helpful to this mission.

What is necessary is discernment, to read the signs of the times.

What do you work for ; is it helping the times, is it answering the needs the Lord is asking of us here and now ? To read the signs of the times is to discover what the Lord is saying here and now to the Church. It is not to present an analysis of the times, but to see what the Lord desires. So the general trends of human society are not always the signs of the times, such as consumerism, hedonism, market economy, etc.

The signs of the times consist in answers to these problems, answers inspired by the Gospels and Jesus' message. Therefore our tasks go against the trends of the times. The signs of the times—what does the Gospel say to answer these injustices ? This is to read the signs of the times—to see what the Gospel says about these problems. The Society and the individual Jesuit need the courage to discern, to really see the signs of the times, to look at our own personal life, our community life, our work, our Province, etc.

I want to stress that the signs of the times are not necessarily negative—there are great signs of hope. Young people all over the world are involved in questions of faith and justice, the environment, et al. Due to the impact of mass media everyone soon knows about things occurring all over the world, e. g. China, Eastern Europe.

The word “justice” is always mentioned whenever Jesuits gather. But we must be careful of how we use the term, that the way it is used in one area, for example in Latin America, is not applicable in other areas. “Justice” is a difficult word. Words are patient ; they remain silent when we use them for any meaning, and even when we use them to mean nothing. There are many usages—justice of God, social justice, legal justice, etc. “The promotion of justice”—the word is used constantly at the risk of losing its meaning. Sometimes words acquire a dynamism from their contraries, e. g. “injustice”. This type of process thus fosters anger. As a result justice is only to put down the injustice.

Father Janssens spoke of social mentality. He said that we must struggle for justice as far as possible given the human condition. It is

not possible to make an ideal world, but we must do the best we can. The 32nd General Congregation was more optimistic. Man can change the world, but doesn't want to. It is doable technologically, but man doesn't do it. Looking back now, maybe this statement was too optimistic.

The promotion of justice is not a social economic program, but a spiritual problem. The promotion of justice is an integral part of the evangelical mission. At the center is the conversion of hearts. This is the point.

All the works of the Society are moving in this direction. Many people think that our schools don't have a purpose—that they are there only to establish the establishment. This isn't true. Look at El Salvador. Those Jesuits who were killed were university professors. Their work was with and for the people of the Gospel, so we can't say that our schools are only for the establishment.

Concerning the Spiritual Exercises, everyone should take his personal responsibility to deal with the history of sin and create one's own history of grace.

The Church speaks of the preferential option for the poor while the Society speaks of the promotion of justice. The Society has to make an election. There is a danger if we speak of love for the poor—we may end up only giving alms or using words. But saying promotion of justice means we must take concrete action. If we stress only a preferential option for the poor, the rich and those not miserable may feel left out of the Church. In this way the promotion of justice can be more holistic, that is it can take in all the people. If this is so, how can we have an option for the poor? The answer is simple. In the Scriptures, Jesus was known as a person for the poor, but not excluding the others. Jesus came for the sick and the suffering. Ignatius said that the Jesuit should be busy for the poor, and also busy for the rich, but must tell the rich that they must have concern for the poor.

Evangelization—an integral part of it is the promotion of justice.

There are some voices today cautioning us not to speak clearly about evangelization, or not to evangelize at all.

For Jesus the only purpose of evangelization and conversion is love. Jesus asked Peter, "Do you love me?" "Yes.", Peter answered. "Then evangelize", was the answer. Everything is already there, prepared, in the soil. We must bring it to fruit. This requires love.

Ignatius wanted men who could go anywhere, anytime. Sometimes we feel we have become too weighted down with institutions, etc., and sometimes shying away from the real challenges of the day. May in this Ignatian year and also in the Japanese Province the call of Christ and the inspiration of the Spirit help us to renew our vision and commitment to explore ever new ways of serving the faith, and promoting justice for the greayer glory of God and the help of people everywhere.

The New and the Old : One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching*

Sergio Bernal**

In the year 1891 (the year of *Rerum Novarum*) great changes were taking place especially in Europe as the result of the "Industrial Revolution." They represented the beginnings of the fantastic progress we are witnessing today, which seems to be projected towards the future in an almost unlimited way. But at the same time this revolution was preparing the ground to another historical turn, the coming to power of Communism presented to the world as the real alternative to the exploitation of the working classes, as the path towards a paradise where nothing would differentiate one person from the other; the advent of a classless society in which the people would rule themselves insuring their perfect happiness through the dictatorship of the proletariat. In one word the paradise of the working classes.

Such utopia appealed strongly to the great number of workers who were contributing with their effort to the creation of wealth while being exploited in many ways: low salaries, inhuman working conditions, unfair contracts which workers were constrained to accept simply because of their absolute lack of bargaining power.

Today, one hundred years after Leo XIII wrote his already famous Encyclical Letter *Rerum Novarum* the marxist utopia has collapsed. Communism has accepted its own defeat as well as its complete inabil-

* This paper was presented at the 11th International Symposium "100 Years of Social Teaching of the Church," Sophia University, December 6-8, 1991, under the co-sponsorship of International Christian University, Social Science Research Institute and this Institute.

** Professor of Sociology, Gregorian University, Rome.

ity to resolve the problems created by the Industrial Revolution and by the establishment of an economic system inspired on the liberal ideology and built upon the capitalist model of production and consumption. And the most significant fact is that it was the workers themselves who assumed the leading role in overriding the system that dominated for more than forty years on their behalf.

Now it seems that a new utopia is being proposed as the solution to the grave problems of millions of people whose most elementary needs remain unsolved. In fact, another system is striving for a monopolistic position, based on the claim of having demonstrated its utter success. The liberal capitalistic model of organizing the economy is being proposed to the world, and particularly to those countries which are struggling to overcome underdevelopment, as the perfect model whereby all problems are going to find an adequate solution.

There are great similarities between these two moments of human history. Once more it appears that humanity is easily carried away by dreams of the impossible when exposed to conditions of hopelessness. Ideologies and systems have demonstrated their incapacity to find adequate solutions to the poverty of great masses, in part because those who manipulate them are only interested in their own benefits, in increasing power and profit at any rate. History again shows that, in spite of the great calamities the world has endured, there has never been a decided will to overcome poverty and injustice. And yet, mankind is prone to create new hopes relying again and again on new all-embracing systems.

The pace progress has assumed today was unthinkable only a few decades away. Parallel to the most sophisticated advances in technology we witness the creation of fabulous financial empires often in the hands of individuals or groups. However the latest World Bank Report estimates that more than one billion people in the Third and Fourth World are still fighting for life in the midst of inhuman poverty. In a world characterized by a growing interdependence, such phenomena

cannot be considered in isolation but are rather to be seen as pieces of a gigantic puzzle in whose solution the cooperation of all is required.

During this last century the Catholic Church has followed closely these historical developments with a critical eye assuming as her own the cause of those men and women condemned to sufferings whose deeper roots are to be found in an unjust organization of society. Being convinced that she has much to contribute to the prosperity of mankind and to world peace, she has systematically offered criteria that will serve to reorganize society in a way that would be more in accordance with the sacredness of the human person and to the attainment of the common good.

Some remarks must precede this reflection on what the Catholic Church has to offer regarding the so-called "Social Question" born precisely from the confrontation between work and capital in the nineteenth century.

1. The interventions that started with *Rerum Novarum* are not the beginning of the Church's concern for justice.

It is often thought that the famous Encyclical Letter *Rerum Novarum* is the first manifestation of the Catholic Church's concern for justice. Such belief, however, is far from the truth. In fact, tracing the faith of the Church to its very origins contained in the Books of the Bible, we find that from the very beginning the Judeo-Christian tradition has understood man and woman as created by God that hence manifest his love. They are destined to dominate the earth through work thus making it fruitful and more perfect. They are also called to make of it a splendid place where all people may find an appropriate environment suitable to the development of all of their abilities and to the full realization of themselves as human beings. It is also clear from Scripture that responding to God's original call presupposes a serious commitment to love others and to establish with them a relationship

characterized by the virtue of justice.

In this vision it is also clear from the start that the earth is a gift from God to all of mankind. Hence any use of property which excludes others in a way harmful to them is contrary to God's will. In fact, the God that reveals himself manifests a particular love and concern for the poor, for those who are marginalized in any way in society. As if the former ways of communicating with man were not enough, God decided to participate in human history by becoming man himself, and showing his solidarity with the poor of his time not only through his words, but assuming their condition and their lot.

Throughout history these tenets have been expressed in many ways, but they all can be synthesized in the words of Jesus Christ: "*The greatest love a person can have for his friends is to give his life for them*" (John 15, 13). This is related to another fundamental principle, namely that the human person in order to attain its fullness has to transcend him or herself both in his openness to the supernatural and to his or her fellow men and women.

Therefore when the Catholic Church produces an official statement referring to justice, peace, commitment to the poor, etc., she is simply updating, so to speak, those truths which constitute the very essence of her faith or expressing them through a renewed language more consonant with the idiosyncrasy of men and women of her time.

2. Catholic Social Teaching refers to the systematic presentation which indeed started with *Rerum Novarum*.

The term "Catholic Social Teaching" refers in general to a series of documents written in the last hundred years, starting with Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (May 15, 1891). By the term "Catholic Social Teaching" we understand the systematic presentation of a way of reading history within the framework of the fundamental criteria contained in the Church's tradition stemming from the Bible and continuing with the

almost two thousand year old praxis of an institution that has tried to remain faithful to its original inspiration. The reference here, then, is to this body of doctrine whose beginnings we are commemorating today.

It must be added that this doctrine is to be found not only in the documents written by the Popes in these hundred years. Indeed we must take into consideration other documents issued by the II Vatican Ecumenical Council (1962-1965) and by other instances of the Roman Curia as well. Of great importance are numerous interventions of Catholic Bishops, individually and especially in groups. Such documents have shed greater light on the Church's reflection and in different ways belong today to this fertile patrimony. In many of these documents it should be noticed that lay men and women have offered a notorious contribution, as Pius XI himself admitted on commemorating the fortieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* (*Quadragesimo Anno* 1931) and as it has been the case—among others—of the US Bishops' Letter on the economy.

3. Continuous progress has been made throughout the years gaining in clarity, precision and freedom.

One could not expect the earlier documents to possess the same characteristics of the more recent ones. In fact, there has been a continuous process from *Rerum Novarum* to our days. This will be easily understood bearing in mind that each document reflects the dominant culture of the time, the stage of evolution of science, as well as the concern for that historical reality to which it mainly refers.

The Church being part of society and culture speaks the language proper of it, a trait of which she has become more conscious with the passage of time. I would say more : the Church has tried to express her thought by means of the language more widely spread at each time in order to render her message more accessible to men and women of her age.

Precisely because she is part of history and culture the Church must

make a continuous effort to liberate herself from the limitations resulting from this reality. Studying the various documents one can detect a rather successful effort in this sense. Any intent to objectively interpret the Church's social teaching cannot ignore this fact.

4. Towards a definition of Catholic Social Teaching.

The best way to understand what the term "Social Teaching of the Catholic Church" means would be to use the definitions found in the documents themselves and, logically we can expect the more recent ones to advance the most accurate description. Pope John Paul II has often tried to describe it in various documents. From them we can choose certain elements useful to grasp the full meaning.

The Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church is the best expression of her social concern *directed towards an authentic development of man and society which would respect and promote all the dimensions of the human person* (SRS 1). It must be said though that the Church does not pretend to offer technical solutions to concrete problems. Being an expert in humanity however, she feels compelled to extend her religious mission *to the various fields in which men and women expend their efforts in search of the always relative happiness which is possible in this world, in line with their dignity as persons* (Ibid. 41).

The Church's Social Doctrine is,

the accurate formulation of the results of a careful reflection on the complex realities of human existence, in society and in the international order, in the light of faith and of the Church's tradition. Its main aim is to interpret these realities, determining their conformity with or divergence from the lines of the Gospel teaching on man and his vocation, a vocation which is at once earthly and transcendent ; its aim is thus to guide Christian behavior (Ibid.).

Contrary to what some claim the Church has received from Revelation a very positive conception of man and of the world. According to

this vision man and woman were created by God and destined to happiness. They are endowed with a particular dignity since they are destined to identify themselves with their Creator while continuing through their activity the unfinished work of God. Man and woman are to realize themselves fully in interaction with each other. They have the capacity to transcend themselves, that is, to overcome their selfishness giving themselves to others. And this, more than a capacity, becomes an innermost need since it is only through the donation of self that the person can attain its fullness.

It is then the person in relation to others, to the world and to God that the Church is concerned about. The person conceived as a social being. It must be added that the Church is concerned about real persons, concrete historical human beings. She reflects upon human events detecting therein an intricate net of relationships characterized by deeply rooted attitudes which render them either useful instruments in the building of an authentic community, or else sinful structures oppressive of the person.

The Church “reads” historical events *as they unfold in the course of history* (SRS 1), analyzing their various components and trying to determine their conformity or their contrast with the values the Church considers of primary relevance. It must be said that the Church maintains a critical approach to reality which prevents her from identifying herself with any historical model of society. *However, such an analysis is not meant to pass definitive judgments, since this does not fall per se within the Magisterium’s specific domain* (CA 3). Pointing to the transitoriness of all systems and models the Church advances a caution about the seductive force of ideologies.

Social analysis requires the contribution of human sciences for the situations analyzed are extremely complex. It is not simply an academic exercise however, but a part of what the Church considers her mission, her task in the world. Furthermore it is a practical doctrine namely one aimed at concrete actions and commitments for the solu-

tions of very specific problems :

The Church, in fact, has something to say about specific human situations, both individual and communal, national and international. She formulates a genuine doctrine for these situations, a *corpus* which enables her to analyze social realities, to make judgments about them and to indicate directions to be taken for the just resolution of the problems involved (*Ibid.* 5).

5. Beyond the Economic Process.

The so-called "*Social Question*" was the result of the tense relationship between labor and capital under the new forms the process of production assumed with the advent of the Industrial Revolution. Ever since, these two elements have been in continuous evolution, each one trying to gain control over the other and each one inspired by a different ideology. Enormous wealth has been created but it has gone mainly to the hands of a few. This fact may be seen as one of the various causes that have generated a continuous confrontation between work and capital. Hence it might seem at first sight that the solution to the question would consist precisely in the redistribution of wealth thus reducing the question solely to economic terms.

While proclaiming the need for a just distribution of material goods the Church has made an effort to demonstrate that the solution to the social question cannot be contained within the narrow limits of the material realm. The economic process of production and consumption of goods and services is basically a social process in the sense that it cannot be carried out by the work of one single person and that it is aimed at the common good.

The Church has shown the intimate connection between the human person and work. In a way we could say that man is created for work. The earth is destined to all and it is through work that each one can have access to it. But work is not only a way to earn one's subsistence. It is the ordinary means by which one realizes him or herself through

the exercise of one's intelligence and freedom. *In so doing he (man) utilizes the things of this world as objects and instruments and makes them his own (···). By means of his work man commits himself, not only for his own sake but also **for others and with others** (Ibid. 43).*

In these words we find the Christian interpretation of economic activity. There it appears at once the close link between the process of production and private property. The universal destination of the earth to all would not make sense without a practical access to it. Each person has the right and the obligation to work and, in order to attain full growth as a person as well as to attain the purpose of work one should be able to work on something of his or her own. This is the path to responsible work.

But it would be erroneous to conclude from this to an individualistic conception of work and of ownership. Human work has to be performed for others. Man indeed works *in order to provide for the needs of his family, his community, his nation, and ultimately all humanity (Ibid.)*. As a collaborator of God the Creator who offered the fruit of his action to mankind unrestrictedly and in the same spirit, man has to bear in mind while working that this activity has in one way or another, a bearing on the totality of men and women sharing the same earth.

Besides one has to have the ability to detect in everything one uses while working, the result of the work of someone else. In fact, every instrument on earth has been produced through human work. Such awareness should lead to practical solidarity as a sign of gratitude to those who have prepared the way to our work and as a responsible action that considers those who will come after us and are also entitled to benefit from our work.

Reflecting on the relationship between work and business economy the Church's Social Teaching offers some considerations which can serve both to understand more in depth the economic process and to find possible solutions to the confrontation between labor and capital. Whereas in the past, only capital and land were considered seriously as

the means of production and both classes contended over their dominion, today it becomes more evident that *man* is the decisive factor. Man is taken here not so much from the standpoint of physical ability applied to matter, but much more we consider knowledge, *especially scientific knowledge, his capacity for interrelated and compact organization, as well as his ability to perceive the needs of others and to satisfy them* (*Ibid.* 32). More and more it becomes evident that “know how” is the great source of wealth and power. And it is the human person that creates and develops it towards a continuously growing perfection.

If taken seriously this conception should induce to organize society in function of the person. The process of production has to be centered around the person that creates it and provides it with a concrete structure. The process itself as well as the things produced cannot constitute a threat to the person. Things are to serve people, not to dominate them.

Underlying this way of considering the economy there is a radical criticism to the human inadequacies of the capitalist system of production and even more to the so-called *consumer society* which reaches far beyond simple social organization generating new values and patterns of behavior and, as a consequence, new forms of alienation.

Such reflection should illuminate any effort to transform the whole process of production making of it a process totally centered around the person that works. It will also have an impact on the concrete forms of ownership of the means of production which are legitimate only when they serve useful work, not simply accumulated capital. *Ownership morally justifies itself in the creation, at the proper time and in the proper way, of opportunities for work and human growth for all* (*Ibid.* 43).

What we have seen so far will serve to understand why for Leo XIII the question of work is a moral and religious issue. The person is destined to attain full realization as an image of the Creator. By striving to attain this fullness the man and the woman worship God, in

other words, practice their religion. Therefore anything that interferes with this endeavor is seen as having moral and religious connotations. According to the Church an analysis of the process of production, in order to be complete, has to include these considerations.

It is not surprising then that throughout the history of Catholic Social Thought human work has been at the center of reflection. It is worth noticing how the Christian Revelation opens with the image of God who is at work in creating the world. Such are the very first words of the Bible: *In the beginning, when God created the Universe...* (Gen. 1, 1). When man and woman are created they receive the precept to dominate the earth through their work. *Rerum Novarum*, the first social document in modern times is indeed a reflection on the conditions of human work. Through times the concept has been redefined and enriched to the point that for John Paul II—himself a mine worker in his youth—human work is the key to the social question. It is he who has contributed the most to what the Church's Social Doctrine has to say about work. Not only is the concern for work present in all his great documents but he has dedicated one of his three social Encyclicals to the subject of work (*Laborem Exercens* 1981).

A historical consideration of human work will necessarily lead to the subject of trade unions. On writing *Rerum Novarum* Leo XIII was also responding to the urgent question posed by some Churchmen about the possibility for Catholics to affiliate themselves to the newly created labor unions. (It should not be forgotten that Unions were the creation of the Socialist Movement which revealed itself in opposition to the Church). The Pope responds stating that there exists a natural human right to associate with others. This is indeed a right which precedes the person's incorporation into political society (cf. *CA* 7). It has not been instituted by the State nor bestowed on the person by it. The State has the obligation to promote and to defend such right.

John XXIII in his great document *Mater et Magistra* written in 1961 to commemorate the seventieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* describes

society as characterized among other traits by the ever increasing number of associations that are of great benefit to man and society taking over sometimes functions that the single person or group cannot perform and which are necessary for the survival and progress of human society. Different groups and associations play an important role in today's life. The Church sees in them an instrument to channel human solidarity and a necessary expression of the social nature of the person.

John Paul II links the workers' movement and solidarity in his *Letter on Human Work* (= *Laborem Exercens*), another commemoration of *Rerum Novarum* (on its ninetieth anniversary). Speaking of the situation of workers in the second half of last century (the workers' question), he says that,

This question and the problems connected with it gave rise to a just social reaction and caused the impetuous emergence of a great burst of solidarity between workers, first and foremost industrial workers. The call to solidarity and common action addressed to the workers—especially to those engaged in narrowly specialized, monotonous and depersonalized work in industrial plants, when the machine tends to dominate man—was important and eloquent from the point of view of social ethics. It was the reaction against the degradation of man as the subject of work, and against the unheard-of accompanying exploitation in the field of wages, working conditions and social security for the worker. This reaction united the working world in a community marked by a great solidarity (*LE* 8).

Hence it is recognized that trade unions have played a significant role in society. The Church openly admits that an important aspect of it is the struggle for justice in the concrete form of the defense of workers' rights and the protection of their interests as persons. Unions should also contribute to a greater participation of workers in the life of society, especially in decision-making processes which have an impact on the life and evolution of society.

Pope John Paul II has been quite outspoken when speaking of justice, but at the same time has been rather careful not to admit class struggle as a valid means to transform society. His enthusiasm about the solidarity of the working classes is by no means an endorsement of class struggle as understood by marxist theory. Coherently with what Pius XI stated in 1931 (*Quadragesimo Anno*), John Paul II insists on the fact that the efforts of the working class to obtain better conditions, rather than a confrontation of one group or class against another, should be seen as a struggle *for* justice. In this context it is interesting to read in *Centesimus Annus* what he has to say regarding the Unions and their struggle on behalf of the working classes.

In this sense, it is right to speak of a struggle against an economic system, if the latter is understood as a method of upholding the absolute predominance of capital, the possession of the means of production and of the land, in contrast to the free and personal nature of human work (CA 35).

Once more the Church accords a central place to work which, in the situation just described, is in open contrast with the economic system. Such conception of private ownership and of capital is incompatible with the Christian conception according to which work has to be free and personal, that is it cannot be imposed upon anyone, but has to be an expression of the self and performed under such conditions as to allow the growth and the full realization of the worker. Work is a right that has to be exercised freely. As we have seen, it is the usual means through which the person attains its plenitude.

Recent events in the countries subjected to communism and some trends in the capitalist world are calling for a new historic presence of organized labor in society. Quite often in the search for a balanced national budget the lower and the weaker strata of society are penalized. Nowadays it is common to speak of reductions in health services, in retirement pensions, in welfare programs and so on. But seldom it is the question of reducing superfluous spending deemed necessary by the

ruling classes. Such is the case of the famous arms race. Seldom are States ready to intervene in order to control the costs of production except the case of controlling wage increase usually regulated by law.

6. Elements for a New Culture.

Bearing all these considerations in mind and well aware of the situation of perhaps the majority of the world population today Pope John Paul offers three fundamental principles upon which a humanly dignified society should rest: *free work, enterprise and participation (Ibid.)*. Thereby he accepts the validity of some elements present in Western societies, but carefully points to the reforms called for in order to overcome serious limitations.

We have seen at length the criteria to understand and to organize work in function of the subject that works and not simply of profit or power. A society built upon this conception of man as the subject of work who, through work has to manifest his own self with all its creativity and develop his potential, will be radically different from existing models. Free work means the necessary conditions to act as a person making of one's own activity an expression of the self, realizing oneself through work together with others and for the benefit of others.

In its present stage the Church's Social Teaching acknowledges the functional value of the market economy, of profit and of production. Indeed, *it would appear that, on the level of individual nations and of international relations, the free market is the most efficient instrument for utilizing resources and effectively responding to needs (Ibid. 34). The Church acknowledges the legitimate role of profit as an indication that a business is functioning well (Ibid. 35).*

As it can be seen from a thorough reading of the Encyclical by no means does the Catholic Church blindly endorse the capitalistic system of production and consumption. The Pope is quite explicit about this point :

We have seen that it is unacceptable to say that the defeat of

so-called "Real Socialism" leaves capitalism as the only model of economic organization. It is necessary to break down the barriers and monopolies which leave so many countries on the margins of development, and to provide all individuals and nations with the basic conditions which will enable them to share in development (*Ibid.*).

Towards the end of the document we read again that,

The Western countries, in turn, run the risk of seeing this collapse as a one-sided victory of their own economic system, and thereby failing to make necessary corrections in that system (*Ibid.* 56).

The Church has maintained a very critical position towards capitalism. It would be unfair to conclude, however, that she condemns the system. In his *Letter on Development* (= *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*) John Paul II manifests the hope that liberal capitalism will show its capacity to change and update itself in order to favor a true and integral development of individuals and people (cf. SRS 21). Even before Leo XIII liberalism had been rejected because of its open contradiction to the Catholic conception of the human person. With the passage of time, however, there has been a clarification as to the necessary distinction between the economic system and the philosophical principles that have inspired it from the beginning. On the other hand—and this is true especially in the social documents of John Paul II—technical aspects are treated with greater precision realizing that moral judgement are not to be made about scientific laws. Another thing is a judgement about the way such laws are applied in real life and as to the consequences of their application on the behavior of people, which is indeed a moral issue.

The acceptance of some elements of capitalist organization refers only to their functionality from the standpoint of efficiency at the material level which, as we have seen, is the lowest level of analysis and only one aspect of reality albeit fundamental.

Profit can rightly be an incentive to production and investment. It can be a gauge to measure the well-functioning of an enterprise. But it can also become an end in itself. Furthermore,

It is possible for the financial accounts to be in order, and yet for the people—who make up the firm's most valuable asset—to be humiliated and their dignity offended (CA 35).

Here again the Christian vision is in open contrast with the values of the prevailing culture, one that may be described as an *economic* culture, the culture of production and consumption. One has to bear in mind that the business firm is by far more than just the rational organization of the means of production. It is a *community of persons who are endeavouring to satisfy their basic needs, and who form a particular group at the service of the whole of society* (Ibid). In the firm each member should be allowed to express him or herself through work in a responsible manner so that each and everyone may realize to be working with others and for others. As the Pope says, such human environment and respect for the person will be of benefit to the firm itself.

Consonant with the Christian vision of work, each person should have access to the property of the firm in order to safeguard a real participation as well as to prompt a gratifying dedication to work from the conviction of working on one's own firm. This could be step forward in the effort to overcome the confrontation between work and capital.

Catholic Social Teaching is by no means opposed to progress. On the contrary its basic tenets is that an essential part of man's vocation is his responsibility vis-a-vis development in all its dimensions, since development is the vocation the Creator has assigned to the earth. Such commitment presupposes an entrepreneurial spirit which the Pope describes as follows:

It is precisely the ability to foresee both the needs of others and the combination of productive factors most adapted to satisfying those needs that constitutes another important source or

wealth in modern society. (...) Organizing such a productive effort, planning its duration in time, making sure that it corresponds in a positive way to the demands which it must satisfy, and taking the necessary risks—all this too is a source of wealth in today's society. In this way, the *role* of disciplined and creative *human work* and, as an essential part of that work, *initiative and entrepreneurial ability* becomes increasingly evident and decisive (*Ibid.* 32).

Such ability is part of the right to economic initiative which like any other right ought to be respected and protected by individuals and nations. It must be noted, however, that such right is to be exercised, as indirectly originating in the more fundamental right to work with others and for others. In no way it is admissible that this knowledge (for it is as a form of knowledge) be used against other persons or nations.

It is relevant to note here that not all human needs are material nor can be satisfied with material means. One of the criticisms to the capitalist organization of production is precisely its incapacity to perceive those needs most deeply rooted in the human person. Furthermore, a system of production which measures everything in terms of costs and returns, pays no attention to the satisfaction of human needs which will not be profitable.

As it has been said the process of production is not merely economic. In advanced countries production not only satisfies basic needs. It goes far beyond even to the point—if we can so speak—of *creating* new needs which often do not correspond to what this term means. We should rather speak of *artificial needs* created to satisfy the demands of the economy, not of the people. Together with them new values and patterns of behavior develop and hence we may speak of an emerging culture which demands a fine process of discernment, since there are positive as well as negative aspects in it.

It has been said that the Church condemns consumption. Only a

biased reading of the documents could lead to such conclusion. Production and consumption are perfectly in line with a christian vision of man and society, provided they are both oriented to the satisfaction of human needs, namely those requirements for the full realization of the person. Such is the scope of the economy.

The Church is indeed critical of consumerism. But, what do we understand by this term? First of all it can be seen as a cultural expression. *A given culture reveals its overall understanding of life through the choices it makes in production and consumption (Ibid. 36).* Every human group must meet basic needs and find ways to satisfy them. Although basic needs are the same for all, each group ranks them according to certain priorities and finds his proper way of satisfying them. Production is then organized as a means to satisfy these needs.

But the discourse here is about other needs. In his previous Social Letter, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* John Paul started the discourse about consumerism, a notion that is closely related to another important concept. He speaks of *Superdevelopment*,

which consists in an *excessive* availability of every kind of material goods for the benefit of certain social groups, easily makes people slaves of "possession" and of immediate gratification, with no other horizon than the multiplication or continual replacement of the things already owned with others still better. This is the so-called civilization of "consumption" or "consumerism," which involves so much "throwing away" and "waste." An object already owned but now superseded by something better is discarded, with no thought of its possible lasting value in itself, nor of some other human being who is poorer (*SRS* 28).

The immediate effects of this attitude are a *crass materialism* and a *radical dissatisfaction* caused by an unquenchable thirst for more. The desire to own things becomes a sort of a "cult" which hinders the process of becoming a true person. And it is important to note what

exactly the Pope is critical of regarding consumption :

The evil does not consist in “having” as such, but in possessing without regard for the *quality* and the *ordered hierarchy* of the goods one has. *Quality and hierarchy* arise from the subordination of goods and their availability to man’s “being” and his true vocation (*Ibid.*).

As a matter of fact in this new culture the material and instinctive dimensions of man are not subordinated to the interior and spiritual ones. On the contrary, a direct appeal is made to his instincts (cf. CA 36). The problem, however, is not limited to the process of production. Consumerist culture tries to *convince man that he is free from every law and from God himself, thus imprisoning him within a selfishness which ultimately harms both him and others* (*Ibid.* 55). Under this conception the person is seen exclusively as one who produces and consumes, as one element in the gigantic economic process that can be manipulated not for its own benefit, but for the benefit of those who conduct it. And in order to fully attain such goals any ethical consideration is excluded pretending the absolute autonomy of the economy from anything not economic. It is here that the Church sees a reason to pass a strong moral judgement since it is the person that is alienated through this manipulation. In fact, the result is that *consumer attitudes and life styles* can be created which are objectively improper and often damaging to his physical and spiritual health (*Ibid.* 36).

Finally as it has been said consumerism often leads to the satisfaction of artificial needs leaving basic ones unsatisfied since the purpose of consumption is no longer the person, but the economy. The Pope concludes his reflection saying that,

a great deal of educational and cultural work is urgently needed, including the education of consumers in the responsible use of their power of choice, the formation of a strong sense of responsibility among producers and among people in the mass media in particular, as well as the necessary intervention by

public authorities (*Ibid.*).

The third goal proposed by *Centesimus Annus* is that of a society based on participation, that is a society that would enable each and every member to *take their place in an effective and humanly dignified way within a productive system in which work is truly central* (*Ibid.* 33). It is not simply a matter of allowing people to take their place. The role of society is an active role which presupposes the creation of the necessary structures that will enable people to participate actively. This means, among other things, participation in knowledge which would permit people to express their creativity and develop their potential. They should be allowed to enter the network of knowledge and intercommunication which will enable them to see their qualities appreciated by others and put to the service of all (cf. *Ibid.*).

The new society would cherish its subjectivity allowing the social nature of the person to be realized *in various intermediary groups, beginning with the family and including economic, social, political and cultural groups which stem from human nature itself and have their own autonomy, always with a view to the common good* (*Ibid.* 13).

7. Conclusion.

The Church does not endorse any particular system nor model of society. She does not propose concrete models nor systems either. Instead trying to fulfill her mission she proclaims the need for fundamental changes in today's society. The emphasis is on culture for *all human activity takes place within a culture and interacts with culture* (*Ibid.* 51). It is often forgotten that culture is man's creation. It is not simply a structure of which the person becomes a victim. But it is also true that our ways of thinking and behaving are profoundly conditioned by culture. More and more we see the trend towards a universal culture with the risk of obliterating cultures which constitute a real asset of humanity and of being subjected to a super-culture which is the by-product of an economic system and thus centered exclusively around

economic values that determine human choices both at individual and social levels.

The history of mankind is one of rulers and nations dominating over people and other nations. From the simple forms of one-to-one confrontation to the devastating characteristics of modern warfare peace reveals itself a fragile situation which however ought to be preserved for the benefit of humanity. New and almost imperceptible forms of domination are being developed which hinder human growth and render the person ominously dependent and at the exclusive service of a system of production and consumption. Alienation after the Marxist conception is disappearing from some countries, but other types are present and spreading in nations which claim to be free.

The more we read the history of the human race the more grows the conviction that behind the great conflicts that have taken place and that have taken millions of human lives plus irreparable destruction, there is a wrong conception of man or complete oblivion of his centrality. Hence history becomes the report of the efforts to organize the world and society ignoring man. Seen under this light the Church's message to the world appears quite relevant for what she has to offer is precisely her vision of man, of humanity as the center of the universe. There remains the hope that men and women of good will regardless of their creed or their nationality will pay heed to the Church's appeal to reorganize society with the human person as the cardinal value and thus striving for a world where solidarity will prevail.

Abbreviations

CA *Centesimus Annus*

LE *Laborem Exercens*

SRS *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*

「新しいことがら」と「古いもの」

—カトリック教会の社会教説 100 年—

セルヒオ・ベルナル
(グレゴリアン大学, イタリア)

<要 約>

1891 年、回勅『レールム・ノヴァルム＝労働者の境遇』が発表された当時のヨーロッパは、産業革命の結果としての大きな変化と、共産主義の台頭があった。そして 100 年経った 1991 年、社会主義国は自ら共産主義の敗北を受け入れたが、一方資本主義体制も多くの人びとの貧困に対する十分な解決策を見つけないでいる。

カトリック教会の社会的関与は、その二千年の伝統の中に、神ご自身がイエス・キリストを通して人間社会に参与し、貧しい人びととの連帯を示されているが、「カトリック社会教説」という体系的な教えの提示は『レールム・ノヴァルム』から始まるここ一世紀の諸文書に見られる。

これらを通じて、教会は特定の社会体制を是認したり、具体的に提示はしないが、教会の使命を果たすために今日の社会の根本的な変革の必要性を主張している。

本講演では、主として『働くことについて』（1981 年）『真の開発とは』（1987 年）『新しい課題』（1991 年）の考察を通して、現代社会に向けた教会のメッセージの重要性を述べる。

The Church's Social Doctrine Dynamism from *Rerum Novarum*

——A Consideration from the Latin American Perspective*——

Juan Carlos Scannone**

1. *Rerum Novarum* and the Dialogue with Modern Times

As Pius XI said forty years after the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, this seeks immediately to solve the “difficult problem of human coexistence that is known by the name of ‘social question’” (QA 2)¹, which is an eminently modern problem. However I agree with those who think that the mediate historical aim of the encyclical and, with it, all of the Social Doctrine of the Church is the dialogue of the Church with the modern world, in such a way that “the general subject historically closer to us is the formulation of the relationship between the Church and the world,”² mainly the modern world, distinguished not only by the industrial and technological revolution from which the above mentioned social question results but also by the scientific, political and cultural revolutions (the Enlightenment)³.

Hence all the dynamics of the Social Doctrine of the Church from *Rerum Novarum* to *Centesimus Annus* can be featured by means of the two following phrases: “Social question” and “dialogue between the Church and the modern world,” since the dialogue is precisely the way

* This paper was presented at the 11th International Symposium “100 Years of Social Teaching of the Church,” Sophia University, December 6-8, 1991, under the co-sponsorship of International Christian University, Social Science Research Institute and this Institute.

** Professor of Theology, Salvador University, Buenos Aires.

of relationship with this that —according to Paul VI— the Church adopted from Leo XIII (cf. *ES* 61). Thus it has changed its first attitude, rather reservedly before modernity.⁴ It is clear that the dialogue with it does not exclude, but that implies the criticism of the criticizable and the taking on of what can be assumed starting from an attentive discernment of what favours or, on the contrary, threatens the man's humanity as it is conceived by the Gospel.

According to what the present Pope said “from its origins up to today, the Church has always found and confronted the world and its problems, enlightening them in the light of faith and the moral principles of Christ,” thus it favours “the formation and revival throughout the history arch, of a number of principles of Christian moral, today known as Social Doctrine of the Church” ; but the founding importance of Leo XIII with *Rerum Novarum* lies in the fact that for the first time he tried “before anyone else, to give it an organic and synthetic nature. In this way the new and delicate task on the part of the Church Teaching Office began which is also a great commitment because it has to do with the making of a teaching for a world in constant change and which is capable of responding to the modern demands as well as to the transformations of the industrial society, and, at the same time suitable for protecting the rights both of the human person as well as of the new young nations which come to be part of the international community.”⁵ The novelty comes to be, then, not only because thus Leo XIII established “a permanent pattern for the Church” (*CA* 5), but because he was dealing with the “new things” (*res novae*), that is, the modern society and culture, and because he focused the Church relationship with them in a new way. Therefore due to “the new situation which was created in the 19th Century in Europe and in part of America as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution, of liberalism, capitalism, and socialism... a lot of Catholics... fostered the awakening of the Christian conscience before the great injustices which have arisen at that time. A new more modern and dynamic conception of the way in which

the Church should be present and exert her influence in the society began. The importance of her presence in the world was grasped and also the style of performance, which the new times required was understood.”⁶ Therefore the Social Doctrine of the Church is fruit of that “more modern and dynamic” conception of the presence of the Church in the *modern* world with it, and, as it was already said, *in dialogue*, and thus it responds to the human —ethical and evangelical— challenge created to the man by the society and culture of our times. As we will say later there lies one of the main reasons of the always renewed dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church.

As the horizon of our exposure is Latin American, let us bring to mind that there are authors for whom “the first setting out that in some way or other compelled to define the new relationship between the Church and the world”⁷ in the modern times was previous to both the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. I am referring to the new attitude of friar Bartolomé de Las Casas and his school in his controversy with Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda about the evangelization method of Latin American natives, in the dawn of modern times. Therefore both theologians presupposed different conceptions about the relationship church-world. Whereas for Sepúlveda an evangelizing method that uses the political and military power of the conquerors is justified, for Las Casas such method on the contrary had to be grounded on the respect and the dialogue with persons and peoples. Such conception of Las Casas responded simultaneously to the genuine Christian sensibility and to the modern humanist sensibility.

Besides, let us recall that from those discussions promoted by the missionaries from Spanish America will arise, already in the XVI Century, so much the theological debate of Salamanca School to the right of conquest of America by the king of Spain as the first elaborations of the modern right of the peoples (*jus gentium*) with Francisco de Vitoria and Francisco Suárez. Thanks to all of this Spain was the only one imperial power that saw its right of conquest questioned by its

own theologians.

It was said that the attitudes of Vitoria's are the preannouncement of the Latin American Liberation Theology.⁸ Well then, Las Casas could also be considered —thanks to his struggle for the owed justice to the native— as the forerunner not only of the said theology but also of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America as, for instance, the episcopal conferences of Medellin (1968) and Puebla (1979) developed it. For Las Casas, the liberation theology and the social teaching of those conferences converge on reaffirming the evangelical priority of the preferential option for the poor.

2. The Whys and Wherefores of the Dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church

According to what was said the dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church emerges, firstly, from its location in the dialogue between Church and world. Since —on the one hand— it is about the modern world, conscious of its own dynamism, of its historical authenticity, of the human creativity and of a faster and faster pace of change ; on the other hand, from the side of the Church, it is the spirit of God that impels to humanize —always in a renewed way— that world in the light of the Gospel.

Secondly, its dynamism comes to the Social Doctrine from the fact that it is not born from any type of encounter of the Church with the present world, but above all with its dehumanizing situations of injustice, conflict, underdevelopment and extreme poverty similar to those that *Rerum Novarum* found and called “social question,” challenges that even today are presented to a large extent of the world, as it was again testified by the last encyclical *Centesimus Annus* (CA 8). That is why some authors assert that the founding experience of the Social Doctrine of the Church is that of *justice*.⁹ The Social Doctrine is the answer of the Church before the human dignity, socially infringed that

challenges and appeals to the Christian conscience.

However today the Social Doctrine of the Church also answers to a new kind of dehumanizing social situations which are caused by overdevelopment, the two more recent social encyclicals talk about (namely *SRS* and *CA*). I am referring to economicism, materialism, individualism, the coming down of which is human to the mere welfare, and —as the opposite side of it— to the lack of solidarity between men and the peoples when the gap between the rich and the poor and between rich nations and poor nations, instead of narrowing it becomes wider in a nearly abysmal way.

Both in the case of underdevelopment as well as in overdevelopment it is the two sides of the same modern world and of which affects the human dignity in it, as well as of the solicitude of the Church for the man, since he lives and coexist in (familiar, national and international) society. “The Church's only aim —John Paul II asserts— has been *the attention and the responsibility towards the man*, entrusted to her by Christ himself. . . It is not about an abstract man, but about the real, and historical man: it is about *each man*, because the mystery of redemption comes to each one, and Christ has bound up with each one forever through this mystery” (*CA* 53).

That is why the dynamism of Social Doctrine of the Church made it enlarge each time its perspectives at the same time that were concentrating them progressively. It enlarged its perspectives about the “social question” from its first concern for the “working questions” — *Rerum Novarum* origin— to its solicitude for the grave international questions of peace, the development of the peoples, justice and the universal welfare. It was already so since the radiomessages of Pius XII during World War II, the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* by John XXIII (1961) and the Vatican Council II, and it became even more evident with the encyclicals about the integral development of the peoples: *Populorum Progressio* (1967) and *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1987), and with the last encyclical, which takes into account the

situation of each big social, cultural scope of the present world, after the events of 1989. At last, since the Council and Paul VI, but above all with the present Pope, the Social Doctrine of the Church without neglecting the “social question” both national and international, widened its concern for the man also for the problems of the culture and the culture of the peoples which nowadays are challenged by the universal civilization.

That further reaching extent does not deny but assumes a greater concentration of the Social Doctrine of the Church, since it is more evident each time that it is about the man, about every man, and about the man as a whole, considered in the light of Christ, who for the Church not only reveals God, but also the man. Everything that affects the man and every man challenges the Church social mission.

It is not to believe that the Social Doctrine of the Church is less universal though it is interested in the man it regards him in the light of the Gospel. On the contrary, from the very beginning it turned to the natural law and to “right by nature” to do so and it made use of rational reflection and argumentation. Afterwards, since *Mater et Magistra* (1961) the papal encyclicals are explicitly addressed not only to Catholics or Christians, but to “every man of good will” as well. And even now, that the epistemological statutes of the Social Doctrine of the Church has become clearer and clearer as belonging “to the scope of the theology” (CA 55; SRS 41). However, it is not less valid universally. So it is, in first place, because it is about *the human part of the man*, that every man can also acknowledge, and besides, because every honest-hearted man can accept even that of the man that the Church knows starting from the Gospel and it may be interpreted as specifically Christian—for instance, the spirit of the blessedness—as it is about something which is *deeply human*, and therefore, universal.

Another source of the dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church is in the mindful look of the Christian community to “examine the signs of the times and . . . interpret them in the light of the Gospel” (GS 4; PP

13 ; SRS 7, etc), that is, to examine and discern “the joys and hopes, the sadness and anguish of the men of our time, above all of the poor and of those who suffer” —Let us notice that Vatican II does not talk only about Christians— since at the same time they “are joys and hopes, sadness and anguish of Christ’s disciples” (GS 1). Hence for the Social Doctrine it is about firstly “looking” and analyzing the historical situation of each people and of every people making use also of the human and social sciences in order to “judge” the social historical reality enlightened by the understanding of the man implied by the Gospel, so that later we may “act” to transform the world into a more just, solidary and human world.

That method of “looking, judging and doing” (MM 236) is another important source of the dynamism of the Social Doctrine, which shows the capacity of “continuity and renewing” (SRS 5) that features it. Since not only the “looking” and the “acting” change at each time and at each social, cultural scope, but also the “judging” itself of the Social Doctrine of the Church changes, though it has the source of its perpetuity in the Gospel, for it also knows how to learn from everything which is human that teaches it both the progress of the sciences and its renewed meeting with the different cultures of the peoples. Below we will say something more about how the Social Doctrine of the Church made the Latin American society dynamic, but at the same time the Church Teaching Office took up the dynamism that came from the meeting with that society and with the culture that is of its own.

3. Dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America

Unfortunately a global history of the Social Doctrine of the Church does not exist in the Latin American sub-continent, not even in each country, but only isolated contributions. Nevertheless some lines can be drawn up to show such dynamism, its crisis of growth and its present re-increasing potentiality. I will divide the exposition of this chapter

into three steps : 1) The influence of *Rerum Novarum* ; 2) The moment of “overshadowing” of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America ; 3) The confronting with the Theology of Liberation and its present re-valuation.

3. 1. The Influence of *Rerum Novarum*

The first influence of *Rerum Novarum* in Latin America was different. In some countries —as Chile, Uruguay and Costa Rica— the episcopates each wrote pastoral letters applying the doctrine of the encyclical to the respective situation. Somewhere else, as in Venezuela, the ecclesiastical journal, probably interpreting the feeling of the Venezuelan bishops, then judged “this encyclical does not affect the southern American countries in its main objective because socialism has not rooted among us yet. . . In these dawning peoples, the separation between the poor and the rich does not nearly exist, industries hardly looms up in bashful draft, and the lack of the population makes life easier for everyone.”¹⁰ The author could not grasp then that the “social question” not only affected the industrial workmen, but that it had some incidence on the land question, which was going to be brought up short after by the Mexican Revolution of 1910. Even less he connected it *with* the native or the Afro-American question, which even now go on being present.

In other regions, perhaps due to the budding formation of proletariat, those, then called “social Catholics” got their inspiration from the Leonine encyclical. The Working Circles were started in this way, for instance, in Argentina. They were promoted by father Grote and a staff of laymen. The idea had existed before *Rerum Novarum*, since the Christian conscience had already been questioned by the new situation and inspired by European patterns ; but thanks to the efficient prompting of the encyclical, father Grote founded the Circles in 1892, in accordance with strategies of that time : mutualism, coordination, human, social, moral and religious education of the workmen and

recreational activities. Some time later there will come the initiative of forming, for instance, university clubs of social studies (1897), and political movements of Christian characteristic, such as Democrat Christian Circle (1902), and professional associations inspired by the Social Doctrine of the Church (also in 1902).¹¹

We cannot follow the subsequent development of the social Christian movement in Latin America, which made social Catholics give lessons and foster studies on the Social Doctrine of the Church, and found unions with that trend (today they are confederate in CLAT) and a workmen's university (the UTAL, in Venezuela) ; also to create democrat Christian parties, which many times reached power, as in Chile, Venezuela and different countries in Central America ; and that also influenced movements of populist nature as the justicialismo in Argentina, and in this way it got that the great majority of the Argentine working class preserved from the Marxist influence, etc.

3.2. The "overshadowing" of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America.

One of the clearest samples of the dynamism of Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America has been its capacity to overcome the acute crisis that made it grow and be transformed, as well as that of assimilating important contributions of the Liberation Theology —that was its rival and opponent for some people— and of finding out its risks. Another proof of its dynamism is the strength of the Latin American Social Teaching in the Episcopal Conferences of Medellin and Puebla, which were autocomprised themselves in the key of the preferential option for the poor. They could influence later in such a sense on the universal social teaching as on that of other regions, for instance, on that of the North American Bishops.¹²

Firstly we will say something about the crisis of the Social Doctrine of the Church in the sixties and its causes. Then we will consider the overcoming of that crisis and the critical assumption by the Social

Doctrine of the Church of the important contributions of the Liberation Theology.

The Reference Document for Puebla Conference (1978) and the work published by the Social Action Department of the CELAM about the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America (1983)¹³ —among others— they talk about an “overshadowing” of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America. There can be mentioned, among its principal causes the understanding of the Social Doctrine which some of its experts and systematizers had spread : was considered as a kind of closed, abstract and non-historical system that later was to be applied in a deductive way to the different, historical and cultural realities. Such understanding did not take sufficiently into account the historical dimension of the Social Doctrine of the Church, and that the very *Rerum Novarum* had been an answer of the Church to the historical challenges and to the practical experiences of the Christians to respond to them.¹⁴ The Aristotelian conception of science —or better, its Neo-Scholastic interpretation— applied to the Social Doctrine of the Church was behind those non-historical systematization of the Social Doctrine of the Church.¹⁵

It was added to it that such system was conceived as mediation between historical reality and God’s Word : it was criticized because it made it difficult an accurate consideration of the historical unpredictable novelty and of the new practical experiences, as well as it was a fundamentally philosophical mediation,¹⁶ in accordance with the Neo-Scholastic —non-historical— conception of the natural law.¹⁷ Because of all those reasons the term “doctrine” caused frequent misunderstanding at that time, as for some of them it seemed that it meant that non-historical and deductive conception of the natural law, without any interrelation to the historical, social and cultural experience and to the historical praxis. Because of it the suspicion that there would be some ideological factors in the Social Doctrine of the Church was raised as some historical factors could be considered as if they belonged to the

everlasting wealth of natural law.¹⁸ To distinguish themselves from that stance some authors tell the difference now about such narrow understanding of the jusnaturalism, on the one hand, and on the other, "natural law" in a broader sense or recognition of the "just by nature," which is essential to the Social Doctrine of the Church.¹⁹

According to my view-point the crisis was over all due to the fact that many exponents of the Social Doctrine put aside precisely the factors of its dynamism which I pointed out at the beginning of my lecture and which had had some incidence from the beginning on the social teaching, namely, an authentic dialogue between the Church and the modern world, in which —as in every dialogue— it is communicated and received at both ends, and, on the other hand, the subsequent use of the method (already made explicit by John XXIII) : "*look, judge and do*" (MM 236). As a consequence of that forgetting, the theoretical dimension of the Social Doctrine *juxtaposed* extrinsically to its historical and practical dimensions, without there having been a true interpenetration between them. Then epistemological constitution of the Social Doctrine itself was not carefully taken into account, since it "entails a triple dimension, namely : theoretical, historical and practical. These dimensions form their essential structure, and they are related between them and they are inseparable."²⁰

3.3. Overcoming of the Crisis and the Theology of Liberation.

Such crisis, which took place first in Europe, had its Latin American expression in certain stances of the Liberation Theology.²¹ Therefore it stressed from the beginning its *historical and praxical* starting point in the reality of the poor and the preferential option for them as well as it asserted the non-philosophical but *theological* nature of its theoretical reflections, as it understood itself as "critical reflection of the historical praxis *in the light of God's Word*."²² On the other hand, the Liberation Theology made it clearly explicit the essential role of the intrinsic mediation of the human and social sciences for the theological reading

and discernment of the social reality.²³

We think that, despite all the apparent and real oppositions, the Social Doctrine of the Church and the Liberation Theology enriched each other, without losing their idiosyncrasy, what is proof of the dynamism of both. From the very beginning, no doubt, there existed the influence of the conciliar constitution *Gaudium et Spes* in the method of the Liberation Theology,²⁴ and of the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* in its contents, as well as that of the episcopal Conference of Medellin in both without forgetting the decisive influence of some of the theologians of the liberation in that conference,²⁵ either. Not only did Medellin took quickly on the new problems of liberation, but, later, the 1971 synod about justice in the world and 1974 synod about evangelization, both echoed the Liberation Theology. Its problems and its ecclesial discernment were later re-taken by Paul VI in the apostolical exhortation *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975). There the Pope also takes on two other subjects which had arisen in which some considered the Argentine current of the Liberation Theology: the ones of the evangelization of culture and of the popular religiousness.²⁶ As far as it is concerned the theological Argentine reflection had met these problems trying to reflect the Latin American reality lighting it up with the chapter of *Gaudium et Spes* dedicated to culture. Later both subjects were taken by Puebla Document in respective chapters and it also influenced on other currents of the Liberation Theology. I think that also the Asian and African theologies influenced the theology of liberation in order to promote its interest in culture, religion and popular religiousness. I am referring to the discussion among the Third World theologians in the several meeting of the Ecumenical Association for Third World Theologians, specially at the meetings in New Delhi (1981) and Oaxtepec (Mexico, 1986).

Among the principal contributions of the Liberation Theology to the Social Doctrine of the Church we can also find, no doubt, the clear explicitness of the preferential option for the poor and that of the

mediating use of the social sciences by theology as well as the concept of “structures of sin.”²⁷ The first one is accepted as priority option by Puebla Document (*DP* 1134 etc.) and, then, by John Paul II (cf. *SRS* 42 ; also see *LC* 68) ; the concepts of “social sin” and “structures of sin” were likewise taken on by Puebla and later deepened by the same Pope (cf. *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia* 16 ; *SRS* 36) and the use of sciences by theology is explicitly admitted both by the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (*LN* VII, 3, 10 ; *LC* 72) and by the last encyclical (cf. *CA* 54, 59). On the other hand, the emphasis laid by John Paul on the *theological* feature of the Social Doctrine of the Church (cf. *SRS* 41 ; *CA* 55) would be a result —according to some commentators²⁸— of the questioning caused by the Liberation Theology, which always stressed the theological feature of its reading of the historical reality “in the light of God’s Word.”

As far as the Social Doctrine of the Church is concerned, above all through *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, Puebla Document, the two instructions of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (*Libertatis Nuntius* and *Libertatis Conscientia* dated in 1984 and 1986 respectively) and John Paul II’s teaching, at the same time that value many aspects of the Liberation Theology, the Social Doctrine helped it in its critical task of discernment, especially referred to the use of the Marxist analysis as social analitical mediation to interpret and judge the social realities theologically. Witness of the assumption of this discernment is the new edition (1990) of the fundamental work by Gutiérrez, who totally re-wrote the previously entitled chapter: “Christian fraternity and struggle of classes.” In this way this chapter got a new name: “Faith and social conflict.” In the new writing Gutiérrez does without the previous terminology, influenced by Marxism —which could lead to misunderstandings— and uses the same approaches as the ones of the encyclical *Laborem Exercens* on talking about the conflict between capital and labour.²⁹

Such an ecclesial effort of discernment of the Liberation Theology

was in turn useful to put vitality again on the Social Doctrine of the Church with such problems. That is how the Pope, on the one hand, happened to say to the Brazilian Bishops that is so far as it is “in *harmony and coherence* with the teachings of the Gospel, the living tradition and the everlasting teaching office of the Church.” “Theology of Liberation is not only suitable, but useful and necessary” ; further more : it “must constitute a *new stage* —in close connection with the former— of that theological reflection which was started with the apostolical tradition and continued with the great Popes and doctors, with the ordinary and extraordinary Magisterium and, more recently, with the rich heritage of the Social Doctrine of the Church.”³⁰ As well as the Theology of Liberation appears in its relationship with the Social Doctrine of the Church, in this text, on the other hand the same Pontiff makes the opposed relationship seen when he affirms: “To whom nowadays seek for a new and authentic theory and praxis of liberation, the Church offers not only the Social Doctrine and, in general, its teaching on the redeemed person by Christ, but also its concrete commitment of help to fight marginal situation and suffering” (CA 26). Therefore not only the ecclesial discernment of the Theology of Liberation but also the events in East Europe have shown how gone by were the attempts to “seek through different ways for an impossible engagement between Marxism and Christianity,” but in turns also led “to reaffirm the positiveness of an authentic human and integral theology of liberation” (*Ibid.*).

That is how today new ways are opened and new challenges are presented to the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America. Thanks to the dynamism that it has shown through and beyond its “overshadowing” and of its mutual fecundation with the Liberation Theology the Social Teaching has been again fully valued by theology and by a great part of Christian laity in our Continent.³¹ No doubt it will take up an important place in the next IV Conference of the Latin American Episcopate, that will meet in Santo Domingo next year, and

in the tasks of new evangelization, human promotion and *inculturation* of the Gospel which will be put forward there.

I think that now it is the turn of Latin American theology to yield new contributions to the dynamism of the Social Doctrine of the Church, by means of an intense interdisciplinary dialogue with the human and social sciences and with the historical praxis,³² to be at the service of the local social teaching and achieve the application, the continual "aggiornamento" and the inculturation of the Social Doctrine of the Church in Latin America. And the Latin American laymen and laywomen must, in the use of their secular autonomy, put forward historical projects and social, cultural, political, juridical and economic patterns which, inspired in the Social Doctrine of the Church and the Christian anthropology that is its basis, respond efficiently to the longing for justice and liberation "expected for such a long time by the Latin American people."

Notes

- 1 I will use the usual abbreviation to assign the teaching documents.

CA *Centesimus annus*

DP *Documentos de Puebla*

ES *Ecclesiam Suam*

GS *Gaudium et Spes*

LC *Liberta Conscientia*

LN *Libertatis Nuntius*

MM *Mater et Magistra*

PP *Populorum Progressio*

QA *Quadragesimo Anno*

SRS *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*

- 2 Cf. G. Farrell, "Desarrollo histórico de las concepciones de la doctrina social católica en el magisterio pontificio," in P. Hünermann & J. C. Scannone (compilers), *América Latina y la doctrina social de la Iglesia. Diálogo latinoamericano-alemán*, volume I, Buenos Aires (in press). Right there the author mentions his book : *Doctrina social de la Iglesia : introducción e histor-*

ia de los documentos sociales pontificos y del Episcopado latinoamericano y argentino, Buenos Aires, 1983, pp. 29ff. (the third edition, revised and enlarged, 1991).

- 3 About the characterization of "modernity," cf. A. Jeanniere "Qu est-ce que la modernité?," *Etudes* 373 (1990), pp. 499-510.
- 4 Instead, *Mirari Vos* by Gregory XVI (1831) and the *Syllabus* by Pius IX (1864) just condemn the modern mistakes, attitude that —condemning what is condemnable— changes with *Rerum Novarum*. Following that tradition the encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* (1964), by Paul VI, is precisely focused on the subject of the dialogue between Church and world. Let us bring to mind that the conciliar constitution *Gaudium et Spes* (immediately subsequent : 1965) is also devoted to the relationship (of dialogue) between the Church and the present world and influenced on the postconciliar setting out of the Latin American theology about which I will talk something else below.
- 5 Cf. John Paul II, "The encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in the 90th anniversary of its issue" (13th of May 1981), *L'Osservatore Romano* (especially the weekly edition) number 646 (17th of May 1981), p. 287, paragraph 6. Among other similar testimonies I just mention John XXIII and Paul VI, when they say, respectively : "it was. . . the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* the one that formulated, for the first time a systematic construction of the principles and a perspective of applications for the future" of the social message of the Church (*MM* 15) ; "the dialogue must feature our apostolical ministry, as we are heirs of a style and of a pastoral guidance which have been bequeathed by our last century predecessors from the great and wise Leo XIII, who undertook stately the practice of the Catholic teaching making the object of his fertile teaching to the problems of our times considered in the light of Christ's word" (*ES* 67).
- 6 Cf. Congregation for the Catholic Education, *Orientaciones para el estudio y enseñanza de la doctrina social de la Iglesia en la formación de los sacerdotes* (December 1988), paragraph 19.
- 7 Cf. G. Farrell, *op. cit.* in note 2 about Las Casas ; also see : G. Gutiérrez, *Dios o el oro en Las Indias*, Lima, 1989.
- 8 Cf. C. Matiello, "Francisco de Vitoria : Un precursor de la teología de la liberación?," *Stromata* 30 (1974), pp. 257-293 and 471-502.
- 9 Cf. J. B. Libanio, "Reflexiones a partir de la Teología de la Liberación : Una significación mutua entre la Doctrina Social de la Iglesia y la Teología de la

- Liberación" will be issued in the first volume of the mentioned work in note 2.
- 10 Cf. That reference of the periodical from Caracas "La Religión" (of September 23rd 1891) in: N. Suárez Figueroa, "La expresión venezolana de la Doctrina Social de la Iglesia," *Sic* 54 (1991), p. 155.
 - 11 Above all what has been said about DSI in Argentina of that time, cf. Néstor T. Auza, *Aciertos y fracasos sociales del catolicismo argentino, I: Grote y la estrategia social (1890-1912)*, Buenos Aires, 1987. Likewise refer to the following volumes of the same work about a later time, namely, II: *Monseñor de Andrea. Realizaciones y conflictos (1912-1919)*, Buenos Aires, 1987; III: *El proyecto episcopal y lo social (1919-1930)*, Buenos Aires, 1988; and IV: *La acción social y la crisis del 45 (1930-1945)* (in preparation).
 - 12 I refer to the pastoral letter "Economic Justice for all: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U. S. Economy," Washington, 1986.
 - 13 Cf. Documento de Consulta, Bogotá, 1978, number 744 and note 89; DEPAS-CELAM, *Fe cristiana y compromiso social. Elementos para una reflexión sobre América Latina a la luz de la Doctrina Social de la Iglesia*, Buenos Aires, 1983, pp. 149-154. About that subject see also my work: *Teología de la liberación y doctrina social de la Iglesia*, Madrid-Buenos Aires, 1987, pp. 148-173.
 - 14 John Paul II says about the Leonine encyclical: "The Pontiff inspired himself, besides, in the teachings of his predecessors, in many episcopal documents, in scientific studies promoted by laymen and laywomen, in the action of Catholic movements and associations, as well as in the concrete fullfilms in the social field, which featured the Church's life during the second half of the XIX Century" (CA 4). Cf. L. Roos about those experiences and movements (especially in Germany), "Kapitalismus, Sozial-reform, Sozialpolitik," in: A. Rauscher (ed.), *Der Soziale und Politische Katholizismus. Entwicklungslinien in Deutschland 1803-1963*, II, München, 1982, pp. 109f. All of this shows that the Social Doctrine of the Church has a historical dimension apart from its theoretical and practical dimensions.
 - 15 Cf. P. Hünermann, "Kirche-Gesellschaft-Kultur. Zur Theorie Katholischer Soziallehre," in: P. Hünermann & M. Eckholt (eds.), *Katholische Soziallehre-Wirtschaft-Demokratie. Ein latein-amerikanisch-deutsches Dialogprogramm*, I, Mainz-München, 1989, pp. 12ff. The author makes us see how the Aristotelian theory of science is not suitable to think of the Social Doctrine of the Church epistemologically.

- 16 Cf. G. Colombo, "Per l'idea della dottrina sociale della Chiesa," *La Scuola cattolica* 117 (1989), pp. 330-340. I do not agree with that author as he attributes to John XXIII and to his encyclical *Mater et Magistra* that "philosophical" conception of the Social Doctrine of the Church: cf. *ibid.*, pp. 334ff.
- 17 About the change in the conception of the natural law that is used as a philosophical assumption by Social Doctrine, cf. W. Kerber, "Katholische Soziallehre," in: *Demokratische Gesellschaft, Konsensus und Konflikt*, II, München, 1975, pp. 572ff.; O. Höffe, "Riflessioni methodiche sulla dottrina sociale della Chiesa," in: *Il convegno di Studio Milano, 14-16 aprile 1988*, Milano, 1988, pp. 55ff.
- 18 J. Ratzinger said so then: cf. "Naturrecht, Evangelium und Ideologie in der Katholischen Soziallehre, Katholische Erwägungen zum Thema," in: K. von Bismarck & W. Dirks (eds.), *Christlicher Glaube und Ideologie*, Stuttgart-Berlin-Mainz, 1964, pp. 24-30. Ratzinger's stance is not the same as that of M. D. Chenu, who points out as ideology to the Social Doctrine of the Church previous to John XXIII: cf. *La doctrine sociale de l'Eglise comme idéologie*, Paris, 1979; against that view, cf. G. Gottier, "La doctrine sociale de l'Eglise comme non-idéologie," *Communio* 6 (1981), pp. 35-47.
- 19 Cf. O. Höffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 57ff. Today that author prefers to talk merely about "justicia (política)," *ibid.*, p. 58. It has to be noticed that the present teaching avoids talking about "the natural law," to avoid misunderstandings; however he does not forget to presuppose the "derecho natural en sentido amplio" (Höffe) on talking about human rights and on the justice owed to the man as he is a man, being founded on the Christian anthropology.
- 20 Cf. Congregation for the Catholic Education, Orientaciones para el estudio y enseñanza de la doctrina social de la Iglesia en la formación de los sacerdotes. About that subject see my works: "Reflexiones epistemológicas sobre las tres dimensiones (histórica, teórica y práctica) de la Doctrina Social de la Iglesia," to be published in volume I of the mentioned work in note 2.
- 21 Cf. C. Boff, "Doctrina Social de la Iglesia y teología de la liberación: prácticas sociales opuestas?" *Concilium* 170 (Dec. 1981), pp. 468-476; J. B. Libanio, *op. cit.* in note 9. I am trying to make notice the convergencies and the differences between Theology of Liberation and Social Doctrine of the Church in my work: "Doctrina Social de la Iglesia y Teología de la Liberación. Dos epistemologías," which the Center of John XXIII in Rio de Janeiro will soon

publish.

- 22 Cf. G. Gutiérrez, *Teología de la Liberación, Perspectivas*, Salamanca, 1972 (the first edition was dated in Lima, 1971).
- 23 Cf. C. Boff, *Teología de lo político. Sus mediaciones*, Salamanca, 1980 (the edition in Portuguese is of 1978). Also see *Church* (already mentioned), above all chapter 2; and "Mediaciones teóricas y prácticas de la doctrina social de la Iglesia," *Stromata* 45 (1989), pp. 75-96.
- 24 Cf. M. McGrath, "The Impact of *Gaudium et Spes* Medellín, Puebla and Pastoral Creativity"; J. C. Scannone, "Evangelization of Culture, Liberation, and 'Popular' Culture: The New Theological-Pastoral Synthesis in Latin America" in: J. Gremillion (ed.), *The Church and Culture since Vatican II, The Experience of North and Latin America*, Notre Dame, 1985, respectively: pp. 61-63 and 74-89.
- 25 Only a few months before Medellín (1968), G. Gutiérrez—who participated as an expert in that conference—had already had an exposure entitled "Hacia una teología de la liberación," later edited by MIEC-JECI in Montevideo, 1969.
- 26 A typical exponent is the book by F. Boasso, *Qué es la pastoral popular?*, Buenos Aires, 1974, that picks up the reflections of a group of theologians under the leadership of L. Gera. On that current of the Theology of Liberation, cf. my works *Teología de la liberación y praxis popular*, Salamanca, 1976, chap. 4; *Teología de la Liberación y doctrina social de la Iglesia* (already mentioned), chap. 1, 2, and 3: and, above all, *Evangelización, cultura y Teología*, Buenos Aires, 1990 (with bibliography).
- 27 Cf. M. Sievernich, "Konturen einer interkulturellen Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 110 (1988), pp. 257-283.
- 28 Cf. G. Colombo, *op. cit.*, pp. 338f.
- 29 Cf. G. Gutiérrez, *Teología de la liberación, Perspectivas. Con una nueva introducción: Mirar lejos* (7th edition revised and corrected), Lima, 1990, pp. 396-407.
- 30 Cf. John Paul II, "Mensaje a la Conferencia Episcopal de Brasil (9 de abril 1986)," *L'Osservatore Romano* (weekly edition in Spanish), number 904 (1986), paragraph 5.
- 31 Cf. my article: "La doctrina social de la Iglesia y la liberación de América Latina," which will soon be issued in: *L'Osservatore Romano*.
- 32 Cf. my article: "Teología e interdisciplinariedad: presencia del saber

カトリック教会の社会教説のダイナミズム ——ラテンアメリカからの考察——

ホアン・カルロス・スカノネ
(サルバドル大学, アルゼンチン)

<要 約>

『レールム・ノヴァルム＝労働者の境遇』を通して追求され、また「教会の社会教説」という動き全体によって追求された歴史的目的は、「教会と現代世界の対話」にあった。「教会の社会教説」は人間的、倫理的、福音的挑戦に答えようとする。ラテンアメリカでは『レールム・ノヴァルム』よりずっと以前に、「教会と世界の新しい関係」をつくる必要に迫られた人物—バルトロメ・デ・ラス・カサスを忘れてはならない。インディオの正当な権利、正義のために戦った彼は、ラテンアメリカの「教会の社会教説」の先駆けであり、解放の神学の先駆けであると言える。

本講演では、1. 「教会の社会教説」のダイナミズムを、諸回勅の視野の広がり、考察の深まりに見て、2. 次に、ラテンアメリカにおける「教会の社会教説」のダイナミズムを、1) 『レールム・ノヴァルム＝労働者の境遇』の影響期、2) 1960年代における「教会の社会教説」の危機（メデジン、プエブラのラテンアメリカ司教会議、解放の神学のいくつかの立場の考察）、3) 解放の神学との出会いと現在の再評価、に分けて考察するなかで、ラテンアメリカの神学は今、「教会の社会教説」のダイナミズムに貢献し、何よりも正義と解放に向かう人びとの切望に応える時であることを強調する。

上智大学社会正義研究所活動報告 (1991 年～1992 年)

I 概 要

上智大学社会正義研究所(Institute for the Study of Social Justice, Sophia University)は、上智大学の経営母体であるイエズス会の第 32 総会教令「信仰への奉仕と正義の促進」の方針に沿って、1981 年 4 月、大学附置研究所として設立された。当研究所は、上智大学の建学理念であるキリスト教精神に基づいて変動する世界における諸問題を社会正義の視点より学際的に研究し、その成果を教育と実践活動の用に供することを目的としている。

研究活動では、所員の専門分野からの個別研究を年 1 回発行の『社会正義』紀要に発表している。また所員を中心とした共同研究では「正義」、「平和研究」、「食糧問題」、「発展途上国問題」、「難民と人権」、「解放の神学」、「カトリック社会教説と経済倫理」、「世界経済の摩擦構造」、「カトリック社会教説と現代社会」などの研究テーマを設定し、1～3 年のプロジェクトとして行ない、その成果をそれぞれ刊行した。海外調査研究では、当研究所の特色として実践活動を重視する点から、その活動の一つである「世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を」の会(難民、貧しい人びとへの援助協力団体で当研究所下部組織)の援助協力先を視察し、新たな協力方法をさぐるために、1981 年より現在までに 6 回の調査研究班をアジア・アフリカ諸国に派遣してきた。

教育活動では、国内の専門家、研究者にかぎらず、国外からも、マザー・テレサ、レフ・ワレサ、ヘルデル・カマーラ、スーザン・ジョージ、サムエル・キム、グスタボ・グティエレス、サウル・メンドロビッツ、ジョン・ソプリノ、リチャード・ディジョージ各氏を招聘し、公開講演会、国際シンポジウムを開催している。特に毎年開催の国際シンポジウムでは「国際相互依存時代における人間尊重」(1981 年)、「アジアにおける開発と正義」(1982 年)、「世界の難民と人権」(1983 年)、「平和の挑戦」(1984 年)、「解放の神学」(1985 年)、「現代社会と正義」(1986 年)、「万人に経済正義を」(1987 年)、「イエズス会の教育の特徴」(1988 年)、「経済と倫理」(1989 年)、「環境と倫理」(1990 年)、「教会の社会教説 100 年」(1991 年)をテーマとしてとりあげた。

実践活動では、「世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を」の会(Sophia Relief Service)を研究所の下部組織として設立(1981年5月)し、主にアジア・アフリカの民間援助機関に、全国からの寄付金によって現在までに総額約1億2千万円の資金協力を行ってきた。

以上、当研究所は、研究、教育、実践の各活動の推進によって、現代社会において微力ながら社会正義の促進に寄与するべく努力するものである。

Ⅱ 所 員・事 務 局

所 長	アンセルモ・マタイス	文学部教授(人間学, 倫理学)
所 員	ロジャー・ダウニィ	経済学部助教授(アジア経済論)
	栗 城 壽 夫	法学部教授(憲法学)
	松 本 栄 二	文学部教授(社会福祉論)
	アドルフォ・ニコラス	神学部教授(組織神学)
	大 河 内 繁 男	法学部教授(行政学)
	武 市 英 雄	文学部教授(新聞学)
	渡 部 清	文学部教授(哲学)
	山 田 經 三	経済学部教授(組織・リーダーシップ論)
兼任所員	村 井 吉 敬	外国語学部教授(東南アジア社会経済論)
客員研究員	エドワルド・ホルヘ・アンソレーナ	本学非常勤講師(人間学)
事 務 局	保 岡 孝 顕	
	大 竹 靖	

研究所所在地 〒102 東京都千代田区紀尾井町 7-1 上智大学
 中央図書館・総合研究棟 7 階 713 号室
 電話 03(3238)3023, 3695
 FAX 03(3238)3885(大学共用)

Ⅲ 研 究 活 動

1. 所員研究

91年度の研究成果として、「現代世界における解放の神学の役割—レオナルド・ボフの貢献」山田經三所員の論文を本書『社会正義』紀要11にとりまとめ

た。

2. 学内共同研究

・カトリック社会教説と現代社会

研究代表者：アンセルモ・マタイス

研究分担者：安藤勇(文学部人間学研究室非常勤講師, イエズス会社会司牧センター所長), ヴィセンテ・ボネット(文学部人間学研究室教授), 松本栄二, アドルフォ・ニコラス, 土田元子(比較文化学部比較文化学科講師), 山田経三, 余語毅男(文学部社会福祉学科教授), ロザ・マリア・コルテス(上智短期大学英語科講師), 保岡孝顕/学外・片平博(清瀬カトリック教会信徒), 横川和夫(共同通信社論説委員), ジョン・ジョセフ・プテンカラム(大学院神学専攻)

研究活動： (テーマ・発表者) 開催日

- (1) 湾岸戦争と教皇ヨハネ・パウロ 2 世の平和メッセージ '91 年 4 月 25 日
＝アンセルモ・マタイス
政治教育プログラム準備への提言＝安藤勇
- (2) 「世界の正義」シノドス文書(1971 年)＝山田経三 '91 年 5 月 23 日
- (3) 「メデジン文書」(全ラテンアメリカ・カトリック
司教団教書, 1968 年)＝グスタボ・アンドラーデ '91 年 6 月 20 日
(本学イベロアメリカ研究所長)
- (4) 「ブエブラ文書」(全ラテンアメリカ・カトリック
司教団教書, 1979 年) '91 年 7 月 18 日
＝エドワルド・ホルヘ・アンソレーナ (当研究所客員
研究員)
- (5) 「チェンテジマス・アンヌス」(新しい課題)教皇ヨ
ハネ・パウロ 2 世(1991 年)＝アンセルモ・マタイス '91 年 9 月 24 日
～25 日
- (6) 「平和の挑戦」(米国カトリック司教団教書, 1983 年) '91 年 10 月 17 日
＝片平博
- (7) 「教会の社会教説 100 年ー『労働者の境遇』(1891 年) '91 年 12 月 6 日
から現代まで」(当研究所, 国際基督教大学社会科学 ～8 日
研究所共催の国際シンポジウム)に参加
- (8) 「アジアの教会からの応答と挑戦」＝保岡孝顕, '92 年 1 月 30 日
相馬信夫(日本カトリック正義と平和協議会担当司教)

なお, 当共同研究の活動報告書は, 前年度活動(本書 10 号掲載)と併せて

1992 年 5 月末日までに出版する予定である。

IV 教 育 活 動

1. 講演会

- ・ 1991 年 5 月 8 日「クルド人難民キャンプを訪れて」

(本学 10 号館講堂)

講師 犬養道子(評論家)

共催 本学カトリック・センター

- ・ 1991 年 10 月 30 日「危機のアフリカの角ー大量難民の発生とその対応」

(本学 7 号館特別会議室)

報告 保岡孝顕(当研究所スタッフ)

ジョン・ジョセフ・ブテンカラム(当大学大学院生)

2. 研修会

- ・ 1991 年 10 月 18 日(金)～20 日(日)

第 5 回平和教育全国研修会ー釜ヶ崎, 猪飼野地区の体験学習を中心に

(大阪カトリックセンター, 釜ヶ崎, 猪飼野)

共催 日本カトリック正義と平和協議会

—————プログラム—————

第 1 日 10 月 18 日(金)

1:30 p.m. 祈り, 挨拶

安田久雄(カトリック大阪大司教区大司教)

相馬信夫(日本カトリック正義と平和協議会担当司教)

2:00 p.m. 講演 1「今こそ大切な平和教育」

相馬信夫

3:00 p.m. 問題提起「平和教育のために, 平和とは何か」

薄田昇(カトリック司祭, 「旅路の里」 責任者)

4:30 p.m. 交流会

第 2 日 10 月 19 日(土)

9:15 a.m. 講演 2「アジアからの労働者と釜ヶ崎」

水野阿修羅(アジア・フレンド代表)

10:45 a.m. 現場学習(釜ヶ崎)

1:30 p.m. 分かち合い

4:20 p.m. アピール

5:00 p.m. ミサ

第3日 10月20日(日)

9:15 a.m. 現場学習(猪飼野)

10:30 a.m. 講演 3「在日韓国・朝鮮人問題を考えるー内なる国際化を求めて」
李清一(KCCー在日韓国キリスト教会館長)

12:00 p.m. コメント アンセルモ・マタイス (当研究所所長)

3. シンポジウム

・1991年5月11日(土)

環境シンポジウム

「いのちと科学技術ーチェルノブイリが問いかけること」

(本学10号館講堂)

共催 「チェルノブイリ被害調査・救援」女性ネットワーク

—————プログラム—————

第1部 司会 福武公子(弁護士,「女性ネットワーク」)

1:00 p.m. 開会のことば 綿貫礼子(環境問題研究家,「女性ネットワーク」
代表)

1:15 p.m. 講演

「放射線被曝の次世代への影響」

野村大成(大阪大学医学部教授・遺伝学)

「チェルノブイリから5年,白ロシアの子どもたちの健康について」

オリガ・アレニコワ [Olga Aleinikova]

(ミンスク小児血液病センター・医師)

コメント 野村大成ほか

第2部 司会 鶴見和子(本学名誉教授,社会学者,「女性ネットワーク」)

3:15 p.m. パネルディスカッション

パネリスト 中島哲演(福井県明通寺副住職,平和運動家)
綿貫礼子

高木仁三郎(原子力資料情報室)

4:50 p.m. 挨拶 アンセルモ・マタイス(当研究所所長)

閉会のことば 荒井佐念子(「女性ネットワーク」アレイニコワ博士歓迎委員長)

・1991年11月30日(土)

シンポジウム

「東チモール問題—新しい民族独立の潮流の中で」

(本学中央図書館 921 会議室)

共催 日本カトリック正義と平和協議会

東チモール問題シンポジウム実行委員会

————プログラム————

1:00 p.m. 開会の挨拶 相馬信夫(日本カトリック正義と平和協議会担当司教)

基調報告 曾我英雄(三重大学教授)

ジョゼ・コスタ・ペレイラ [José Costa Pereira]

(ポルトガル大使館一等書記官)

パネルディスカッション

パネリスト 伊藤正孝(朝日新聞編集委員)

鈴木佑司(法政大学教授)

ジョゼ・コスタ・ペレイラ

アジオ・ペレイラ [Agio Pereira]

(元東チモール独立革命戦線オーストラリア代表)

ジェームズ・ダン [James Dunn]

(元オーストラリア東チモール駐在領事)

曾我英雄

*参加予定の下斗米伸夫氏は都合により欠席

司会

首藤もと子(駒沢大学助教授)

5:00 p.m. 閉会の挨拶 ジャイメ・コエリョ(上智大学教授)

・1991年12月6日(金)〜8日(日)

第11回国際シンポジウム

「教会の社会教説100年—『労働者の境遇』(1891年)から現代まで」

(本学7号館特別会議室)

共催 国際基督教大学社会科学研究所

————プログラム————

共同司会 新津晃一(国際基督教大学社会科学研究所所長)

アンセルモ・マタイス(当研究所所長)

第1日 12月6日(金)

1:30 p.m. オリエンテーション アンセルモ・マタイス

1:45 p.m. 基調講演

「教会の社会教説の100年」

セルヒオ・ベルナル [Sergio Bernal]

(グレゴリアン大学教授, イタリア)

「教会の社会教説—ラテンアメリカの視点から」

フアン・カルロス・スカノネ [Juan Carlos Scannone]

(サルバドル大学教授, アルゼンチン)

「教会の社会教説—日本の視点から」

岡田武夫(カトリック司教)

司会 保岡孝顕(当研究所スタッフ)

渡部 清(当研究所所員)

5:30 p.m. レセプション

第2日 12月7日(土)

10:00 a.m. ワークショップ

「労働について」

講師 ホセ・エリャクリア [José Ellacuria]

(レールム・ノヴァールム労働センター所長, 台湾)

林 尚志(下関労働教育センター)

安積仰也(国際基督教大学教授)

司会 新津晃一

1:30 p.m. ワークショップ

「平和について」

講師 深瀬忠一(北星学園大学教授)

今井圭子(上智大学教授)

姜尚中(国際基督教大学準教授)

司会 栗城壽夫(当研究所所員)

「開発について」

講師 ホセ・エリャクリア

安藤勇(イエズス会社会司牧センター所長)

村井吉敬(当研究所兼任所員)

司会 山田經三(当研究所所員)

第3日 12月8日(日)

1:30 p.m. 共同の祈り

永田竹司(国際基督教大学教会牧師, 同教授)

ホセ・エリャクリア

パネルディスカッション

「正義促進のための私達の責任と役割」

パネリスト セルヒオ・ベルナル

ホセ・エリャクリア

フアン・カルロス・スカノネ

安藤勇

永田竹司

斎藤恵彦(東京外国語大学教授)

司会 アンセルモ・マタイス

新津晃一

5:00 p.m. 閉会の辞 新津晃一

V 実践活動

「世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を」の会

上智大学は1979年12月上旬からインドシナ難民救援のため、募金活動(街頭・新宿駅前)を開始し、更に1980年2月から同年10月まで、タイの難民キャンプに延べ152名の本学教職員・学生によるボランティアを派遣してきた。また、1981年3月22日から同年4月7日まで、A.マタイスを団長とする4名の難民キャンプ調査団が、タイ、インド、パキスタン、ケニア、ソマリアを訪れ、現地で救援活動を行っている関係者と援助協力の可能性を検討した。調査団は帰国後、学内における報告会の開催、報告書『難民調査の旅』を作成し、1981年5月に「世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を」の会が発足した。当会は、当研究所設立と同時にこれまで本学の外事部が主管してきた難民救援活動を当研究所の実践活動の一つとして引き継いだ。また従来の難民救援活動の全学的取り組みの精神を生かすため、当会は本学の教職員・学生ボランティア・学外のボランティアによって構成されている。なお、評論家『人間の大地』著者の犬養道子氏には会のアドバイザー(1982年1月より)として協力を得ている。

1) 募金協力者 約 700 名

2) 募金総額 126,080,186 円(1981 年 5 月～1992 年 3 月)

3) '91 年度援助協力先(1991 年 4 月～1992 年 3 月)

① インド

- ・デディアパダ社会福祉協会(グジャラート州)

貧困に苦しむアディバシスと呼ばれる先住民の子供たちのために教育活動等を行っている。

援助金額 807,000 円

② ケニア

- ・マリア医療宣教会

北西部山岳地帯で、医療保健員育成、巡回医療サービス、浅井戸建設等の援助を行っている。

援助金額 1,613,100 円

- ・イエズス会

カンゲミ・スラム(ナイロビ郊外)で教区事務所、司祭館、診療所、保育所、小学校などの建設、所得を得るための各種授産施設への資金援助を行っている。

援助金額 684,735 円

③ ソマリア

- ・カリタス・ソマリア

コリオレのエチオピア人難民キャンプでの食糧援助、浅井戸ポンプ・プロジェクトおよび難民とソマリアの貧しい人びとのために総合病院建設を行っている。

援助金額 1,613,100 円

④ エチオピア

- ・イエズス会救済事業

1982 年より南部シダモ州ゴザで飢餓難民のための巡回保健医療活動を行っている。更に 1985 年より北部被災民の再移住地である南西諸州での緊急医療を実施している。

援助金額 1,616,700 円

⑤ スーダン

- ・スーダン・エイド

南部ジュバでは貧しい子供たち、難民のための教育を行っている。

援助金額 816,000 円

4) 他の難民救援団体との交流

難民救援連絡会(難民救援にたずさわる 19 団体が参加)に加盟し、例会に参加している。

5) 学内外での募金活動

1991年6月15日 チャリティーコンサート(建築会館ホール)

主催：日本建築学会学友会，トラウム

収益金 684.735 円

1991年10月15日～16日 チャリティーバザー(上智大学内)

収益金 247,772 円

6) ニュース・レターの発行

会の活動は年 2 回『世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を』を発行し、寄付協力者への報告、難民救援へのアピールを行っている。

7) 募金の受付は――

□座名儀 「世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を」の会

郵便振替口座 東京 8-86078

銀行口座(普通預金) さくら銀行四谷駅前支店 3090766

第一勸業銀行四谷支店 1310474

VI 出版活動

1. 所員研究の成果

『社会正義』紀要 11, 上智大学社会正義研究所, 1992 年 3 月

「現代世界における解放の神学の役割—レオナルド・ボフの貢献」山田經三、
「聖イグナチオのカリスマと今日のイエズス会の使徒的挑戦」ペーター・ハン
ス・コルベンバッハ、
“The New and the Old : One Hundred Years of
Catholic Social Teaching,” Sergio Bernal, “The Church’s Social Doctrine
Dynamism from *Rerum Novarum* – A Consideration from the Latin
American Perspective,” Juan Carlos Scannone, 活動報告 1991-92

2. 学内共同研究の成果

『「カトリック社会教説と現代社会」報告書—1990～91年度』

上智大学学内共同研究，1992年5月発行予定

3. 海外調査研究の成果

『1991年アフリカ難民の実情—上智大学アフリカ難民現地調査報告』上智大学
社会正義研究所、1992年3月〔1991年8月に実施された調査の成果〕

4. 国際シンポジウムの成果

『人間尊重の世界秩序をめざして』上智大学社会正義研究所，1982年6月

〔第1回「国際相互依存時代における人間尊重」1981年10月30日～11月1日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：地球化時代の変革，国家安全保障の拘束服，世界秩序の推進に対する大学の役割，世界秩序にむけての戦略，地球的精神性をめざして，シンポジウム：日本の安全保障，東アジア世界の現状と展望，地球社会化教育，国際秩序のあるべき姿

隅谷三喜男，A. マタイス編『アジアの開発と民衆』YMCA 出版，1983年11月〔第2回「アジアにおける開発と正義」1982年10月22日～24日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：近代化の再検討から内発的發展へ，アジアの経済発展と日本，分科会：韓国報告－開発にたいする民衆の声，フィリピン報告－日系企業進出とフィリピン社会，インドネシア報告－インドネシアにおける開発と正義，インド報告－人口・食糧・開発，総括討論：アジアの開発と日本－今後のかかわり方

緒方貞子，A. マタイス編『世界の難民』明石書店，1984年12月

〔第3回「世界の難民と人権」1983年12月9日～11日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：難民の歴史と世界の対応，難民の人権－日本の対応，分科会：アフリカ難民－救援活動の現場，アフガニスタン難民－国を離れた350万人の希望と苦悩，インドシナ難民－ボート・ピープルとランド・ピープル，日本国内のインドシナ難民－定住促進にむけて，パネルディスカッション：世界の難民と人権－私たちの自覚と連帯を求めて

関 寛治，A. マタイス編『平和のメッセージ』明石書店，1985年11月

〔第4回「平和の挑戦」1984年12月7日～9日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：『平和の挑戦』－それは何を語っているか，それは何を意味するか，平和教書と世界秩序，分科会：核の脅威，軍需産業・開発，アームズコントロールと軍縮，日本の平和問題，総括討論：平和の挑戦－私たちの役割

グスタヴォ・グティエレス，A. マタイス編『解放の神学』明石書店，1986年11月

〔第5回「解放の神学」1985年11月29日～12月1日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：『解放の神学』－神について語ること，解放の神学はアジアの教会で可能か，分科会：聖書における解放，バチカンをとる Option for the poor，南米における解放の神学，アジアにおける解放の神学，パネルディスカッション：解放の神学と私たち

稲垣良典, A. マタイス編『現代社会と正義』明石書店, 1987年11月

〔第6回「現代社会と正義」1986年11月28日～30日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：正義とは何か，正義と平和を求めて－フィリピンの場合，特別講演：正義と平和の世界秩序を求めて－世界の飢餓問題，分科会：西欧における正義，日本における正義，国家と正義，富の生産・分配の正義，パネルディスカッション：正義の促進のために－私たちの選択

磯村尚徳, A. マタイス編『今こそ経済正義を』みくに書房, 1988年11月

〔第7回「万人に経済正義を」1987年11月27日～29日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：解放と判断を識別しながら－米国カトリック司教団経済教書『万人に経済正義を』について，第三世界における貧困と貧しい人々への選択，分科会：経済生活に関するキリスト教のビジョン，特定の経済政策上の諸問題－雇用と貧困，「食料と農業」に関する報告，相互依存の地球規模経済，パネルディスカッション：万人に経済正義を促進する為の私たちの選択

上智大学社会正義研究所編『正義に向かう教育』中央出版社, 1989年10月

〔第8回「イエズス会の教育の特徴」（上智大学創立75周年記念ソフィア・シンポジウム）1989年10月29日～30日開催のとりまとめ〕

講演：イエズス会の教育の特徴－教育界において正義を促進するために，今日の日本社会におけるカトリック学校の現状と課題，東南アジアからみたイエズス会の教育の特徴，現代社会における科学技術教育について，現代社会における人間的なかわりの大切さを求めて，パネルディスカッション：

21世紀へのカトリック大学の教育－その課題と展望

新津晃一, A. マタイス編『地球再生のための経済倫理』柘植書房, 1990年12月

〔第9回「経済と倫理」1989年11月17日～19日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：経済倫理－異なった社会体制における状況，分科会－多国籍企業の責任－発展途上諸国における実態，パネルディスカッション：経済と倫理－発展途上諸国に対する先進諸国の責任

新津晃一, A. マタイス編『地球再生 21世紀への提言』柘植書房, 1992年4月

〔第10回「環境と倫理」1990年12月7日～9日開催のとりまとめ〕

基調講演：地球の未来を守るために－我ら共有の未来，ワークショップ：開発と環境破壊の実態－南米の場合，日本と第三世界，パネルディスカッション：環境と倫理－地球の未来を守るための私たちの責任

5. その他の出版物

ニュース・レター『世界の貧しい人々に愛の手を』第 21 号(1991 年 7 月), 第 22 号(1991 年 12 月)

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE(=ISSJ) (1991—92)

I ORIGIN AND AIM

ISSJ was established at Sophia University (Jesuit Univ.) in 1981.

ISSJ's purpose is to investigate the conditions of social justice in the domestic and international arena and to contribute to the promotion of social justice, peace and development of humanity based on interdisciplinary efforts. The creation of ISSJ was a prompt response to the Decree 4 (the promotion of justice in the name of the Gospel) of the thirty-second General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (1975).

The Institute emphasizes the need for wider support and cooperation from various research institutions both at home and abroad in pursuit of this objective. In accordance with this purpose, the Institute sets up research projects on justice issues.

Another purpose of the Institute is to find a relevant relationship between research and teaching. Since the staffs of the ISSJ are faculty members of Sophia University, they teach in their respective specialties. So, ideas and insights originating from research projects being conducted by the Institute also influence students through their classes.

Results of research projects of the Institute are published annually. One of the main publications is called *Shakai Seigi* (=Social Justice).

II ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF

Director

Anselmo MATAIX (Professor, Philosophical Anthropology, Ethics)

Staff Members

Roger DOWNEY (Associate Professor, Economics, Social Accounting).

Hisao KURIKI (Professor, Constitutional Law)
 Eiji MATSUMOTO (Professor, Social Welfare)
 Adolfo NICOLÁS (Professor, Theology)
 Shigeo OHKŌCHI (Professor, Administration)
 Hideo TAKEICHI (Professor, Mass Communication)
 Kiyoshi WATABE (Professor, Philosophy)
 Keizō YAMADA (Professor, Management)

Associate Member

Yoshinori MURAI (Professor, Socio-economics of Southeast Asia)

Visiting Researcher

Eduardo Jorge ANZORENA (Lecturer, Philosophical Anthropology)

Administration

Takaaki YASUOKA (Lecturer, Third World Affairs, Community College)

Yasushi OHTAKE

Location

The Institute is located at Sophia University (No. 713, 7th Floor of the Central Library Building), 7-1, Kioi-cho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102, Japan, Tel. 03-3283-3023, 3695. Fax 03-3238-3885

III ACTIVITIES

The activities of the Institute are organized in four categories; A - Research, B-Symposia, Seminars, and Public Lectures, C-Action programs and D-Publications.

A-Research

Interdisciplinary research is carried out in the form of an intra-campus research group financed by Sophia University

Katorikku Shakai Kyōsetsu to Gendaishakai=Catholic Social Teachings and Contemporary Society

Organized by Prof. Anselmo Mataix, this group has carried out two year research activities on the Papal Social Encyclicals and Synod Documents as well as Bishops' Pastoral Letters of different local

Churchs. The 1991-1992 period program consisted of the following areas: Pope John Paul II's discernment on the Gulf War of 1991; Catholic Social Teaching and the Japanese society—a proposal of Political Education; the 1971 Synod Document on *Justice in the World*; the 1968 *Medellin Document* by the Latin American Bishops; the 1979 Puebla Document by the Latin American Bishops; Pope John Paul II's *Centesimus Annus*; *the Challenge of Peace* by the United States Bishops; Social Teaching of the Church for the Foundation of Evangelization in Asia by the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conference.

Research members: Isamu Andō, SJ, Jesuit Social Center; Vicente Bonet, Professor, Philosophical Anthropology; Sister Rosa Maria Cortes, Lecturer, Sophia Junior College; Hiroshi Katahira, Kiyose Catholic Church member; Eiji Matsumoto, Professor, Social Welfare; Adolfo Nicolás, Professor, Theology; Joseph Puthenkalam, SJ, Theology student; Motoko Tsuchida, Lecturer, Political Science; Keizō Yamada, Professor, Management; Takaaki Yasuoka, ISSJ; Takeo Yogo, Professor, Social Welfare; Kazuo Yokokawa, Kyodo News Service.

B-Symposia, Seminars and Public Lectures

● Symposia

• The 11th International Symposium

From 6th to 8th of December, 1991, the Institute held the 11th International Symposium under the co-sponsorship with the Social Science Research Institute of International Christian University.

The following is the Programme on the theme of One Hundred Years of Social Teaching of the Church since *RERUM NOVARUM*.

The 1st Day, Dec. 6(Fri.)

ORIENTATION: Anselmo Mataix, (Director, ISSJ, Sophia Univ., Japan)

KEY-NOTE SPEECHES: "The New and the Old: One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching," Sergio Bernal (Professor, Gregorian Univ., Rome, Italy); "The Church's Social Doctrine Dynamism

From *Rerum Novarum*-A Consideration from the Latin American Perspective," Juan Carlos Scannone (Professor, Salvador Univ., Buenos Aires, Argentine) ; "One Hundred Years of Social Teaching-From the Japanese Perspective," Takeo Okada (Bishop, Urawa, Japan)

RECEPTION

The 2nd Day, Dec. 7 (Sat.)

WORKSHOP ON LABOUR-Morning Session : "On the Hundredth Anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*," José Ellacuria (Director, Rerum Novarum Labour Center, Taipei, Taiwan) ; "The Conditions of Workers in Japan," Hisashi Hayashi (Shimonoseki Labour Education Center, Japan) ; "Technology and a Sense of Alienation-the Case of Japanese Workers," Kōya Azumi (Professor, International Christian Univ., Japan)

WORKSHOP ON PEACE-Afternoon Session : "Ideas of Peace and Human Rights in the Present Japanese Constitution, Tadakazu Fukase (Professor, Hokusei Gakuen Univ., Japan) ; "Post-Cold War System and Problems of Developing Countries," Keiko Imai (Professor, Sophia Univ., Japan) ; "Is Our Fight with History already over?-the Critical Examination of the Postwar Japan and the Japanese with Asian Peoples," Kang Sangjung (Associate Professor, International Christian Univ., Japan)

WORKSHOP ON DEVELOPMENT-Afternoon Session : "A Global, Humanitarian Development and the Taiwan-style Development," José Ellacuria, "Authentic Development and the Japanese Case Study," Isamu Andō (Director, Jesuit Social Center, Japan) ; "Development of the Third World and the North," Yoshinori Murai (Professor, Sophia Univ., Japan)

The 3rd Day, Dec. 8 (Sun.)

PRAYER : Takeshi Nagata (Minister, International Christian Univ., Japan), José Ellacuria

PANEL DISCUSSION : A Way of Working for Justice in the World with Individuals, with Structures," Sergio Bernal, José Ellacuria, Juan

Carlos Scannone, Isamu Andō, Takeshi Nagata and Yasuhiko Saitō (Professor, Tokyo Univ. of Foreign Studies, Japan). Chaired by Anselmo Mataix and Kōichi Niitsu (Director, Social Science Research Institute of International Christian Univ., Japan)

• On May 11th, 1991, **the Symposium on the Problem of Environment** was held under the co-sponsorship with the Woman's Network on the Chernobyl Disaster Survey and Relief at Sophia Univ. Auditorium.

The following is the Programme on the theme of Life, Science and Technology.

The First Part : Chairperson Kimiko Fukutake (Lawyer)

OPENING ADDRESS : Reiko Watanuki (Science Writer, Chairperson, Woman's Network)

KEY-NOTE SPEECHES : "Effect of the Radioactive-victim on Future Generation," Taizō Nomura (Professor, Osaka Univ. School of Medicine) ; "Five Years after the Chernobyl Disaster-Effect on the Health of the Children," Olga Aleinikova (Doctor, Center for the Children's Blood-Disease, Minsku, USSR) ; Comment : Taizō Nomura

The Second Part : Chairperson Kazuko Tsurumi, (Professor Emeritus, Sophia Univ., Sociologist)

PANEL DISCUSSION : Tetsuen Nakajima (Myōtsūji Buddhist Temple, Fukui) ; Reiko Watanuki ; Jinzaburō Takagi (Director, Citizen's Nuclear Information Center, Tokyo)

CLOSING ADDRESS : Anselmo Mataix (Director, ISSJ, Sophia Univ.) ; Sayoko Arai (Welcoming Committee for Dr. Aleinikova, Woman's Network)

• On November 30th, 1991, **the Symposium under the theme of East Timor** in the Midst of a New Tide for Independence of Nations was held under the co-sponsorship with the Japanese Catholic Council for Justice and Peace and the Working Committee for the Symposium on East Timor at Sophia Univ.

The following is the programme.

OPENING ADDRESS : Nobuo Sōma (President, Japanese Catholic

Council for Justice and Peace)

KEY-NOTE SPEECHES : Hideo Soga (Professor, Mie Univ.) ; José Costa Pereira (First Secretary, Portuguese Embassy, Tokyo)

PANEL DISCUSSION : Masataka Itō (Senior Staff Writer, the Asahi Shimbun) ; Yūji Suzuki (Professor, Hōsei Univ.) ; José Costa Pereira ; Agio Pereira (Former Representative, the Revolutionary Front of Independent East Timor) ; James Dunn (Former Australian Consul in East Timor) ; Hideo Soga ; Motoko Shutō (Associate Professor, Komazawa Univ.)

CLOSING ADDRESS : Jaime Coelho (Professor, Sophia Univ.)

● Seminar

From 18th to 20th of October, 1991, the 5th National Seminar for Catholic School Teachers was held at Osaka Catholic Center, Kamagasaki in Osaka on the theme of Peace Education in cooperation with the Japanese Catholic Council for Justice and Peace. The following is the programme.

The 1st Day, Oct. 18 (Fri.)

PRAYER AND OPENING ADDRESS : Hisao Yasuda (Archbishop, Osaka) and Nobuo Sōma (Bishop, President, Japanese Catholic Council for Justice and Peace)

ORIENTATION & LECTURE : "Peace Education, Now," Nobuo Sōma, "What is Peace? Toward Peace Education," Noboru Susukida, (Director, Tabiji-no-sato, member of Ecumenical Association for Cooperation and Friendship in Kamagasaki, Osaka)

SHARING :

The 2nd Day, Oct. 19 (Sat.)

LECTURE : "Foreign Migrant Workers from Asia and Kamagasaki," Ashura Mizuno (Asian Friend)

EXPOSURE PROGRAM at Kamagasaki

SHARING, APPEAL, MASS

The 3rd Day Oct. 20 (Sun.)

EXPOSURE PROGRAM at Ikaino

LECTURE : "Problems of the Korean residents in Japan and International Mindedness of the Japanese," Lee Chong-il (Director, Korean Christian Center, Osaka)

Concluding Remark by Anselmo Mataix (Director, ISSJ, Sophia Univ.)

● Public Lectures

(1) "Visiting the Kurdish Refugee Camps," Michiko Inukai (Critic, and Adviser, Sophia Relief Service) jointly held with Catholic Center, Sophia Univ., May 8, 1991.

(2) "The African Refugees and Displaced Persons: Crisis of Horn of Africa-Field Reports of Kenya and Tanzania," Takaaki Yasuoka (Staff member, ISSJ, Sophia Univ.) ; John Joseph Puthenkalam, SJ (Jesuit Scholastic), October 30, 1991.

C-Action Program

From 1st to 21st of August, the Sophia Relief Service sent the two-men field research team to investigate present situation of refugees and displaced persons in Eastern Africa, Kenya and Tanzania respectively. The fact-finding team was composed of Takaaki Yasuoka, staff member of ISSJ and John Joseph Puthenkalam, SJ.

The following is the itinerary.

(Kenya : Nairobi, Nakuru) From 3rd to 5th of August, From 11th to 10th of August, Meetings with Fr. Giorgio Bertin, President, Caritas Somalia ; Fr. Michael Schultheis, SJ, Director, Jesuit Refuges Services, Africa ; Fr. Payer, SJ, St. Joseph Parish, Kangemi Slum Project ; Medical Missionaries of Mary in Nakuru. (Tanzania : Dodoma, Morogoro) From 6th to 10th of August, Meetings with Fr. Rudwig, SJ, Superior, Airport Parish ; Inades Formation Tanzania, Agricultural Development Programs : Sisters of Mary Immaculate, Dispensary, Mother-Child-Health Care Programs ; Holy Cross Sisters Medical Programs.

Figures of Donations and Disbursement (As of March 1992)

Sophia Relief Service has received Yen 126,080,186 from May 1981.

Disbursement :

- (1) India-Gujarat, Adivasi Samajik Kendra, Education of Adivasi Children of Dediapada (Yen 807,000)
- (2) Kenya-Nakuru, Karbanet, Medical Missionaries of Mary, Community Based Health Programme (Yen 1,613,100)
- (3) Kenya-Nairobi, St. Joseph Parish Kangemi, Society of Jesus-Slum Project (Yen 684,735)
- (4) Somalia-Mogadishu, Caritas Somalia, Emergency and income-generating activities for refugees and displaced persons (Yen 1,613,100)
- (5) Ethiopia-Kaffa, Kische-Mechi, Jesuit Relief Service, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Programmes of displaced persons from the North (Yen 1,616,700)
- (6) Sudan-Juba, Southern Sudan, Sudan Aid, Education Programme for displaced children and Ugandan refugee children (Yen 816,000)

D-Publications

The Institute has emphasized the importance of high quality research papers and academic publications.

The following are the academic journals, research papers and other types of publications.

1. Academic Journals

- (1) *Shakai Seigi* (= *Social Justice*), Vol. 1 (Tokyo : ISSJ, Sophia Univ., 1982) ~ *Shakai Seigi*, Vol. 10. 1991.
- (2) *Shakai Seigi*, Vol. 11 (Tokyo : ISSJ, Sophia Univ., 1992) 94pp.

Contents :

The Role of the Theology of Liberation in the Modern World-The Contribution of Leonardo Boff/The Charism of St. Ignatius and Some Apostolic Challenges to the Society of Jesus Today/The New and the Old : One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching/The Church's Social Doctrine Dynamism from *Rerum Novarum* : A Consideration from the Latin American Perspective/The Reports : Activities of 1991 -92

2. Symposium Reports

(1) *Ningensonchō no Sekaichitsujo o Mezashite*(=*In search of Human Dignity and World Order*)(Tokyo: ISSJ, Sophia University, 1982)105pp.

The report of the 1st International Symposium on Human Dignity in the Age of Interdependence which was held at Sophia University from October 30th to November 1st, 1981.

(2) Anselmo Mataix and Mikio Sumiya eds., *Ajia no Kaihatsu to Minshū*(=*Development and Justice Issues in Asia*)(Tokyo: YMCA, 1983)266pp.

The report of the 2nd International Symposium on Development and Justice Issues in Asia which was held at Sophia University in October 1982.

(3) A. Mataix and Sadako Ogata eds., *Sekai no Nanmin*(=*The World Refugees*)(Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1984)250pp.

The report of the 3rd International Symposium on World Refugees and Human Rights-Our Role and Responsibilities which was held at Sophia University in December 1983.

(4) A. Mataix and Hiroharu Seki eds., *Heiwa no Messe-ji-Kaku Sensō no Kyōi o Norikoete*(=*Message of Peace-Beyond the Threat of Nuclear Warfare*)(Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1985)225pp.

The report of the 4th International Symposium on Challenge of Peace and Our Role which was held at Sophia University in December 1984.

(5) A. Mataix and Gustavo Gutiérrez eds., *Kaihō no Shingaku Kokusai Shimpojiyūmu*(*A Liberation Theology: International Symposium*)(Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1986)221pp.

The report of the 5th International Symposium on A Liberation Theology which was held at Sophia University in November 1985.

(6) A. Mataix and Ryōsuke Inagaki eds., *Gendai Shakai to Seigi*(=*Justice in the Contemporary World*)(Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1987)179pp.

The report of the 6th International Symposium on Justice in the Contemporary World which was held at Sophia University in Novem-

ber 1986.

(7) A. Mataix and Hisanori Isomura eds., *Ima Koso Keizai Seigi o* (= *Economic Justice for All*) (Tokyo: Mikuni Shobō, 1983) 379pp.

The report of the 7th International Symposium on Economic Justice for All which was held at Sophia University in November 1987.

(8) Institute for the Study of Social Justice ed., *Seigi ni mukau Kyōiku* (= *Educating to Justice*) (Tokyo: Chūō Shuppansha, 1989) 213pp.

The report of the 8th International Symposium (= Sophia Symposium) the Characteristics of Jesuit Education which was held at Sophia University in October 1988.

(9) A. Mataix and Kōichi Niitsu eds., *Chikyū Saisei no tameno Keizai Rinri* (= *Economics and Ethics*) (Tokyo: Tsuge Shobō, 1990) 256pp.

The report of the 9th International Symposium which was held at Sophia University in November 1989.

(10) A. Mataix and Kōichi Niitsu eds., *Chikyū Saisei 21seiki eno Teigen* (= *Revitalizing Our Earth: A Proposal for 21st Century*) (Tokyo: Tsuge Shobō, 1992) 295pp.

The report of the 10th International Symposium which was held at Sophia University in December 1990.

3. Research Paper

Katorikku Shakai Kyōsetsu to Gendais hakai (= *Catholic Social Teachings and Contemporary Society*) (Tokyo: ISSJ, 1992)

4. Newsletter

The Sophia Relief Service publishes its newsletter carrying vital informations of refugees and displaced persons in the Third World, especially Asia and Africa to which this organization are assisting their relief and rehabilitation projects.

Newsletter (Sekai no Mazushii Hitobito ni Ai no Te o-Extending Hands to Needy People of the World) No.1 (Tokyo: Sophia Relief Service, ISSJ, May 1981) ~ No.22 (Tokyo: Sophia Relief Service, ISSJ, December 1991)

社 会 正 義 紀 要 11

1992 年 3 月 25 日 印刷
1992 年 3 月 31 日 発行

編 集 者	渡 部 清
発 行 者	アンセルモ・マタイス
発 行 所	上智大学社会正義研究所 〒 102 東京都千代田区紀尾井町 7-1 電 話 03-3238-3023 3695
印 刷 所	三 美 印 刷 株 式 会 社

SOCIAL JUSTICE

No. 11 (1992)

Contents

The Role of the Theology of Liberation in the Modern World —The Contribution of Leonardo Boff	<i>Keizō Yamada</i> 1
The Charism of St. Ignatius and Some Apostolic Challenges to the Society of Jesus Today	<i>Peter-Hans Kolvenbach</i>17
The New and the Old : One Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching	<i>Sergio Bernal</i>29
The Church's Social Doctrine Dynamism from <i>Rerum Novarum</i> —A Consideration from the Latin American Perspective	<i>Juan Carlos Scannone</i>51
The Reports : Activities of 1991-92	71
Institute for the Study of Social Justice, Sophia University (1991-92)	85

Institute for the Study of Social Justice
Sophia University