THE GLORY OF GOD AND THE GLOBAL COMMON GOOD: SOLIDARITY IN A TURBULENT WORLD

DAVID HOLLENBACH, S.J.

This talk has three parts. The first argues that the turbulence of the global scene today calls for a strengthened commitment to the common good both locally and globally. Part II treats some ethical requirements of the common good that are especially relevant today. Part III is more theological. With the help of Ignatius Loyola, it suggests that Christians are called to work for "the glory of God and the common good."[1] My overall goal is to show that promoting the common good and giving greater glory to God are deeply interconnected.

I. The Turbulent Global Scene Today

The journal *Foreign Affairs* recently suggested that today's international system is "*Out of Order*."[2] Important institutions developed after World War II to secure justice and peace, preeminently the European Union, are being weakened by Brexit in the UK and similar movements elsewhere. President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris accord on climate change is the most tragic example of a growing tendency to replace collaboration for the international common good with pursuit of an illusory understanding of national self-interest. There are major threats in the global South as well. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein recently lamented that we are living in a political earthquake zone where "raging conflicts continue to cause immense suffering and force unprecedented numbers of people to flee their homes."[3] Yet, rather than dealing with these realities, many nations, sadly including the US, want to turn away and look inwards. When St. Augustine and Luther described sin as being "turned in on oneself," they could have been describing important currents in our politics.

This looking inward can be called nationalism, anti-cosmopolitanism, or populism.[4] It claims to support "the people" over against elites, as when Donald Trump

[1] This statement of the Jesuit mission is in the apostolic letter of Pope Julius III, *Exposcit debitum* (July 21, 1550) that approved the "formula of the Institute" of the Society of Jesus. It is available in *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), I. Formulas of the Institute of the Society of Jesus, Julius III, no. 1, 4.

[2] See *Foreign Affairs* 96.1 (January/February, 2017): cover and table of contents.

[3] Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, "The Impossible Diplomacy of Human Rights," lecture given on the occasion of receiving the 2017 Raymond "Jit" Trainor Award for Excellence in the Conduct of Diplomacy, Georgetown University and United States Institute of Peace, February 16, 2017. Both video and text versions of this lecture are online at: https://isd.georgetown.edu/trainor2017 (on 7/16/2017).

[4] For a useful overview of these and similar movements see John B. Judis, *The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics* (New York: Columbia Global Reports, 2016).

declared that he would bring power back to "the American People"[5] and Marine Le Pen campaigned for the presidency of France *au nom du peuple*. The causes of populist movements can be analyzed in several ways. Some see them emerging from a "cultural backlash" against unfamiliar languages, lifestyles, and religions brought by immigrants.[6] Others argue that they are responses to economic suffering. The economists Anne Case and Angus Deaton have shown that over the past two decades the death rate of middle aged, non-Hispanic whites with high school education or less has risen notably in the US. Growing numbers of these people succumb to "deaths of despair" due to drug overdose, alcohol abuse, and suicide.[7] Trump's ideology was music to the ears of many of them.[8]

The social psychologist Jonathan Haidt argues that these anti-globalist movements are responding to *moral* challenges, not just cultural or economic ones. They seek to protect the "we" of important communities.[9] In harmony with Catholic tradition, Haidt stresses that persons need communal support. When globalization fractures local communities it threatens the dignity of many people. Though today's anti-globalist sentiment has notable racist and anti-Islamic dimensions, it is also often due to real suffering.

An adequate response to today's turbulence, therefore, requires efforts to heal local communities fractured by globalization and new technologies in the global North, reduction of poverty, war, and displacement in the global South, and response to environmental degradation everywhere. We need to find new ways build up the common good locally, regionally, and globally, all at the same time. This is both a pragmatic and a moral challenge.

---

[5] Donald J. Trump, Inaugural Address, January 20, 2017, Washington, DC, online: https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address, on 7/16/2017. For populism in US history see Michael Kazin, *The Populist Persuasion: An American History* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1998); and Gary L. Gerstle, "The Contradictory Character of American Nationality: A Historical Perspective," in Nancy Foner and Patrick Simone, eds., *Fear and Anxiety over National Identity* (Russell Sage Foundation, 2015), 33–58. For analyses of recent populist movements throughout the world, see *Foreign Affairs* 95:6 (November/December, 2016).

[6] Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris, "Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash," Harvard Kennedy School Faculty Research Working Paper, Series RWP16-026, August, 2016. Available at https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/workingpapers/citation.aspx?PubId=11325&type=FN&PersonId=83 (on 7/16/2017).

[7] See Anne Case and Angus Deaton, "Mortality and Morbidity in the 21st Century," paper prepared for the Brookings Panel on Economic Activity, March 23–24, 2017. Available at https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/6_casedeaton.pdf (on 8/2/17). See also Case and Deaton's earlier study "Rising Morbidity and Mortality in Midlife among White Non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st Century," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, no. 49 (December 8, 2015): 15078–15083.

[8] See interview of J. D. Vance by Rod Dreher, "Trump: Tribune of Poor White People," distributed electronically by *The American Conservative* July 22, 2016, available online: http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/trump-us-politics-poor-whites (on 8/2/17). I am grateful to my colleague Mark Lagon for this reference.

[9] Jonathan Haidt, "When and Why Nationalism Beats Globalism," *American Interest* 12, no. 1, Sept./Oct. 2016: 1–8.

II. The Common Good: Local, Regional, and Global

The common good is a normative concept with a rich history. Its meaning, however, is rarely clarified with precision. It is sometimes identified with an *aggregative* concept of "the greatest good for the greatest number." This is helpful, but it does not tell us how the overall sum is to be distributed. The common good can also be understood in a way that focuses on the *social institutions* needed to sustain human well-being. Pope John XXIII took this approach when he described the common good as "the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment."[10] This is approach is important as well, but we need a more substantive moral perspective to determine which institutions best serve society's members.

A more helpful understanding draws on the similarity of the common good to what economists call *public goods*. A public good is a good present for all members of a community when it is present for any of them. If it is absent for some, it is absent for all. For example, when a city creates the public good of an effective system of traffic lights, it benefits all drivers. More technically, public goods are "nonrivalrous in consumption." There is no rivalry among the community's members when they want to enjoy the good. Public goods are also "nonexcludible."[11] When such goods are present, they are present for everybody, not just for those with privileged access. For example, when two countries achieve the public good of peace between them, everybody in both countries shares the peace.

This non-excludability, however, gives rise to the challenge of the "free rider." Free riders are those who benefit from public goods without contributing to them. To deal with this problem, the coercive power of the state is often needed to support public goods, for example through taxes.

A problem to be faced in a globalizing world, therefore, is the lack of a transnational coercive power like the state that can compel peoples or countries to contribute to "global public goods."[12] Though transnational organizations often have strong understandings of the goods people need to sustain them in dignity, these agencies lack enforcement power. For example, the High Commissioner for Refugees makes an annual appeal to countries for the funds needed to protect refugees, but this appeal regularly produces much less than needed so millions of refugees continue to suffer.

---

[10] Pope John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra,* encyclical letter of 1961, no. 65. This and all papal documents herein are available through the Vatican website: w2.vatican.va. This definition is cited in: Vatican Council II, *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 26; Vatican Council II, *Dignitatis Humanae*, no. 6; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 1906; and *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, no. 164.

[11] For a classic economic approach to the meaning of public goods, see Paul Samuelson, "The Pure Theory of Public Expenditure," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 36.4 (November, 1954): 387–89.

[12] For a concise discussion of public goods in a global context, see Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern, "Defining Global Public Goods," in Kaul, Grunberg, and Stern, eds., *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University, 1999), 2–19.

The lack of institutional support for global public goods led Pope John XXIII to conclude that the nation-state system is no longer adequate "to the task of promoting the common good of all peoples." Thus he called for a "public authority, having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective," namely, the global common good.[13] Benedict XVI wanted this global authority to be given "real teeth."[14] For both popes the global common good requires more than the nation-state system delivers. Does this mean they are urging the creation of a world state? I think not, for they also insist global governance should shaped by the principle of subsidiarity. Subsidiarity requires protecting local and national communities *and* working to secure the transnational, global common good. The local, regional, and global common goods should be seen as complementary, not antithetical.[15]

The American economist Elinor Ostrom, who in 2009 became the first and only woman to receive the Nobel Prize in Economic Science,[16] has refined the economic approach to public goods in a helpful way. Ostrom distinguishes what she calls common pool resources from public goods. Common pool resources are often given in nature or by God rather than being humanly constructed.[17] They include goods such as fisheries, forests, oceans, and the earth's atmosphere. Ostrom stresses that common pool resources are often so large and located across such different regions that it is difficult to identify who is using them and more difficult for one centralized agency to regulate their use.[18] Because of this complexity, no single agent can sustain common pool resources for the long term. These resources will need to managed in diverse ways by different agents, some governmental, some in the private sector, some through community ownership, and some by local or global non-governmental organizations.

In her Nobel Prize acceptance speech, therefore, Ostrom called for a move "beyond markets and states" to "polycentric governance" carried out by multiple agents, including states, markets, and many other actors in civil society. An example of polycentric governance is the way the threatened codfish of the Gulf of Maine are being protected by agreements reached by groups of fishermen in local harbors, and also through regulations hammered out by the governments of the state of Maine, the US, Canada, and at the United Nations.

What Ostrom calls polycentric governance, political scientist Anne Marie Slaughter calls governance through networks. In her recent study *The Chess Board and*

[13] Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, encyclical letter of 1963, nos. 135 and 138.

[14] Pope Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, encyclical letter of 2009, no. 67.

[15] Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, no. 139.

[16] See "The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 2009," online: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2009/.

[17] See Ostrom's speech accepting the Nobel Prize, "Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems," delivered December 8, 2009, Stockholm University, esp. 412–13, at https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economic-sciences/laureates/2009/ostrom_lecture.pdf, (on 7/16/2017). Ostrom's major work on these matters is *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University, 1990).

[18] Elinor Ostrom, "The Challenge of Common-Pool Resources," *Environment* 50.4 (July/August, 2008): 8–20, at 11.

the Web,[19] Slaughter argues that governance from above by sovereign governments must today be complemented by networks linking groups across borders in complex webs of mutual dependence. People who are networked together can begin to recognize that their own interests and the interests of others in the network are intertwined. They begin to pursue goals other than maximization of self-interest. In networks, "rewards, monitoring, and punishments are less likely to be effective than engagement, communication, norms, socialization, identity, and common purpose."[20] Through networking, different groups can work together in a participatory way—in collaboration without domination, in mutual support without hegemony. Thus the coercive power of a world state is not the only way to move toward the global common good. Governance through collaborative, participatory networking holds real promise as a way to advance the transnational common good. This is similar to what Ostrom calls polycentric governance.

These theories suggest that we can seek to overcome the split between nationalists and globalists by helping them recognize that they can more effectively attain the goods they seek by working together to address urgent problems with both local and global dimensions. The 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change, though far from perfect, was an example of such networked, polycentric governance. Numerous civil society groups from both the global North and global South helped shape it—so did national and regional governments. Global intergovernmental bodies also played key roles. There was no effort, however, to create uniform global standards for greenhouse gas emissions that would be coercively enforced from above. The states party to the agreement committed themselves to their own "nationally determined contributions" to greenhouse gas reductions.[21] The Paris agreement, therefore, has been a promising example of the promotion of local, regional and global cooperation for the common good through polycentric governance and networking.

Following such a path, of course, makes significant moral demands. Collaboration in networks requires a degree of trust among those who participate. Ostrom draws on game theory and Slaughter on a range of social scientific studies to show that trust is essential for the collaboration they advocate.[22] The importance of trust for the success of the Paris Climate accord is another reason why US withdrawal from the accord is so destructive. By reneging on its commitments, the US could well undermine the shared trust that keeps other nations committed to the accord, with potentially devastating consequences for the entire planet. This again suggests that Trump's decision to withdraw can be seen as objectively sinful. Also, there is a notable similarity between this trust and what Catholic tradition calls solidarity. John Paul II argued that a moral commitment of solidarity must shape the de facto linkages of our interdependent world if human dignity is to be served.[23] Absent moral solidarity, interaction can lead to

[19] Anne Marie Slaughter, *The Chessboard and the Web: Strategies of Connection in a Networked World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2017).

[20] Ibid., 70.

[21] Paris Agreement on Climate Change, art. 4, para. 2. At http://unfccc.int/files/home/application/pdf/paris_agreement.pdf, on 7/17/2017.

[22] Ostrom, "Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems," 409; Slaughter, *The Chessboard and the Web*, 83, 103–104.

[23] Pope John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, Encyclical letter of 1987, no. 26.

conflict rather than collaboration. But when trust and solidarity begin to be present, collaborative work for the common good can arise.[24]

The importance of solidarity points to a final understanding of the common good central to this discussion, namely the common good as relational, similar to the good of friendship. In friendship, persons enjoy a good they cannot enjoy alone, namely the good of the relationship between them. Similarly, there are dimensions of the common good that exist in the bonds among the members of the community, enhancing their well-being through the very relationships among them. There are, of course, many kinds of relationship among persons. Some are personal and intimate. Aristotle, however, believed that friendship could also take a political form in the relations among the citizens of the Greek city-state. He called this "civic friendship." Today we can call it "solidarity," a relationship that binds people together as a "we" and leads them to see the good of this "we" as their own good. Aristotle wrote that such "friendship seems to hold states together."[25] We could extend this claim and say that solidarity is needed to hold local communities, nations, and even global humanity together. Solidarity leads members of a community to recognize that their well-being is shared. The relationships linking them with other members of the "we" are themselves key aspects of the common good they share.

Today we are challenged to act in ways that reflect the fact that local, regional, and global bonds of solidarity are *all* essential to human well-being. The common good is increasingly polycentric, with some aspects centered in local communities, some on the national level, and some in the interdependent global economy and environment. To move toward the common good, therefore, we need to strengthen solidarity on multiple levels. Exclusionary localism, isolationist nationalism, and hegemonic globalism must all be resisted. It is a mistake to think we must choose between support for the working class and openness to trade relations that assist developing countries, or between assisting refugees and advancing the national interest. There are important dimensions of human well-being at stake in each of these areas, so action to advance human well-being will be needed in each of these domains. This is in harmony with the principle of subsidiarity, which requires both sustaining local communities and also drawing on the resources of larger, even global, institutions when their contribution is required.[26] Thus we need more effective government on the local, national, and international levels, stronger labor unions to support workers, and deeper commitment to social responsibility by the banks and corporations that play increasingly important global financial and economic roles.

In addition, action in these diverse sectors and levels needs to be interlinked. Promoting the common good in it fullness will require working together in networks that cross local and national boundaries and also bridge the divisions that often separate business, government, and civil society. We need what I have elsewhere called a

[24] For Pope John Paul II's treatment of the "virtue of solidarity" and its relation to the common good, see *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis,* no. 38.

[25] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1155a and 1167b. "State" is the English used for *polis* in Martin Ostwald's translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1962). Aristotle himself, of course, raised the question of how large a *polis* could be before this kind of unity becomes impossible. See *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1170b–1171a.

[26] See Pope Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, encyclical letter of 1931, no. 79.

"network of crisscrossing communities."[27] Such networking will help overcome the divisions that today drive some groups into conflict and that leave far too many with no social support at all.

III. The Common Good and the Glory of God

The need for a networked polycentric effort for the common good makes the social ministry of the church particularly important today. The Catholic church is the single largest global institution in the world today. It is also locally embedded in most of the world's countries and cultures. Both the lived experience of the Catholic community and its mode of institutional organization, therefore, position the church to be a key agent of the common good today. Christians can contribute to the common good in their interactions in families and neighborhoods, through their labor, in their activity as citizens, through volunteer activity in civil society in their own countries and internationally. People's participation in the life of the church itself can also contribute to the common good, ranging from action on the parish level to globally organized efforts of the Holy See, and on all levels in between. Every Christian has a moral duty to make such contributions to the common good. This is clear from the fact that Thomas Aquinas saw the obligation to the common good as a duty in justice, a moral duty that falls on all persons and every citizen.[28]

Though these moral obligations are certainly important, I will conclude by suggesting that service of the common good is also a central aspect of the specifically religious vocation of Christians. As noted above, Ignatius Loyola saw the common good as closely linked with the glory of God.[29] Ignatius called Jesuits to undertake several clearly religious ministries, including preaching the word of God, hearing confessions, and administering other sacraments. These ministries help make the glory of God manifest in our earthly existence. But Ignatius also called his followers to forms of service that might be seen as more secular, such as educating children, reconciling those in conflict, assisting the imprisoned. By identifying these contributions to the common good as part of their religious vocation, the earliest Jesuits were led to run schools and universities, advise princes, conduct scientific investigations in astronomy, and prepare the earliest grammars and dictionaries of a number of non-Western languages. My colleague, the distinguished historian John O'Malley, S.J., has argued that under the influence of Renaissance humanists such as Erasmus, Ignatius took a rather radical step by calling his followers to work that suggested a concern for the well-being of the earthly city and a lessening of focus on distinctively evangelical goals.[30] Though O'Malley is surly right, I want to suggest that we can also see

[27] See David Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press, 2002), 229 ff.

[28]Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* II-II, q. 58, art. 6. Pius XI called the form of justice that specifies duties to the common good "social justice," and the U. S. Catholic Bishops, in their 1986 pastoral letter *Economic Justice for All,* called it "contributive justice," because it helps specify the contribution to the common good that justice requires from individual people. See *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (Washington: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1986), no. 71.

[29] See footnote 1 above.

[30] My discussion of O'Malley draws upon his "Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism: Content and Method," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 38, no. 4 (Winter, 2006): esp. 21,

Ignatius's move as radical for a converse reason, namely that it regards activities often seen as secular as genuinely religious. In other words, the promotion of the common good is itself a way to show forth God's glory in the midst of history—part of the distinctively religious Christian vocation.

There are important historical roots for this claim that the promotion of the common good has a distinctive religious dimension. Aristotle maintained that the good of the community is more "divine" than the particular goods of private persons.[31] Thomas Aquinas echoed Aristotle when he said that the shared good of the community is more "godlike" than the good of individuals. Indeed Aquinas went so far as to affirm that very reality of God is the supreme and common good of all persons: "the supreme good, namely God, is the common good, since the good of all things depends on God."[32] Thus, the highest good to which all persons are called is union with God's own self, and this union with God is a good shared with others in the communion of saints. The pursuit of the fullness of the common good is, therefore, central in the Christian religious vocation.

The link between the common good and the glory of God is also evident when we consider the meaning of the "glory of God." The glory of God is an idea with theological richness that far exceeds what can be said here. Therefore, just a couple of observations will be made. First, God's glory is the numinous reality of God's transcendent greatness, often symbolized in the Bible as lightning, thunder, or earthquake. The appropriate human response to God's glory so understood is awe and humble worship. The numinous glory of God is hinted at in the beauty or sublimity of great artistic achievements. Second, the Bible also portrays God's glory as transcendent righteousness, an incomparable justice that exceeds the moral weakness of humans and that rules history with holiness.[33] Seen in this light, God's glory beckons humans to live justly, and thus to promote the common good as justice requires. When God's righteousness begins to be present in human history through human action that promotes greater justice, the glory of God's kingdom begins to be visible. Acting *ad majorem Dei gloriam*, for the greater glory of God, thus calls for action that makes both the transcendent righteousness of God and the unsurpassed justice of God's reign more fully visible among us. In the words of Jules Toner, the call to serve "the greater glory of God" is a call to advance "the kingdom of God in its eschatological fullness. . . when all in the kingdom are filled with divine splendor and totally divinized in Christ, the refulgence of God."[34] This identity of the glory of God with the fullness of God's reign, including the reign of God's justice, has led pastors like Archbishop Oscar Romero and theologians like Elizabeth Johnson to rephrase Irenaeus's famous epithet,

---

22, 26; and his "Introduction" to *The Jesuits II: Culture, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773*, ed. John O'Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Stephen Harris, and T. Frank Kennedy (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2006), xxxvi–xxxviii.

[31] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094b.

[32] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, III, 17. The translation has been adapted, using "God" rather than "Him," from that contained in *Basic Writings of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Anton C. Pegis, 2 vols. (New York: Random House, 1945), vol. 2, 27.

[33] The literature on God's glory is considerable. A useful overview is Arthur Michael Ramsey, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ* (London: Longmans, Green, 1949), 10–15, and passim.

[34] See Jules J. Toner, *Discerning God's Will: Ignatius of Loyola's Teaching on Christian Decision Making* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1991), 15.

"Gloria Dei, vivens homo" in a way that promises justice to the poor and marginalized: "*Gloria Dei, vivens pauper*," the glory of God is fullness of life for the poor.[35]

God's glory is also manifest in God's salvific action, preeminently in the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus. The cross reveals the greatness of God's saving love, a love brought to its fulfillment in Christ's resurrection and the sending of Christ's divinizing Spirit. The paschal mystery in its fullness, therefore, both reveals the glory of God and enables men, women, and all creation to share in that glory, through the fulfillment of their humanity in a just community. Thus a soteriological perspective also suggests that the earthly presence of the glory of God and the advancement of the common good of creation arise together.

This link between the common good and the glorification of God in history is also implicit in Vatican II's affirmation that the church is a sacrament of both "communion with of God, and of the unity of the entire human race."[36] The unity of the community of faith is a sacrament of the divinizing union in which Christians come to share the glory of God's own life. The unity of the community of faith is also a sacrament of the human solidarity to which all are called. This solidarity will make the glory of the kingdom incipiently visible in history. Union with God and solidarity with one's neighbors, of course, remain incomplete in history, just as the reign of God is not yet fully present. We are still on the way to the eschatological fullness of both. But Christians are called to continue responding to God's grace in ways that advance the greater glory of God by promoting deeper human solidarity and greater integrity of creation. In this way, the fuller presence of God's reign, the greater glory of God, and the more complete common good of the human community and the earth will arise together. Promoting the greater glory of God and advancing the common good are integrally linked in a single Christian mission.

This integral connection is further evident in the way Pope Francis links the Eucharist and the call to protect the common good of our common home—the earth and the earth's surrounding environment. Francis writes that, in the Eucharist, Christ embraces and divinizes matter and all of creation. God comes to us tangibly, revealing the fullness of divine love at the heart of the cosmos. Further, Francis affirms that the glorification of earthly existence comes not from above the created reality of a fragment of bread, but from within its very materiality. God's glory is to be found right within this world. Where there is love and harmony, both among human beings and in their care for nature, the beauty and glory of God are visibly present. Reverence for this transcendent glory invites us to care for creation and to work vigorously for the common good of our shared home, respecting the full reality of both nature and of society.[37]

---

[35] See Archbishop Romero's use of this phrase, quoted in Jon Sobrino, *Archbishop Romero: Memories and Reflections* (New York: Orbis Books, 1990), 15–16. See also Elizabeth Johnson, *Quest for the Living God: Mapping Frontiers in the Theology of God* (New York: Continuum, 2007), 82–83. I am grateful to her for the reference to Romero.

[36] Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, no. 1, in *Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1996). This statement is directly quoted in the Council's *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 42.

[37] These reflections by Pope Francis on the Eucharist are in his encyclical, *Laudato Si', On Care for Our Common home*, no. 236. Francis notes that he draws here on the writings of Pope John Paul II concerning the Eucharist.

This stress on the way the glory of God shines forth from within the created order leads to a final reflection. Both the common good and the glory of God should be pursued in ways that respect both the full reality of our life as human persons and the integrity of natural world. Attaining the common good and showing forth God's glory should never obscure the freedom of individual persons or threaten the rightful integrity of the natural order. Rather, promoting the common good and God's glory should bring persons to their proper fulfillment. To do this, global solidarity should be combined with respect for both the freedoms and rights of each person and for the appropriate roles of local and regional relationships. Similarly, the identification of the common good in its fullness with God's glory requires full respect for all God's creatures, including the earth.

Advancing both the common good and the glory of God thus remains a multidimensional task. The glory of God will shine forth in its full splendor when our many relationships with each other and with the earth are brought to fulfillment in union with God and with each other in God. As we move toward that fulfillment, we are called to labor in hope for a fuller achievement of the common good that will make the beauty of God's love and justice more visible in our world.