



JOAN *and* RALPH LANE  
CENTER *for*  
CATHOLIC  
STUDIES  
*and* SOCIAL  
THOUGHT  
at the UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

# **Globalization as a Challenge to Catholic Social Thought**

JOHN A. COLEMAN, Ph.D.  
Charles Casassa Chair of Social Values  
Loyola Marymount University

## **Inaugural Lecture**

To Announce the Opening of the Lane Center for Catholic Studies and Social Thought  
University of San Francisco  
October 12, 2004

Globalization as a Challenge to Catholic Social Thought

John A. Coleman S.J., Casassa Professor of Social Values  
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA

Inaugural Lecture to Announce the Opening of the Joan and Ralph Lane Center for  
Catholic Studies and Social Thought at the University of San Francisco  
October 12, 2004

Although at six feet four and with a beard and a booming voice, I do not usually easily trepitate! --I confess to some trepidation in addressing the topic: Globalization as a challenge to Catholic social thought. Why not its inverse: Catholic social thought as a challenge to globalization? Moreover, the title made me mindful of solemn advice once imparted to me when I was a youngish, tyro student-teacher at St. Ignatius prep in San Francisco. My Principal warned me strongly never to try to explain the obscure by the even more obscure! Catholic social thought, notoriously, has been dubbed: ‘ Our best kept secret’. Some of its key ideals and concepts such as subsidiarity, justice as participation, solidarity, the option for the poor and, especially, its key cornerstone notion of the common good are not, exactly, coin of the land ( or, for that matter, in the realm of Catholic pews).

Boston College ethicist David Hollenbach writes in his book, The Common Good and Christian Ethics, that “ a central concept advanced by the Bishops’ 1986 Letter on the economy—the common good—was nearly incomprehensible to most of the people the bishops’ sought to address”. Globalization, itself, is a highly contested process as to its definition, scope, components and directionality. How can such a humongously abstract and elusive phenomenon illuminate the challenges and future directions for Catholic social thought?

Three realities, however, led me to choose the topic: (1) I had just finished a book entitled Globalization and Catholic Social Thought: Promise or Peril ? which I sent off to my publishers this past May; (2) I have always been convinced that the deepest meaning—its bite, really—of Catholic social thought is illumined less in philosophical/ theological accounts of it than in its steady application to public policy and looming new social phenomena and problems. (3) Finally, I was intrigued by a throw-away line of the Boston priest and Harvard Professor of social ethics, Bryan Hehir, who once, provocatively asked, “ Can Catholic social thought survive globalization?” Hehir pointed to the ways in which the classic statements of Catholic social teaching derive largely from nation-state systems, from civil society within national states and lack any full assessment of the burgeoning new global phenomena such as Intergovernmental Organizations ( hereafter IGOs), international non-governmental organizations ( NGOs, hereafter), the multi-national corporation.

In global society, the remit of the state is, increasingly, being curtailed. Nothing quite like civil society can be found on a global scale. Moreover, for some interpreters, globalization reverts us back to the kind of savage capitalism and mis-treatment of

workers excoriated by Pope Leo XIII in the first of the modern encyclicals, Rerum Novarum. It was as if we were transported in a time warp back before the rise of modern Catholic social teaching—its nuanced teaching ignored and stricken from history-- to the conditions of penury, insecurity about jobs, health care and old age provisions; back to Satanic mills and factories and the marginalization of the poor which Dickens' so well depicts in Bleak House and the popes condemned in their social encyclicals as high and gross injustice.

I want to cover three main topics in this presentation today. (1) How to define or, at least, delineate and situate what is meant by globalization?; (2) How does globalization effect Catholicism and what resources in the social teaching does Catholicism bring to this new, startling reality? (3) Finally, I will signal three lacunae or gaps in the social teaching which will need a more careful address or expansion before Catholic social teaching can play a more commanding role in the debates and social movements around globalization.. I sense again that unwonted trepidation since these three are, indeed, a very large order.

## I. Globalization Delineated and Situated

In his 1999 Director's Lectures on globalization at the London School of Economics, sociologist Anthony Giddens remarked, trenchantly, that no one could even be a practicing social scientist of any minimal sophistication, if they did not grasp or master the debates about globalization. For Giddens, this debate about globalization is, by far, the most significant controversy now occurring. It confronts us with a world not firmly under our control, says Giddens, but one which seems "to be an erratic, dislocated world, if you like—a runaway world". Globalization, that much vaunted if often quite ill and differently defined term, names, nevertheless, something real that is urgent, in many ways new and unsettling (as the Industrial Revolution was in its time). Catholic social thought, if it too is to serve as a resource of some sophistication and wisdom, must channel its rich intellectual tradition of root metaphors about human and social life and its ethical principles for society to position itself, effectively as well as humanely, in the debates and advocacy about the direction of globalization.

Yet it becomes exceedingly difficult to take any stance that is un-ambivalent about a 'process' which is still quite in process, incomplete, contested in a world, in the words of Harvard International Relations expert, Robert Keohane, which remains only "a partially globalized world". I have recently spent six months sabbatical at the University of California, Santa Barbara whose Center for Global Studies speaks easily about globalization(s)—in the plural! There are fiercely competing hopes and fears about our global risk society. Globalization seems to divide as much as it unites. It clearly has—at least in the short-run (and, as John Maynard Keynes once pithily said—"in the long run we are all dead!")—both winners and losers. To be a loser in this global gamble can mean the loss of security about the most basic human needs; to undergo identity dislocation; to suffer humiliation rather than dignity; to face uncompensated mass resettlement (as in India and China) to make way for mega-dams or to find one's job, suddenly and irretrievably, 'outsourced'. Global climate changes due to excessive and growing greenhouse gasses might force people to abandon their homelands or bring about

the melting of all the glaciers. As one South Sea native of Tuvalo ( which is sinking into the sea because of rising sea levels due to global warming) put it to Mark Lynas: “ We are being made the victims of something that has nothing to do with us at all. The Industrialized countries caused the problem but we are suffering the consequences”.

Sociologist Roland Robertson has always famously insisted that the essence of globalization lies precisely in its simultaneous compound effect of producing differentiation and homogenization, a universalizing trend but also attempts to re-invent and re-assert the local. Robertson coins the inelegant word, glocal, to indicate that the advancing process of globalization will likely foment the resistance of more nationalistic and ethnic groups, as well as the repressive ( by governments, by IGOs , such as the International Monetary Fund or over-reaching multi-national corporations such as Nike in Indonesia or Shell Oil in Nigeria) suppression of vibrant varieties of localism. So called anti-globalization movements, such as we saw in Seattle in 2000 at the meetings of the World Trade Organization, may, paradoxically, eagerly anticipate an alternative, more humane, form of globalization. “ Another world is possible” runs their slogan. Globalization involves perilous risks. Do we not now all live in an increasingly inter-dependent risk society where the spill-over effects from weapons of mass destruction; the potential impact of genetically modified crops; terrorism and global crime syndicates; climate changes; new diseases such as SARS, the simply irresponsible and shocking loss of forests; water pollution; the depletion of the fishing stock in the global commons of the ocean; the Asian or Brazilian financial crises—all leave residues on and in our own terrain and portfolios ? There are, to be sure, also immense opportunities ingredient in globalization: the vision of a global commons; a shared sense of the humanum; the world as global village; promises of economic and health betterment around the world.

Starkly differing projects of globalization contend. The Neo-Liberal project is painted for us by David Korten in his book, When Corporations Rule the World, as an attempt “ to integrate the world’s national economies into a single borderless global economy in which the world’s mega-corporations are free to move goods and money anywhere in the world that affords an opportunity for profit, without governmental interference. In the name of increased efficiency, the alliance seeks to privatize public services”. Indeed, as a potentially trillion dollar a year industry, the IMF and the World Bank and many corporations have tried to privatize something as essential as water. In response to an enforced privatization of water, imposed as a condition for a World Bank loan, outraged citizens of Cochabamba, Bolivia, protesting skyrocketing costs for water supplied by the French multi-national corporation, Suez Lyonnaise des Eux, carried placards which read, “ Water is God’s gift and not a merchandise” “ Water is life”. As Vadana Shiva puts it: “ When water disappears, there is no alternative. The water crisis has commercial causes but no market solutions... More than any other resource, water needs to remain a common good and requires community management”. For his part, British sociologist Zygmunt Bauman echoes Korten’s unmasking of some rhetorics about globalization: “ Robbing whole nations of their resources is called promotion of ‘ free trade’, robbing whole families and communities of their livelihood is called ‘ downsizing’ or just ‘ rationalization’ “

Quite different and in explicit opposition to Neo-Liberal economics is the project of the World Social Forum which convenes popular movements and NGOs ( including representatives from Brazilian Catholic agencies) around a hope of meeting basic human needs; reducing poverty; guaranteeing the rights of indigenous peoples; encouraging citizens' involvement in government and championing a program of disclosure, transparency and accountability for IGO's such as the World Bank and WTO. The New York Times' columnist, Thomas Friedman, can exalt market liberalization as inherently benign and contend, in his whimsical ' golden arch' theory that " no two countries that both have a McDonalds have ever fought a war against each other since they each got their McDonalds." Princeton political scientist, Richard Falk, on the other hand, speaks forthrightly in his chosen book title of a kind of predatory globalization.

Still others seek to contain the bad initial effects of globalization and bring in reforms around a strategy of: (1) containing negative globalization; ( 2) promoting new forms of global governance and functional regulating regimes; ( 3) expanding civil society input and access to IGO's such as the IMF; ( 4) Linking globalization to democratization; ( 5) working for ethical codes for multi-national corporations.

So, a precise definition of globalization—which remains an inherently contested process and project, involving, as it does, power and wealth re-arrangements—seems inopportune at this time. Yet how , at least, to delineate and situate the phenomenon, thus, to enter the debates and contestations about globalization ? Let me venture a few helpful descriptions of the phenomenon we confront together, whether we applaud or curse it. In an essay entitled, " World Society, Its Structure and Trends", political scientist Dirk Mesner describes it this way: " Globalization denotes a process in the course of which the volume and intensity of trans-boundary transportation, communication and trade relations are rapidly increasing. It is undermining the divisive connotations of national boundaries and intensifying the impacts of border crossing economic, social and political activities for national societies. Many pressing problems cut across territorial boundaries. More and more events are simultaneously perceived throughout the world, making themselves felt with increasingly brief delays in more and more places."

The empirical data seems to bear out that this process is occurring. Trade and travel between nations increased four times between 1980-2000. \$400 billion dollars in cross-border currency now pass hands every six hours ( more money in these exchanges in just six hours than ever dispersed by the World Bank in its fifty year history!). The number of migrants working in countries other than their own has grown exponentially. Refugees greatly inflate these numbers. Remittances from migrant workers to relatives back home have also increased dramatically: three billion dollars a year pours back to India in this form and an equal three billion dollars yearly flow to Mexico just from Mexican migrants in California. In some countries such remittances is their largest source of foreign investment. Indeed, in some countries ( e.g., the Philippines) we can now speak of a globalized family system with siblings or nieces and nephews working in Saudi Arabia, Ireland and the United States.

A boom in international non-governmental organizations has occurred. There are some 50,000 NGOs active at the global level ( a 90 percent increase since 1970). Increasingly, trans-boundary issues elude any single national solution: the drug and private arms trade; arms control; money laundering; pollution; refugees; common heritage issues concerning the ocean and its mineral and fish resources; the atmosphere, population pressures, health and infectious disease.

Globalization has been driven both by a self-conscious project of the economic integration of a world market and by technology, especially the information technology. The internet serves multi-national corporations; scientists and scholars; crime syndicates (e.g., the increasingly international forms of Russian, Columbian and East Asian drug, smuggling and sex-trade cartels); reformers and human rights and environmental moral reformers. Globalization, like God's sun, seems to shine on the good and the bad alike! Without the internet there would never have been an international anti-personnel land-mine treaty nor a World Commission on Dams nor the boycott of Nestle's unhealthy baby formulas in the third world. New global financial rules and the internet are a money launderer's or a porn and drug addict's dream! Globalization has involved every bit as much a communications revolution as an economic one. Roland Robertson speaks of globalization as entailing " a rapidly increasing global connectivity on the one hand and fast expanding and intensifying reflexive global consciousness, on the other". Increasingly, we have become a community of common fate and responsibility, if not a global village than a spaceship earth. We may not be seeing Francis Fukayama's end of history but, instead, a kind of end to geography.

There are both positive and negative effects of globalization. Positively, we have become more conscious of being one world. Information flows are now more democratically available. Human rights language increasingly permeates a wider global consciousness. Among the alleged negative effects of globalization is its gross insensitivity to human suffering. A second negative effect involves the inattention ( by multi-national corporations in extractive industries) to ecological sustainability. A third negative effect entails polarization ( political and economic and in terms of life chances and life expectancies) between and within nations. The gap between the poorest and richest nations has been steadily growing, not declining under globalization. The inequalities within the sectors or classes of the developed world, itself, have also been growing. There is an immense internet gap between the rich and the poor.

The facts, once again, are glaring: less than one percent of Africans have ever used the internet and there are more telephones in Tokyo than in all of Africa. Forty percent of Latin Americans still can not read or write. As the Canadian social scientist, Pierre Hamel, puts it: " Uneven development trails globalization like a shadow.. The buzzword is globalization but we inhabit a divided world". A strong fear is that the poorest countries of the world ( and in the case of Africa, entire world regions) will become marginalized to the process, so that there will be both greater world integration and loser societies almost completely left out, in a kind of globalization apartheid.

Finally, people fear the erosion of the abilities of governments to provide the societal goods classically expected of the state: physical security ( especially in the growing number of failed states); economic welfare and opportunities for human betterment; a social safety net; distributive justice—in sum, what Catholic social teaching enunciates as the common good. To be sure, states remain indispensable actors if globalization is to be civilized, humanized, something other than ‘savage capitalism’ and what George Soros has called ‘casino financial markets’. Yet the ability of states to deliver on social goods or counter the negative faces of globalization has eroded. Change in our social and economic realities has far outpaced change in the political institutions and processes which once firmly embedded them. So, a last working definition of globalization, taken from a book by David Held and Anthony McGrew , Globalization/ Anti-Globalization, might help us here: “ Globalization, simply put, denotes the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of trans-continental flows and patterns of social interaction. It refers to a shift or transformation in the scale of human organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across the world’s regions and continents. But it should not be read as pre-figuring the emergence of a harmonious world society or as a universal process of global integration in which there is a growing convergence of cultures and civilizations. For not only does the awareness of growing inter-connectedness create new animosities and conflicts, it can fuel reactionary politics and deep-seated xenophobia. Since a substantial proportion of the world’s population is largely excluded from the benefits of globalization, it is a deeply divisive and, consequently, vigorously contested process. The unevenness of globalization ensures it is far from a universal process experienced uniformly across the entire planet”.

We may not be able to agree on any precise definition of globalization but few can doubt that globalization is, empirically, a real phenomenon. Individuals, corporations, NGO’s and nation states seem to be able to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before. Few can also doubt that new global units or actors—IGOs such as the WTO, NGOs such as Doctors Without Borders, GreenPeace, Amnesty International, Transparency International—have grown apace and change many of the received rules of the game for economics, geopolitics, ecology and persons. The key issue becomes: how to humanize globalization and make it serve our habitat and humanity and not just the Halliburton Corporation? How to bring about an ethical and just world order? How to integrate a world economy so it serves people? To the pressing question: “ Is the earth still governable?”, the empirical facts of globalization—whatever one’s varying definition or project for it—force the answer: clearly not by the old rules or with the old cast of characters. Multi-lateralism is the new game since no one nation—not even the hegemon and would- be new empire, The United States—can, on its own, address and solve a host of trans-border issues of poverty, illness, global security, crime, terrorism, financial stability, secure health, ecological degradation. Yet as Yale ecologist James Spaeth puts it, in a stunning new book on the global environmental crisis and the sheer arrogance of the world’s largest polluter to face the issue, Red Sky in the Morning : “ Addressing the global environmental threat will require a global effort in a world where international cooperation on the scale that may be required is seldom achieved”.

## II. Catholic Social Thought's Response to the Challenge of Globalization

Of course, as the world's largest trans-national organization and as a purveyor of a nuanced and thoughtful social ethic, in many ways the inverse proposition is equally true: Catholic social thought presents a decided challenge to some projects of globalization. Clearly, social Catholicism does not fit nicely with Neo-Liberal theories of an entirely autonomous economy unrelated to legitimate regulation for the common good or with overly vigorous statist communitarian doctrines which deny, stringently restrict and restrain justice as participation and subsidiarity. As the Welsh political scientist, David Ryall once put it: "The church has been involved, as a primary agent and subject of globalization for at least as long as any other body" Moreover, Ryall asserts, "In Catholic political culture qualified and pooled sovereignty, transnational structures, subsidiarity and devolution have long been familiar concepts". Yet, paradoxically, Catholic voices—except on the issue of debt relief for poorer nations as found in the Jubilee 2000 initiative—seem fairly muted in the major NGO globalization campaigns concerning population explosion; the environment; transparency and anti-corruption programs for governments and multi-national corporations; the women's movement. What are the peculiar strengths or shortcomings in Catholic Social thought in its address to globalization ?

In papal encyclicals and Episcopal letters from countries ranging from Canada, the Philippines, Brazil; in specialized trans-national religious groups such as the Jesuits, The Community of San Egidio or Pax Christi, Roman Catholicism has been an interested participant in debates about globalization. Long before the term, ' globalization' became fashionable about fifteen years ago, after all, social Catholicism had been rather continuously dealing with key issues of development within the poorer nations; immigration; the arms race and weapons of mass destruction; the addressing of basic human needs; the right to participation; the need for new structures to guarantee a global common good. All have now become uppermost in globalization debates. Especially since the 1980's, Catholicism has made human rights a decided center of its diplomatic and teaching strategies. Some secular international-relations specialists could even claim, with Samuel Huntington, that the church has been at the vanguard of the global human rights revolution.

Social network activists tend to emphasize the following salient themes for building a more humane globalization: ( 1) Working toward a global ethic; ( 2) Devising more just trade and economy; ( 3) Collaborating with the United Nations and other IGO's ( such as , for example, the World Criminal Court, which the Vatican has endorsed) to improve global governance; ( 4) Developing inter-religious dialogue in initiatives to avoid or overcome what Samuel Huntington ominously prophesizes as a coming ' clash of civilizations; ( 5) a new concern for the environment to protect biodiversity, the ozone layer, global temperature; ( 6) Movements for the emancipation and education of women ( women's education represents the greatest single predictor of population stability in third world countries). Catholic voices have been active—but certainly, with the exception of human rights and inter-religious dialogue—never dominant or truly salient in NGOs working on all six global arenas.

The Commission of the European Catholic Bishops commissioned a 2001 document from a committee which included Michael Camdus, the former director of the International Monetary Fund, Global Governance: Our Responsibility to Make Globalization an Opportunity for All. This document endorses a need for a global ethic. It follows Swiss Theologian Hans Kung's reasoning: no world order without a global ethic; no world peace without peace between the religions; no peace between the religions without dialogue between the world religions. As Bryan Hehir once famously said: globalization may have a logic of its own but it lacks any ethics of its own. While Catholic social teaching on its own can not, as such, provide the needed global ethic, it can contribute strongly to it.

Basically a reformist document, the European Bishops' document draws on strands of Catholic social teaching to underscore common values for a global world: human dignity; solidarity; responsibility; human rights; a care for the common environment; accountability; participation and transparency. It calls for the creation of a UN special agency—akin to the WTO and the International Labor Organization—devoted to global environmental issues. Global Governance, to this point, is the most sophisticated and explicit CST source dealing with global governance.

Incipient Catholic discourse on globalization—yet, significantly there is, as yet, no truly rounded treatment of the issue in Catholic social teaching, although Pope John Paul II has addressed some aspects of it in his World Day of Peace speeches and in a special session of the Pontifical Academy of Social Science—tends to see it as a complex, rapidly evolving ambiguous phenomenon—in itself neither good nor bad. “It will be”, in John Paul II's frequently re-iterated throw away line—“what people make of it”. Elsewhere he supplies the motto: “we need a globalization of solidarity”. The papacy insists that globalization has great possibilities and potential risks: “For all its risks it offers exceptional and promising opportunities, precisely with a view to enabling humanity to become a single family, build on the values of justice, equity and solidarity”, avers the pope. As sociologist Jose Casanova has argued: “The Catholic Church has embraced globalization, welcoming its own liberation from the strait-jacket of the territorial sovereign nation-state which had restricted Catholic universal claims. But the embrace is not uncritical”.

The church's public voice insists that globalization must serve solidarity and the common good, be truly global, fully respect the human rights of all persons and provide for participation according to appropriate responsibilities. Catholicism distances itself from Neo-Liberal projects of globalization, although it fully accepts the role of markets and entrepreneurship. It notes, too, the deficits in current globalization, without joining with anti-globalization forces: threats to welfare and a decent floor to meet human needs; the inability of globalization—to this point—to reduce world poverty (world poverty has been exacerbated in the last decades); dangers of a homogenization of culture (making the world safe for McDonalds and MTV); the need for socially responsible investment; a democratic deficit. In slogans much repeated, Catholics claim they want a globalization without marginalization, a globalization with a human face, a globalization which does

not homogenize culture. Catholic voices endorse a notion of global civil society and embrace the concept of subsidiarity in any global governance regime.

Msgr. Frank Devane, of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, asserts : “ There are different starting points [ in debates about globalization] for churches as opposed to businesses. The churches’ concern must be for the poor, those not able to benefit from the goods of creation and human inventions. Churches must be concerned very much with how wealth is distributed. Comments of churches on the complex questions like economic progress and growth and for that matter on all aspects of globalization should be critical; critical of received wisdom, critical of the current consensus and critical of new theories.”

Yet there may be also some severe limits to any role Catholicism might play in globalization debates and advocacy. It is very—indeed, extremely—striking how truly jejune are the treatments of Catholicism in the burgeoning literature on globalization as I discovered this spring when writing an essay on Catholicism as a Global Actor for a forthcoming Encyclopedia of Globalization. Indeed, given Catholicism’s size, global reach, its armory of rich theoretical and institutional resources, what strikes one is how marginalized, in many ways, Catholicism remains in globalization campaigns and debates. Why might this be so?

Some of it may reflect a blindness of the secular enlightenment thinkers to what religion can bring to policy debates. In part, the church still hunkers in many places for a religious hegemony, foreign to a cosmopolitan globalization. Like many religious groups, it frequently jealously keeps its own autonomy and is not, as a large institution, a very good or reliable net-working partner. Catholicism remains, as a world organization, much too cumbersome and slow to be the kind of resource for “ alternative information flows” and quick networking which have been such effective tools of NGOs working in global civil society.

In general, successful NGO’s global networking ( about landmines, sweatshops, child labor, sex trade of women, indigenous people’s rights, the environment)—as Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink demonstrate in their study of advocacy networks in international politics—is non-hierarchical, involves wide partnerships and remains truly flexible. The church, moreover, remains distrusted by many international women’s groups ( a potent global movement), groups working on population questions and is seen to suffer, itself, from a democratic deficit. Paradoxically, this most potent global unit may lack the inner organizational flexibility for the kind of rapid and networked response to global issues as they arise. Hence, it is much more likely that semi-autonomous and more local Catholic sub-groups will be the major Catholic actors in activist global networks. . To the extent the hierarchical church attempts to rein in or control such local Catholic NGO’s ( or, because of its stance on abortion, dis-allow partnerships with women’s or other groups who hold for abortion, even on issues totally unrelated to abortion, as has happened in some places) their own flexibility for networking and initiative will be stifled. Emory sociologist, Frank Lechner has explicitly studied religious groups in globalization movements and debates. He argued that, with a few exceptions,

such as the Jubilee 2000 campaign to relieve third world debt, Catholic groups tend generally to play subaltern, supportive roles in some one else's network concerning globalization.

We can take as an important index of the success of Catholic social teaching a remark of Pope John Paul II that social Catholicism is found not just in social doctrine but “ in her concrete commitment and material assistance in the struggle against marginalization and suffering”. We still have a long way to go to build the kind of social teaching, from the bottom and not just the top, which Paul VI challenged us to in his Octogesima Adveniens: “ Christian communities, with the help of the Holy Spirit, in communion with the bishops who hold responsibility, and in dialogue with other Christian people and all people of good will, need to discern the options and commitments which are called for in order to bring about social, political and economic changes seen in many cases to be urgently needed”

### III. Three Lacunae in Catholic Social Teaching About Globalization

I want to lift up briefly three lacunae in current versions of Catholic social teaching for its encounter with globalization: (1) Issues of global governance; ( 2) the multi-national corporation; ( 3) issues of the environment. My treatment of each will be relatively jejune, more evocative than demonstrative, more indicating the issues than fleshing out the precise directionality of the response.

#### Global Governance

To be sure, as early as the 1960's, Pope John XXIII in Pacem in Terris signaled glaringly unfinished business in governance: “ Under the present circumstances of human society, both the structure and form of governments as well as the power which public authority wields in all the nations of the world must be considered inadequate to promote the universal common good” (#135). Although this short-coming is signaled, no systematic thought has been given to the contours of what kind of institutions might yield a global governance which is not some world government ( which would violate, presumably, subsidiarity and constitute a threat to the Catholic sense of limited government). To the extent that institutions are mentioned in the literature they tend to be either states , IGOs ,such as the UN, The International Labor Organization, UNESCO or the World Criminal court or some generic support for the expansion of the rule of international law.

For those who follow the globalization literature, this emphasis almost uniquely on states and IGOs seems old-fashioned and one sided. In point of fact, much of the global governance that is incipient takes the form of somewhat amorphous, governing units called ‘ regimes’ or ‘ global policy networks’. If what I am about to say about regimes and global policy networks may seem to you a bit arcane, keep these following bromides in mind. Governance is not the same as government. It is possible that other units, besides states and intergovernmental organizations, can provide the needed coordination and governance. After all Standard and Poors, does an effective job in coordinating the bond market! When we look at effective global regimes ( e.g. the International Civil

Aviation Organization; The International Postal Union) we discover that some of them flow entirely from an IGO, e.g., The World Health Organization of the U.N; some, i.e., 'The Basle Committee on Banking Regulations and Supervisory Practices' involve public-private partnerships e.g, between IGOs and Banks; some are purely private regimes in the public interest ( The Internet Corporation for Assigned Agencies). In a similar way, there are now hundreds of what can be called global policy networks such as the World Commission on Dams ( which unites IGOs, such as the World Bank, corporations, governments and environmental NGOs as co-stakeholders), the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers; Transparency International which focuses on exposing and reforming corruption in governments and corporations. Global policy regimes more and more follow the logic of networks. Functionally specific and defined, such networks avoid bureaucratic inertias and bring together diverse sectors from society.

While difficult to define or type, policy networks bring together both diverse countries and diverse sectors of activity. Often they have shown special ingenuity in their use of information technologies. Global policy networks place new issues on the global agenda or raise up issues that have been neglected ( or treaties which are not being implemented). They help fashion a truly public discourse on such issues. They can facilitate the negotiating and setting of global standards ( e.g., for regulations to catch and monitor money laundering or for environmental management). Global policy networks are natural units for gathering and disseminating knowledge. They can serve, at times, as innovative mechanisms by which IGOs outsource pieces of the implementation of their policy. They also close the participatory gap in global governance. Too often we think of subsidiarity too single mindedly as a kind of vertical subsidiarity ( e.g., from local to regional to national governance). But there is also a kind of horizontal subsidiarity which looks to a leaner form of governance, one that by-passes top heavy bureaucracy and coordinates the many stake-holders into governance units which respect both the local and the legitimate stakeholders. If a coordinating global network can do the job, why introduce a more cumbersome bureaucratic IGO ? No bigger than necessary to get the global job done!

What one looks for in international regimes and policy networks is efficiency, accountability, transparency, participatory access to legitimate stakeholders and the removal of corruption, both from governments and in multi-national corporations. One seeks effective coordination and a kind of socialization of global actors to a quasi-constitution of rules about issues such as aviation, banking, the postal union, anti-personnel landmines etc. Note that many of these salient themes ( transparency, corruption, regimes which are neither states nor IGO's) are rarely spoken about anywhere in current Catholic Social Teaching.

Two top-most issues in global governance ( whether in IGO's which are often run by bureaucratic elites or in some policy regimes) are: (A) a democratic deficit at the global level. Nothing quite analogous to democratic parliaments or truly global social movements exists on the ground. (B) The issue of the adequate financing of global organizations. Presently, it depends entirely on the good will of states and has absolutely no provision for dealing with the free-rider problem ( i.e., those who gain from the global governance scheme but do not pay for it) Neither topic has received a systematic address

in Catholic social teaching.. For all its vaunted call for an international common good, inasmuch as the common good intrinsically includes an institutional imagination, the Catholic social tradition has remained still much too vague and moralistic when it comes to thinking through global governance.

### The MultiNational Corporation

In his encyclical, Centessimus Annus in 1991, John Paul II treated the business corporation as creative entrepreneurship in a free enterprise economy. But he never really dealt with the new forms of the multi-national corporation, as such. World Bank economist, Wolfgang Reinecke in his book, Global Public Policy demonstrates that the multi-national corporation has a different organizational logic and form than its earlier national corporation type ( the type dealt with in Centessimus Annus). A journalist writing in The Manchester Guardian could claim that “ corporations have never been more powerful, yet less regulated, never more pampered by government yet less questioned, never needed to take social responsibility, yet never more secretive. To whom will these fabulously self-motivated, self-interested supranational bodies be accountable?”

Multi-nationals merge and acquire.. Frequently, they enter into secure inter-firm alliances to defray costs or in outsourcing of intermediate inputs. Notoriously, parts of a Japanese auto may have components made in France and the USA. International outsourcing and multiple affiliates help the multi-nationals insulate the company from risks, from exchange rate fluxuations and unwanted regulations. Thus, if country X engages in an embargo of its products to country Y, the headquarters of a company in country X ( making guns, pharmaceuticals or cars) can simply transfer the contracts to an affiliate to avoid the regulation. The new multi-national business corporation makes both regulation of industry or its taxation by any one country nearly impossible. Indeed, frequently profiting from governmental research and development moneys; all too often eluding the payment of any taxes and benefiting from state policies of corporate welfare; free to treat the environment as some externality—many multi-nationals are the veritable prototypes of the free-rider.

To be sure, there will be no humane globalization without the cooperation of multi-nationals. And many multi-nationals, prodded by consumer boycotts and consumer education, have moved toward good global citizenship behaviors. Because many corporations have sometimes shown themselves good global citizens and have voluntarily subscribed to ethical principles -- e.g. the UN global compact based on principles of fair enterprise (including avoidance of child labor, respecting the human rights of workers, guaranteeing labor safety etc.) -- we can not simply demonize them. They provide jobs and create wealth. They find ways, through the market, to maximize efficiencies and bring forth new products. They will be indispensable actors in discovering and marketing more environmentally friendly energy sources. The Sullivan principles, applied to apartheid in South Africa by corporations gave leverage to those resistant to a racist regime.

But we do need a vigorous address to the pervasive role of corporations in setting agendas in politics (both domestic and in IGOs such as the World Bank) or dominating on regulatory agencies. Perhaps David Korten goes too far, but he suggests that corporations, as such, be kept from any direct political lobbying or involvement. By almost any standards, the disproportionate sway of corporations and moneyed interests over politics seems excessive and dangerous to democratic principles, the environment and workers' rights.

If multi-national corporations will, willy-nilly, play an indispensable role in any humane globalization, the lack of any systematic analysis ( both sociologically and ethically) of the multi-national form ( its strengths and dangers; its limits and need for ethical monitoring; the necessity of a counter-force to check its enormous powers) by Catholic Social thought limits its effectiveness in debates on globalization.

### The Environment

Both John Paul II and the American bishops have said some humane, wise, forceful and thoughtful things about the environment. Yet, their thought about the environment tends to tack it on to the original thrust of the social teaching around economy and politics. The model remains, at best, the model of stewardship. But many are rightly arguing that we need, at this time, two crucial paradigm shifts in thinking about the economy and the environment: (1) A shift from an overly anthropocentric understanding of life on planet earth to a deeper sense of the cosmos ( in all its varieties and speciations) as the mirror of the glory and wisdom of God. The human is not the only image and likeness of God. It may be, perhaps, stretching the metaphor too much to speak of the cosmos as the body of God but the cosmos is, in some real sense, an integral part of creation in its own right and not just some useful means for human flourishing. Catholic social thought has been rooted almost entirely in theological anthropology and theological ethics. It needs a new situating in cosmology. (2) The second paradigm shift—a massive one—would make the economy subordinate to ecology. The economy must, increasingly, be seen as a sub-set of ecology. Rather than being an externality to the economy, the ecological realm is the nesting niche for any true economy. We are coming to see that if life-support systems are destroyed irreparably, if water shortages increase, if food supplies decrease, if fisheries are depleted, if global warming remains unchecked, forests ravaged and topsoil degraded, there will be no viable economy. Fully half of all the jobs world-wide relate to nature: farming, fishing and forestry. Catholic social thought needs to avoid tacking its environmental thought on as a kind of humane after-thought and integrate it from the outset and fully into its teaching about the economy.

If, in places, I have critiqued Catholic Social Thought, it has been to strengthen a distinguished and distinctive body of thought. It is what someone who loves and nurtures a beloved tradition and what a Catholic university in service to the church should do. For, in the end, religious voices will be essential for any humane globalization. Princeton political scientist, Richard Falk contends that the prevailing bankruptcy of the regnant global schemes cries out for a religious voice. “ The best of secular thinking falls short of providing either a plausible path to travel in pursuit of humane global governance or a

sufficiently inspiring vision of its elements to mobilize a popular grass roots movement for drastic global reform”. For Falk, religions contribute the following key components for a humane globalization: (1) They take suffering seriously and respond to real people who suffer; (2) They tap into deep roots in popular culture; (3) They anchor an ethos of solidarity; (4) They provide normative horizons based on a transcendent ethic; (5) They rely, in overcoming pessimism, on the transformative power of faith; (6) They foster a sense of limits ( and human fallibility); (7) They provide people with rooted identities in a runaway world; (8) They believe in both justice and the need for reconciliation. Thus, avers Falk: “ It is in the end the possibility of a religiously grounded trans-national movement for a just world order that alone gives hope”

My own fondest hope is that the Joan and Ralph Lane, Jr. Center for Catholic Studies and Catholic Social Thought here at the University of San Francisco will build on this important legacy to help forge, both in thought and in actions, that “ just world order that alone gives hope” Truly, then, Catholic social thought will become an effective challenge to the, often bankrupt, regnant forms of globalization.