

SOCIAL ETHICS IN WESTERN EUROPE

LINDA HOGAN AND JOHN D'ARCY MAY

The article highlights the distinctiveness of European social ethics by beginning with an analysis of how theological ethicists have engaged with "Europe" as both idea and political project. Themes discussed include the role of religion in the public square, pluralism, and the limits of tolerance and intercultural ethics. Also considered are ethical questions arising from Europe's power as a significant economic bloc, as well as ethical responses to war and other forms of political violence. The article concludes with a comment on method.

DIVERSE LINGUISTIC, CULTURAL, AND POLITICAL PATTERNS among the nation-states of Europe give rise to an array of constitutional arrangements vis-à-vis religion in general and Catholicism in particular. For example, in France a strict separation of church and state is maintained, while in the United Kingdom there is an established Church. Thus, although social ethicists in Europe share many concerns, the political contexts in which ethical questions are debated are diverse. Alongside this long-standing political and cultural diversity, however, runs a trajectory of integration. In Europe this integrationist impulse has two significant driv-

LINDA HOGAN received her Ph.D. from Trinity College, Dublin, where she is professor of ecumenics in the Irish School of Ecumenics. Specializing in Christian social ethics and the ethics of gender, her most recent publications include: "Gender and Culture as Dimensions of Bodiliness" with John May, in *Bodiliness and Human Dignity*, ed. Harm Goris (LIT 2006) and "A Different Mode of Encounter: Egalitarian Liberalism and the Christian Tradition," *Political Theology* 7 (2006). In process is a book on the appropriation of human rights language in Christian social ethics.

JOHN D'ARCY MAY is associate professor of interfaith dialogue also in the Irish School of Ecumenics, Trinity College, Dublin. He holds doctoral degrees in philosophy and theology from the Universities of Frankfurt and Münster respectively. Focusing on the theology of religions, Buddhist-Christian dialogue, and indigenous religious traditions of Asia-Pacific, he has most recently published "Rootedness: Reflections on Land and Belonging," in *Recognising the Margins*, ed. Werner Jeanrend and Andrew Mayes (Columba, 2006), and "Buddhists, Christians and Ecology," in *Buddhism, Christianity and the Question of Creation*, ed. Perry Schmidt-Leukel (Ashgate, 2006). A future work considers how interactions of Islam in Indonesia and Christianity in Melanesia with indigenous cultures have affected democratization.

ers: (1) the European Union (hereafter EU¹), a body that began in 1951 as the Coal and Steel Agreement (1952) between Germany and France in the shadow of World War II, but that in the interim has been transformed into an ambitious political experiment; and (2) economic globalization, the dominant effect of which is to drive nation-states to more extensive and deeper incorporation.

CONTEXTS: LOCAL, REGIONAL, GLOBAL

The social, economic, and political issues with which European ethicists have been concerned arise at three levels: local, regional, and global, although inevitably these three are interwoven. We use “local” in this context to mean national; in the literature, national preoccupations figure prominently. The regional space, of course, is occupied by the European project itself,² and inevitably this is the focus of much reflection by social ethicists. Moreover, the political and economic weight of the EU itself is so much greater than the sum of its parts that important moral questions, such as the limits of tolerance and the ethics of global trading practices, take on a particular political significance when considered in this context. Of course, the concerns of social ethics in Western Europe are also global in orientation. Thus, the ethical issues raised by economic globalization are debated not only in the context of the EU, but also in relation to countries in the South.³ Much of the ethical analysis, however, proceeds with all three contexts clearly and constantly in view. Marianne Heimbach-Steins’s contribution to *Sojourners and Strangers: Asylum, Immigration, and Nationality*⁴ captures well this local, regional, and global dynamic within the

¹ In this article we use “EU” specifically to designate the political entity—for example, when referring to the EU’s neoliberal economic policies. We use “Europe” when referring to the larger entity (and context of debate) that includes countries like Switzerland that do not belong to EU and that predate the EU. The two terms are not interchangeable, though in the context of this article they often overlap.

² With the two most recent rounds of enlargement, the EU is expanding eastward. In 2004 it welcomed ten new members, and in January 2007 Romania and Bulgaria joined. Thus the extent of the EU is now much larger than is conventionally understood as “Western Europe.”

³ See, for example, Eric Tollens and Johan de Tavanier’s “World Food Security and Agriculture in a Globalising World,” *Ethical Perspectives* 13 (2006) 91–115, which, although focusing on developing nations, also discusses the interrelated issue of agricultural subsidies in the nations of the North.

⁴ Marianne Heimbach-Steins, “Education for World Citizens in the Face of Dependency, Insecurity, and Loss of Control,” *Studies in Christian Ethics* 19.1 (2006) 63–80. This issue includes contributions from Luke Bretherton, Christine D. Pohl,

ethics of immigration. Here Heimbach-Steins begins with her own context of Germany and asks what kind of educational strategy would enable Christians to respond to the needs of those forced by economic or political necessity to seek refuge in another country within a globalized world. Her analysis and that of both Bretherton⁵ and Sriskandarajah⁶ in the same volume highlight how the paradoxical simultaneity of opening and closing, at all three levels (national, European, and global) combines visions of unity with experiences of alienation. Heimbach-Steins's conclusion, which also embodies this strong, multileveled approach, is that a form of education which addresses people as citizens of the world is the key. Moreover, according to her, if education is to help secure the requirements for a humane and peaceful life together under conditions of socioeconomic and sociocultural differences and manifold experiences of alienation, then this "education for 'the citizens of the world' will need to connect experiences that form identity with the capability to transcend one's own horizon without fearing the loss of one's identity."⁷

This section of moral notes highlights the distinctiveness of European social ethics by beginning with an analysis of how theological ethicists have engaged with "Europe" as both idea and political project. Their concern with the ethical challenges facing Europe is not a narrow, insular one but rather serves as the frame of reference within which the ethical import of today's economic and political realities is considered. Figuring prominently are questions that relate to political ethos. These are pursued both in relation to the nature of the public square and the role of religion therein, as well as in their practical manifestations in questions of intercultural ethics, pluralism, and the limits of tolerance (1). The power of Europe as a significant economic bloc has also led ethicists to consider the ethics of globalization, both in terms of addressing the critical challenges and in relation to the moral categories according to which this process can be critiqued and evaluated (2). Social ethicists in Europe have also been con-

and Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah on the ethical questions raised by immigration. See also the earlier text by Marianne Heimbach-Steins and Gerhard Kruij, ed., *Bildung und Beteiligungsgerechtigkeit: Sozialethische Sondierungen* (Bielefeld: Bertelsmann, 2003) which discusses access to educational opportunity and is quite concerned with the German context.

⁵ Luke Bretherton, "The Duty of Care to Refugees, Christian Cosmopolitanism, and the Hallowing of Bare Life," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 19.1 (2006) 39–62. See also his *Hospitality as Holiness: Christian Witness amid Moral Diversity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) which provides a more developed theological argument for his position.

⁶ Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah, "Migration Madness: Five Policy Dilemmas," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 19.1 (2006) 21–38.

⁷ Heimbach-Steins, "Education for World Citizens" 63.

cerned with war and other forms of political violence, and within this concern they have focused on the ethics of peace and reconciliation (3). The note will conclude with a brief comment on method (4).

ENGAGING THE "IDEA OF EUROPE"

The extent and rate of political change in Europe, much of it centered on the institutions of the EU, have meant that the ethos of the "idea of Europe" has itself become a major preoccupation of social ethicists, much as it has for episcopal conferences and faith-based NGOs.⁸ Indeed, it is precisely because this political space is in transition that Christians are at the fore in these debates. The Catholic bishops through the Commission des Episcopats de la Communauté Européenne (COMECE) have insisted that, as citizens of constituent member states of the EU, Catholics have a particular responsibility to ensure that the European project is shaped by Christian values.⁹ The bishops' statement, *Le devenir de l'Union Européenne et la responsabilité des Catholiques*, explores this responsibility by first "seeing how the spiritual experience of believers can provide the foundation for engagement by conscientious European citizens" (the Be-attitudes are invoked here as a fundamental charter); then "outlining several of the original contributions that the Catholic communities might bring to the vitality of the European Union" (the focus here is on educational, cultural, humanitarian, and charitable works pursued in an ecumenical and interreligious spirit and mode); and "finally proposing some major lines of the Christian tradition which might also orientate the future of Europe." The bishops mention as critical here the Christian tradition's recognition of an inherent distinction between political institutions and religious communities. They also suggest that Christianity's attempt to be a community of unity-in-diversity may also be a helpful guide for the EU. Discussions of the moral obligations that arise for Catholics vis-à-vis the EU have tended to proceed along two main trajectories. One centers on defining the proper relationship between religion and politics within the liberal political architecture of both the EU and its constituent states. The as yet unratified EU constitution, with its controversial preamble that fails to mention Europe's Christian roots, has been the most recent occasion on which this question

⁸ See, for example, <http://www.cidse.org>. Coopération Internationale Pour le Développement et la Solidarité is an alliance of 15 Catholic NGOs from Europe. Its members include Broederlijk Delen, CAFOD, CCFD, Cordaid, Entraide et Fraternité, Fastenopfer, Misereor, SCIAF, Trócaire, and Voluntare Nel Mundo.

⁹ COMECE, *Le devenir de l'Union Européenne et la responsabilité des Catholiques*, http://www.comece.org/upload/pdf/evo_cath_FR_050509.pdf (accessed November 24, 2006).

has been debated.¹⁰ However it continues to be discussed in relation to concrete issues such as whether the EU resolution on homophobia, which will criminalize homophobic speech, violates the free exercise of religion.¹¹ The second trajectory relates to constructing a just and equitable society and focuses on the duty that falls to Christians to use their political and economic power at all levels to ensure that the principles of justice, solidarity, and care for the vulnerable guide the development of policy at national and EU levels.

The Political Architecture

The construction of the EU as a political entity has provided the occasion for a reenergized debate about the role of religion in the liberal polity. For Christian social ethicists the concern has been twofold, involving, first, a consideration of whether and how Christian belonging can be combined with a commitment to democratic politics and, second, the development of a coherent role for Christianity in a multireligious, but secular, polity.¹² Moreover, these questions have been pursued in relation to national as well as regional contexts and in their intersections. Within EU member states there is a multiplicity of institutional arrangements between majority and

¹⁰ The most high profile debate on the role of religion in the emerging EU structures was conducted in January 2004 between the then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger and Jürgen Habermas at the Catholic Academy in Munich. See Jürgen Habermas and Joseph Ratzinger, *Dialektik der Säkularisierung: Über Vernunft und Religion* (Freiburg: Herder, 2005). For insightful analyses of the theological issues at play in the debate see Thomas Eggensperger, "De la relation entre religion et politique: Les principes de la doctrine social catholique dans le contexte de l'Union européenne," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 37 (2006) 3–25, and Maureen Junker-Kenny, "The Pre-Political Foundations of the State," in *The New Pontificate: A Time For Change?* ed. Erik Borgman, Maureen Junker-Kenny, and Janet Martin Soskice, Concilium 2006/1 (London: SCM, 2006) 106–17. Ignace Berten's "La Constitution européenne et les religions," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 35 (2004) 474–94, provides a comprehensive discussion of the nature and structure of the Constitution and of the much debated Article 51.

¹¹ See Piotr Mazurkiewicz, "The European Continental Panel," *Catholic Theological Ethics in the World Church: The Plenary Papers from Padua*, ed. James F. Keenan, S.J. (New York: Continuum, forthcoming).

¹² For a thoughtful analysis of the way in which pluralism in Europe raises questions for Catholics, see Joseph Joblin, "Le pluralisme dans les sociétés démocratiques: Origins et perspectives d'avenir," *Gregorianum* 81 (2000) 751–74 and Luigi Lorenzetti, "Cattolici in Politica," *Rivista de teologia morale* 140 (2003) 461–64, which summarizes the proceedings of a discussion among Franco Garelli, Enrico Chiavacci, Giannino Piana, and Luigi Lorenzetti on this matter, while Claude Gèfré, "Le pluralisme religieux et l'indifférentisme, ou le vrai défi de la théologie chrétienne," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 31 (2000/1) 3–32, argues for a paradigm shift in the Catholic understanding of religious pluralism.

minority faiths, a factor that inevitably influences how the political architecture within states as well as that of the European project itself is approached. These diverse institutional contexts have been extensively discussed by Christian social ethicists at colloquia in Lille (2002), Stuttgart-Tübingen (2003), and the Sorbonne (2003) and the proceedings published in two supplements of *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale*. The intersecting themes of the pluralism of religions, the evolution of the state, and the construction of Europe are examined in *Degré de modernité des états en Europe*¹³ (in the context of Belgium, Holland, and Great Britain) and in *Religions et Nations*¹⁴ (in the context of Italy, Germany, France, Poland, and Spain). While many of the theological and political questions mirror those pursued in the Anglophone literature, unlike in the American debate, discussion of the adequacy of the Rawlsian arrangement does not dominate. Instead, the historical trajectories that have led to such diverse institutional arrangements are analyzed in light of theological engagements with a broader range of political theorists¹⁵ and in the context of the extensive empirical data gathered from the ongoing European Values Study (EVS).¹⁶

Although the Spanish context is not specifically in view in Adela Corti-

¹³ "Degré de modernité des états en Europe," *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* "Le Supplément" 226 (September 2003).

¹⁴ "Religions et Nations," *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* "Le Supplément" 228 (March 2004).

¹⁵ See, for example, Jürgen Habermas, "Vorporpolitische Grundlagen des demokratischen Rechtsstaats?" in his *Zwischen Naturalismus und Religion* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2005) 106–18. For the theological-ethical engagement with Habermas on the role of religion in the liberal polity see Rudolf Langthaler and Herta Nagl-Docekal, ed., *Jürgen Habermas über Religion* (Wien: Oldenbourg, 2006) and Guy Jobin, "La traduction salvatrice? Penser les communautés de foi dans l'espace public avec Habermas," *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* 238 (March 2006) 85–112.

¹⁶ The EVS, initiated by Jan Kerkhofs, S.J., and Ruud de Moor in the 1970s, is now a large-scale, cross-national, and longitudinal study of fundamental values in European societies. The academic literature assessing the findings of the three new waves of the study is vast, comprising a host of national and cross-national comparative studies as well as Europe-wide analyses. Recent analyses of the political significance of religious values include Ronald Inglehart, ed., *Human Values and Social Change: Findings from the Values Surveys* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) and Wil Arts, Jacques Hagenaars, and Loek Halman, *The Cultural Diversity of European Unity: Findings, Explanations, and Reflections from the European Values Study* (Leiden: Brill, 2003). The latter includes an insightful interview with Cardinal Godfried Danneels of Mechelen-Brussels on the evolution of European values. See also Danneels, "The Role of Ethics in an Enlarged Europe," in *Christianity in Present Day Europe*, Dialogue Series 1 (Antwerp: UCSIA, 2004) 11–18.

na's *Covenant and Contract*,¹⁷ it does inform her argument for a different mode of engagement between religions and the liberal polity than that envisaged by either Rawls or Habermas.¹⁸ She begins with the fact of moral pluralism and articulates an account of the public square that is open to religious voices and imposes neither the "public reason" nor the "proviso" requirement of Rawls.¹⁹ Rather, Cortina argues for an understanding of the polity in which the two enduring parables about human bonds, the covenantal and the contractual, continue to be narrated and to be embodied in political structures. Arising from the recognition of the importance of these two ways of understanding the structure of human political relationships, Cortina develops a political ethic in which one of the cornerstones of liberalism, the distinction between public morality and private moralities, is set aside.²⁰ Thus the pursuit of agreement on fundamental political matters no longer depends on citizens being prepared systematically to relegate their comprehensive doctrines either to the private realm or to the background culture (*pace* Rawls²¹), or to explain and translate them (*pace* Habermas²²). Rather, Cortina argues for an "*ethics of minima* for civic ethics and an *ethics of maxima* for ethics which make proposals for a happy life."²³ Thus we have a polity in which "each group can provide foundations for these shared minima on different premises, proper to their conception of good life, their form of understanding what the meaning of life is, on religious or non-religious premises and maxims."²⁴ Distinctive here is Cortina's rejection of the association of minima with the "supposedly" public morality and of maxima with the "supposedly" private life. In

¹⁷ Adela Cortina, *Covenant and Contract: Politics, Ethics, and Religion* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003; orig. publ. as *Alianza y contrato: Política, ética, y religión* [Madrid: Trotta, 2001]).

¹⁸ Although they start from different premises, see Christopher Insole, *The Politics of Human Frailty: A Theological Defence of Political Liberalism* (London: SCM, 2004) and David Fergusson, *Church, State, and Civil Society* (New York: Cambridge University, 2004) for an approach similar to Cortina's vis-à-vis a civic ethics.

¹⁹ See John Rawls, "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited," *University of Chicago Law Review* 64 (1997) 765–807, reprinted in John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples; with, "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited"* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1999) 131–80.

²⁰ Feminist political thought has long problematized the distinction between the public and private spheres, although this is not Cortina's route to this conclusion.

²¹ Rawls, "Idea of Public Reason."

²² Habermas, *Zwischen Naturalismus und Religion*.

²³ Cortina, *Covenant and Contract* 105.

²⁴ *Ibid.* This conclusion represents an approach not unlike that of Jeffrey Stout in *Democracy and Tradition* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, 2004) and implied in Michael Waltzer's *Politics and Passion: Toward a More Egalitarian Liberalism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 2004).

fact, she insists that all moralities have a vocation for being publicly presented, though this does not mean that they have a vocation for stateness. Thus she concludes, “it is advisable to forget the erroneous distinction between public morality and private moralities and to replace this with the distinction that more accurately matches reality, between a civic public ethics of minima and different public ethics of maxima. All of them are public, none of them state, and both committed to the task of building a better society.”²⁵

However, as Cortina herself recognizes, we still have to consider how to conceptualize the relationships between these different public ethics of maxima in discrete political contexts and in relation to often contentious practical norms. In European politics these concerns have long been to the fore, though they have become especially salient in recent decades as many countries have become home to people from Europe’s former colonies, to economic migrants and to political refugees. Moreover, the growth of a substantial, self-consciously Muslim presence poses a challenge to Europe’s liberal self-understanding.²⁶ Indeed, as David Masci indicates,²⁷ the number of Muslims in Europe has tripled in the last 30 years, and predictions suggest that by 2020 Muslims will constitute 10% of Europe’s population. This trend will be further accentuated if Turkey, with a population of 70 million, becomes a member of the EU. This changing cultural and religious character of Europe, with the attendant insecurity that the accelerated nature of the process creates, has given rise to many ethical challenges for both host and immigrant groups.²⁸ The ethical significance of this insecurity has been probed insightfully in “Terror, Fear, and Anxiety in Europe:

²⁵ Cortina, *Covenant and Contract* 107. Of course, the Rawlsian arrangement has its advocates among European social ethicists. See Patrick O’ Riordan, “Permission to Speak: Religious Arguments in Public Reason,” *Heythrop Journal* 45 (2004) 178–96, who argues that Rawls’s understanding of the polity evident in combined roles of public reason, background culture, and public political culture results in a polity hospitable to religion. See also Jack Mahoney, S.J., “Christian Doctrines, Ethical Issues, and Human Genetics,” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003) 719–49, who seems to accept the Rawlsian arrangement, as does Nigel Biggar in “God in Public Reason,” *Studies in Christian Ethics* 19.1 (2006) 9–19. For a comment on these questions from the perspective of a Catholic politician, see Shirley Williams, *God and Caesar: Personal Reflections on Politics and Religion* (New York: Continuum, 2004).

²⁶ For recent Catholic discussions of this issue see Jaume Flaquer, S.J., *Fundamentalism: Amid Bewilderment, Condemnation, and the Attempt to Understand* (Barcelona: Cristianisme i Justícia, 2005) and Erik Borgman and Pim Valkenberg, ed., *Islam and Enlightenment: New Issues*, Concilium 2005/5 (London: SCM, 2005).

²⁷ David Masci, *An Uncertain Road: Muslims and the Future of Europe* (Washington: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2004), <http://pewforum.org/publications/reports/muslims-europe-2005.pdf> (accessed November 8, 2006).

²⁸ See John D’Arcy May, “Verantwortung *Coram Deo*? Europa zwischen säku-

Challenges for Theology,”²⁹ the two-volume proceedings of the 2004 congress of the European Society for Catholic Theology. Herein essays by László Lukács, Philippe Bordeyne, Giovanni Mazzillio, Alberto Bondolfi, Marie-Jo Thiel, and Marianne Heimbach-Steins analyze the social, cultural, political, and psychological upheavals that create this culture of insecurity and variously develop theologico-ethical responses both to specific instances of this malaise (Lukács) and to the dynamic of fear itself (Heimbach-Steins). Thiel’s “Europe, spiritualités, et culture face au racisme”³⁰ also examines this dynamic with a focus on the racism and xenophobia that minorities in Europe routinely face. Inevitably the ethical debate is also concerned with the limit questions, that is, the extent to which a society should adapt its existing laws to accommodate religious and cultural practices that are not typical of those of the host or “already settled” communities. However, these limit questions tend to be pursued in the context of discussions about the merits of different policy approaches that European countries have adopted, since France, with its republican ideal of *laïcité*, has a strongly assimilationist system, while Holland, Belgium, and the United Kingdom have adopted various forms of multiculturalist frameworks.³¹ Karl-Willhelm Merks’s “Zwischen Gastfreundschaft und gleichem

larer und interreligiöser Ethik,” in *Verantwortung—Ende oder Wandlungen einer Vorstellung? Orte und Funktionen der Ethik in unserer Gesellschaft*, ed. Karl-Willhelm Merks (Münster: LIT, 2001) 193–207; see also May, “God in Public: The Religions in Pluralist Societies,” *Bijdragen* 64 (2003) 249–64 and “Alternative a Dio? Le religioni nella sfera pubblica globale,” in *Teologia nella città, teologia per la città*, ed. Antonio Autiero (Bologna: Dehoniane, 2005) 95–110. See also the contributions in “Dialogue inter religieux: Une provocation à la réflexion éthique et théologique?” *Revue d’éthique et de théologie morale “Le Supplément”* 217 (June–July 2001) and Fred Poché, “Partager la parole: Altérité et reconnaissance mutuelle,” *Revue d’éthique et de théologie morale “Le Supplément”* (December 2005) 79–98.

²⁹ “Gespenster der Angst in Europa—Provokation der Theologie,” *Bulletin ET* 15.1–2 (2004), and Adrian Loretan and Franco Luzatto, ed., *Gesellschaftliche Ängste als theologische Herausforderung: Kontext Europa* (Münster: LIT, 2004). See also Samuel Kobia, “Terreur, peur, et angoisse en Europe: Des défis pour la théologie,” *Revue d’éthique et de théologie morale “Le Supplément”* (June 2005) 87–96.

³⁰ “Europe, spiritualités et culture face au racisme,” ed. Marie-Jo Thiel, *Revue d’éthique et de théologie morale “Le Supplément”* 231 (September 2004).

³¹ See the various essays in *Pluralism in Europe? One Law, One Market, One Culture?* Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Societas Ethica in Ljubljana, August 2004, ed. Stefan Heuser and Hans Günter Ulrich (Münster: LIT, 2006); Mary Jo Thiel, *Europe, spiritualités et culture face au racisme; Islam and Enlightenment: New Issues*, Concilium 2005/5 (London: SCM, 2005); and Johan de Tavanier, “Tolerance, Pluralism, Identity and Truth,” in *Traditions in Dialogue: Applied Ethics in a World Church*, ed. Linda Hogan (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, forthcoming).

Recht”³² addresses the merits of these various frameworks directly and argues for an approach to migration that goes beyond rights to the development of a migration policy that institutionalizes hospitality.

In the context now developing worldwide, which is of particular relevance to those European countries that were formerly colonial powers, the public sphere and civil society are both becoming global. This trend transposes many of the ethical issues classically discussed in the context of nation-states and pluralistic societies to a new, global level, where they can no longer be insulated from questions of post-colonial responsibility and just trading relationships with former colonies.

The Economic Imperative: Globalization

These economic dimensions of integration are discussed primarily through the lens of globalization and have led to renewed attention being paid to the relationship between justice and the “good life” sometimes at a very basic level of philosophical debate.³³ Of ongoing importance is the analysis of the nature, extent, and novelty of the contemporary phenomenon of globalization. Thus Étienne Perrot discusses the ambiguities that arise from a trajectory of fragmentation existing alongside one of integration,³⁴ while in *Ethical Globalisation* Lorna Gold, Enda McDonagh, and Brian Hehir probe the economic and political drivers of globalization.³⁵ Each contributor to the magisterial collection *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds*³⁶ concludes that globalization fundamentally changes the nature of modernity, while in a different vein Martin McKeever³⁷ and Yves de Maeseneer³⁸ discuss globalization’s underlying philosophical mood. McKeever concludes that globalization is “only the surface of a much

³² Karl-Willhelm Merks, “Zwischen Gastfreundschaft und gleichem Recht: Ethische Überlegungen zur Migrationspolitik,” *Bijdragen* 64 (2003) 144–64.

³³ See Peter Koslowski, ed., *The Theory of Capitalism in the German Economic Tradition* (Berlin: Springer, 2000), *Principles of Ethical Economy* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2001), and *Business Ethics and the Electronic Economy* (Berlin: Springer, 2004).

³⁴ Étienne Perrot, “The Ambiguities of Globalization,” in *Globalization and Its Victims*, ed. Jon Sobrino and Felix Wilfred, Concilium (2001/5) (London: SCM, 2001) 17–24.

³⁵ Lorna Gold, Brian Hehir, and Enda McDonagh, *Ethical Globalisation* (Dublin: Veritas, 2005).

³⁶ Georges de Schrijver, *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds: A Clash of Socio-Economic and Cultural Paradigms* (Leuven: Leuven University, 1998).

³⁷ Martin McKeever, “Afterthoughts on the Globalization Debate: Critical Observations on a Hyper-Modern Metanarrative,” *Studia moralia* 42 (2004) 205–23.

³⁸ Yves de Maeseneer, “Saint Francis versus McDonalds? Contemporary Globalisation Critique and Hans Urs von Balthasar’s Theological Aesthetics,” *Heythrop Journal* 44 (2003) 1–14.

deeper issue concerning the place of ethics within the cultural form of modernity” and that the ethical import of the adoption of this extravagant metanarrative³⁹ remains to be properly considered. De Maeseneer’s argument develops in a different, though complementary, manner. He discusses the contrasting anthropologies inherent in the narratives of globalization and Christianity, arguing that the former is utterly hubristic, while the latter gives appropriate recognition to the materiality, mortality, and vulnerability of human beings.⁴⁰

There are challenging discussions of the negative effects of globalization, namely chronic poverty, increasing inequality between and within states, and environmental destruction.⁴¹ Moreover, within the globalization debate in Europe the interconnectedness of the local, regional, and global contexts is evident. As a result, there is a growing body of literature devoted to analyzing the impact that the increasingly neoliberal economic policies of the EU have within the European context itself.⁴² While wealth is increasing, inequality is growing, and some sectors of populations, especially minority groups and migrants, are experiencing new levels of poverty, threat, and social exclusion.⁴³ Indeed the exploitation associated with

³⁹ McKeever, “Afterthoughts on the Globalization Debate” 223.

⁴⁰ De Maeseneer, “Saint Francis versus McDonalds?” 11.

⁴¹ The literature is extensive. See, e.g., Cosimo Quarta, ed., *Globalizzazione, giustizia, solidarietà* (Bari: Dedalo, 2004); Johan Verstraeten, “Globalisation and the Dignity of the Poor,” in *Globalisation and Human Dignity: Sources and Challenges in Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Wim van De Donk (Buden: Damon, 2004) 96–111 (the other essays in his work are also relevant); Mary Grey, “Gender Justice and Poverty in Rural Rajasthan—Moving Beyond the Silence,” *Feminist Theology* 25 (2000) 33–45; Ann-Cathrin Jarl, *Women and Economic Justice: Ethics in Feminist Liberation Theology and Feminist Economics* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000); Anne Smith and Enda McDonagh, *The Reality of HIV/AIDS* (Dublin: Trocaire/Veritas/CAFOD, 2003); Tollens and De Tavanier, “World Food Security and Agriculture in a Globalising World”; Hans J. Munk, “Sustainable Development as a Task of the State: Ethical Aspects of Political-legal Realisation,” *Studia moralia* 38 (2000) 217–28; Alan Carter, “Distributive Justice and Environmental Sustainability,” *Heythrop Journal* 41 (2000) 449–60; and Celia Deane-Drummond and Bronislaw Szerszynski, with Robin Grove-White, *Re-ordering Nature: Theology, Society, and the New Genetics* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2003).

⁴² See the essays by Paul Dembinski, Gerhard Kruij, Gotlind Ulshöfer, Volkert Beekman and Frans Brom, and Alexander Brink and Johannes Eurich in *Pluralism in Europe? Societas Ethica Jahresbericht* 41 (2004) 197–261; also Faustino Parisi, “Oltre M. Novak per una pratica cristiana dell’economia,” *Studia moralia* 44 (2006) 121–39; Johan Verstraeten, *Business Ethics: Broadening the Perspectives* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000); and Luis De Sebastián Carazo, “Europe: Globalisation and Poverty,” in *Globalisation and Its Victims* 59–66.

⁴³ See Tadeusz Budinski and Dariusz Dobrzanski, ed., *Eastern Europe and the Challenges of Globalisation* (Washington: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2005) and Marianne Heimbach-Steins’s contribution to “The European Continental Panel,” in *Catholic Theological Ethics in the World Church*.

migration is emerging as one of the most serious challenges for Europe, since Europe is now a major point of origin as well as a destination for large numbers of women and children who are trafficked for the purposes of sexual exploitation.⁴⁴ Europe's position as a major economic bloc has also given rise to a discussion about its responsibilities in the global marketplace. In this context the twin themes of aid and trade predominate, with Christian ethicists considering the ethical norms that ought to shape Europe's relationships with the developing world.⁴⁵ Reforms in both the economic and the political orders are acknowledged to be critical to the development of ethical forms of globalization, as is the importance of linking both spheres. In her contribution to the festschrift honoring Irish moral theologian Enda McDonagh, Mary Robinson, the former United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights, argues for a necessary linkage between economic and political reform and illustrates her case with reference to the Ethical Globalization Initiative that "seeks to work with those who are committed to bringing the values of international human rights to the tables where decisions about the global economy are being made" and which is driven by the conviction that sustainable development and social justice must be underpinned by multilateralism and respect for international law.⁴⁶

Whether there is any prospect of governments adopting common values in the promotion of an ethical form of globalization is unclear. Joseph Joblin is acutely aware of the inherent difficulties, but is convinced that the interests of particular states must be subordinated to common ones, if there is any hope of building a global economic and political order that is just.⁴⁷ As might be expected, Christian social ethicists concur on the values

⁴⁴ See Cristina Barragán Ruiz-Matas, *Migration, Minorities, Compensation: Issues of Cultural Identity in Europe* (Brussels: Coimbra Group Office, 2001).

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Johan Verstraeten, "Debt Forgiveness, Social Justice, and Solidarity: A Theological and Ethical Reflection," *Ethical Perspectives* 8 (2001) 18–28; Alain Durand, "Les nouvelles formes de penser une éthique de la solidarité aujourd'hui: De Dom Helder Câmara à Porto Alegre: Nouveaux chemins de la solidarité Nord-Sud," *Lumen vitae* 58 (2003) 7–20; Rebecca Dudley and Linda Jones, ed., *Turning the Tables: Reflections on Faith and Trade* (London: CAFOD, 2003); and Adela Cortina, *Por una ética de consumo: La ciudadanía del consumidor en un mundo global* (Madrid: Taurus, 2002).

⁴⁶ Mary Robinson, "Linking Ethical and Globalisation," in *Between Poetry and Politics: Christian Ethics in Dialogue: Essays in Honour of Enda McDonagh*, ed. Linda Hogan and Barbara Fitzgerald (Dublin: Columba, 2003) 182–90, at 185. See also COMECE, *Global Governance: Our Responsibility to Make Globalisation an Opportunity for All*, http://www.comece.org/upload/pdf/pub_GG_010900_en.pdf (accessed November 15, 2006).

⁴⁷ Joseph Joblin, "Globalisation économique et universalisme des valeurs," *Gregorianum* 84 (2003) 849–71.

that, if adopted, would lead to the “humanization of globalization.”⁴⁸ Thus Christian ethicists agree that an ethical form of globalization can be created only if economic concerns are framed by (subordinated to) respect for human dignity (perhaps given legal recognition through the category of human rights), social justice, and ecological sustainability.⁴⁹ Moreover, there is a fascinating, though minor, discussion of the responses of Catholic institutions to globalization, as for example in relation to “ethical investments,” that is, the direct implementation of ethical principles in the areas of capital accumulation and dividends. Thus Johannes Hoffmann, in collaboration with other ethicists and economists, produced the “Frankfurt-Hohenheim Guidelines” for the ethical rating of companies (analogous to their financial rating as investment prospects) based on their track record of promoting cultural, social, and ecological sustainability.⁵⁰ And in a different context Cardinal Grocholewski considers the challenging questions that globalization raises for the Catholic university.⁵¹ However, within this broad consensus regarding the core values, social ethicists throughout Europe have adopted manifold ways of expressing these values and hold different views about how the particular and universal dimensions of these values interrelate.⁵²

⁴⁸ This is Johan Verstraeten’s phrase in his excellent “Catholic Social Thinking as Living Tradition That Gives Meaning to Globalization as a Process of Humanization,” in *Globalization and Catholic Social Thought: Present Crisis, Future Hope*, ed. John A. Coleman and William F. Ryan (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2005) 28–41.

⁴⁹ See Eberhard Schockenhoff, *Natural Law and Human Dignity: Universal Ethics in an Historical World* (Washington: Catholic University of America, 2003); Regina Ammicht-Quinn, Maureen Junker-Kenny, and Elsa Tamez, ed., *The Discourse of Human Dignity*, Concilium 2003/2 (London: SCM, 2003); the essays by Simone Morandini, Enrico Chiavacci, and Werner Wolbert, in *Tra etica e politica: Pensare i diritti*, ed. Simone Morandini (Padova: Fondazione Lanza, 2005); and, albeit in a slightly different vein, Karl Golser, *Verantwortlich für das Haus des Lebens: Zum zehnjährigen Erscheinen der Enzyklika “Evangelium Vitae”* (Brixen: A. Weger, 2005). See also Christa Schnabl, *Gerecht sorgen: Grundlagen einer sozial-ethischen Theorie der Fürsorge* (Freiburg: Herder, 2005); Michael Schramm, Hermann-Josef Grosse-Kracht, and Ulrike Kostka, ed., *Der fraglich gewordene Sozialstaat: Aktuelle Streitfelder, ethische Grundlagenprobleme* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2006); Hans-Joachim Höhn, *Ökologische Sozialethik: Grundlagen und Perspektiven* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001); and Duncan Forrester, *On Human Worth: A Christian Vindication of Equality* (London: SCM, 2001).

⁵⁰ See Lucia A. Reisch, ed., *Ethical-Ecological Investment: Towards Global Sustainable Development* (Frankfurt: IKO-Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation, 2001) and Johannes Hoffmann and Gerhard Scherhorn, *Saubere Gewinne: So legen Sie Ihr Geld ethisch-ökologisch an* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002).

⁵¹ Zenon Grocholewski, “La Universidad Católica ante la globalización,” *Seminarium* 4 (2003) 1033–50.

⁵² See Johannes Müller and Mattias Kiefer, ed., *Globalisierung der Gewalt: Welt-*

War, Peace, Reconciliation

The European experience of the last five decades supports the view that an increasing density of economic and political interdependence creates the sense of a common fate and thus reduces the likelihood of nations resorting to war to settle disputes. Yet, even here one is aware of the attendant ambiguities in the integration process since it has been accompanied, in Europe as well as around the world, by rising levels of conflict and by a dramatic increase in annual global military spending.⁵³ Moreover, as a result of global integration the trade in arms (both legal and illegal) grows ever-more lucrative, more technologically sophisticated, and, inevitably, more difficult to control. That the ethics of war and peace continue to be a concern for European social ethicists is, therefore, not surprising since Europe has not only experienced violent conflict in the Balkans, the Basque country, and Northern Ireland, but it is also a “player” (albeit an ambivalent one) in the “war on terror.” As one might expect, most of the ethical reflection centers on the adequacy of the tradition of the just war. However, here too the ambiguities of the political context impact on the theological debate. Thus one set of authors ponders *The Return of the Just War*,⁵⁴ while another considers whether the new wave of terrorism signals the end of the just war concept.⁵⁵ In a series of articles in *Studia moralia*, Brian Johnstone assesses different aspects of the “war on terror” in light of just war criteria. He is confident that, properly applied and combined with the subjective virtue of charity, just war “doctrine” facilitates the assessment of war in a genuinely moral way.⁵⁶ Similar conclusions are arrived at by Piotr Mazurkiewicz, Reinold Schmückler, Fred van Iersel, and Frederik

weite Solidarität angesichts neuer Fronten globaler (Un-)Sicherheit (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005); Thomas Hoppe, *Menschenrechte im Spannungsfeld von Freiheit, Gleichheit, und Solidarität: Grundlagen eines internationalen Ethos zwischen universalem Geltungsanspruch und Partikularitätsverdacht* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002); and Marianne Heimbach-Steins, *Menschenrechte in Gesellschaft und Kirche: Lernprozesse—Konfliktfelder—Zukunftschancen* (Mainz: Grünewald, 2001).

⁵³ The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute estimates that the global budget for 2005 was \$1 trillion, or 2.6% of global GDP; report available at www.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_trends.html (accessed November 15, 2006).

⁵⁴ María Pilar Aquino and Deitmar Mieth, ed., *The Return of the Just War, Concilium 2001/2* (London: SCM 2001).

⁵⁵ Wim Smit, *Just War and Terrorism: The End of The Just War Concept?* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005).

⁵⁶ Brian Johnstone, “The War on Terrorism: A Just War?” *Studia moralia* 40 (2002) 39–61, at 61, and “Pope John Paul and the War in Iraq,” *Studia moralia* 41 (2003) 309–30. See also Oliver O’ Donovan, *The Just War Revisited* (New York: Cambridge University, 2003).

Naert in discussions of humanitarian intervention,⁵⁷ tyrannicide,⁵⁸ martyrdom,⁵⁹ and preemption⁶⁰ respectively.

However, while the just war tradition continues to be the idiom through which the majority of social ethicists assess the morality of war, some are concerned about the hazards of idolatry⁶¹ and self-legitimization inherent therein. These are articulated in Gerhard Beestermöller's "Eurocentricity in the Perception of Wars"⁶² and in the essays of Irina Novikova and Rada Drezgić on the war in the Balkans.⁶³ The late Grace Jantzen's magisterial *Foundations of Violence* also draws attention to what she calls the necrophilic *habitus* of modernity that, unchecked, will continue to bring about violence, death, and destruction. Thus, she argues, we need to construct alternative discourses.⁶⁴ Although not quite accepting the need for an alternative discourse, Johan Verstraeten takes a step in that direction by proposing the reintegration of just war thinking into a more sustainable ethics of conflict resolution.⁶⁵ Paul Valadier dislodges the just war idiom further by arguing that there is a more fundamental question to be addressed, namely, whether and how the Christian tradition can enable the kind of dialogue that will ameliorate irrational fears and encourage the

⁵⁷ See Fred van Iersel, "Catholic Military Chaplaincy and Moral Leadership: Dilemmas in the Just War Tradition," in *Religious Leadership and Christian Identity*, ed. Doris Nauer (Münster: LIT, 2004) 115–29; Piotr Mazurkiewicz, "Humanitarian Intervention: General Conditions for its Admissibility and Practical Difficulties with Its Application," *Societas Ethica Jahresbericht* 40 (2003) 227–45; and Reinold Schmückler, "Can War Be a Moral Action? Toward a Normative Theory of Humanitarian Intervention," *Ethical Perspectives* 11 (2004) 162–75.

⁵⁸ Brian Johnstone, "Political Assassination and Tyrannicide: Traditions and Contemporary Conflicts," *Studia moralia* 41 (2003) 25–40.

⁵⁹ Fred van Iersel, "Stopping the Murdering Martyr: Just War Tradition and the Confrontation with Ethical Asymmetry in Warfare," in *Just War and Terrorism* 165–90.

⁶⁰ Frederik Naert, "The Impact of the Fight against Terrorism on the *ius ad bellum*," *Ethical Perspectives* 11 (2004) 144–61.

⁶¹ See Roger Burggraeve, et al., ed. *Desirable God? Our Fascination with Images, Idols, and New Deities* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

⁶² Gerhard Beestermöller, "Eurocentricity in the Perception of Wars," in *Return of the Just War* 33–42; see also Stanley Hauerwas, Linda Hogan, and Enda McDonagh, "The Case for the Abolition of War in the Twenty-First Century," *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 25 (2005) 17–35.

⁶³ Irina Novikova, "Lessons from the Anatomy of War: Svetlana Alexievich's Zinky Boys" and Rada Drezgić, "Demographic Nationalism in the Gender Perspective," in *War Discourse, Women's Discourse: Essays and Case-Studies from Yugoslavia and Russia*, ed. Svetlana Slapšak (Ljubljana: TOPOS, 2000) 99–116, 211–35.

⁶⁴ Grace M. Jantzen, *Foundations of Violence* (London: Routledge, 2004) 10.

⁶⁵ Johan Verstraeten, "From Just War to Ethics of Conflict Resolution," *Ethical Perspectives* 11 (2003) 99–110.

different religions to recognize their irreducible complementarity,⁶⁶ while Simone Morandini develops the theme in relation to the creation of a peace culture.⁶⁷ For Christians, these issues are particularly challenging since they require us to confront the radical demands of the gospel. François Houtart does not rule out the use of violence in limited circumstances, though he recognizes that the gospel command to love the enemy means that reconciliation with the enemy is also necessary.⁶⁸ Indeed, reflection on the nature of peace-making, especially in postconflict societies, continues to emerge as a significant theme among social ethicists in Europe. Moreover, within this literature the major preoccupation is with reconciliation in the transition from violence to peace.⁶⁹

CONCLUSION

Today “area ethics” are proliferating,⁷⁰ but there are also indications that ethicists wish to move beyond them and refocus on specific problems. This is particularly evident in the superb textbook edited by Marianne Heimbach-Steins in collaboration with Bavarian university colleagues who aim to present an “ethic of society,” acknowledging the need of collabo-

⁶⁶ Paul Valadier, “La barbarie dans la civilization: Réflexions sur le terrorisme international,” *Revue théologique de Louvain* 34 (2003) 457–72, at 472.

⁶⁷ Simone Morandini, “‘Non abbiate timore’ (Gv 14,27): La paura minaccia alla pace,” *Studi ecumenici* 21 (2003) 369–78.

⁶⁸ François Houtart, “Love of Enemy and Class Struggle,” in *Reconciliation in a World of Conflicts*, ed. Luiz Carlos Susin and María Pilar Aquino, Concilium 2003/5 (London: SCM, 2003) 117–25.

⁶⁹ See, e.g., Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, *Rituals and Ethics: Patterns of Repentance—Judaism, Christianity, Islam* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005); Joseph Leichty and David Tombs, ed., *Explorations in Reconciliation: New Directions in Theology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Didier Pollefeyt, ed. *Incredible Forgiveness: Christian Ethics between Fanaticism and Reconciliation* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004); Nico Schreurs, Thomas Plastow, and Albert Nolan, ed. *Juxtaposing Contexts: Doing Contextual Theology in South Africa and in the Netherlands* (Pietermaritzburg: Cluster, 2003) and Bert Roebben and Leo van der Turin, *Practical Theology and the Interpretation of Crossing Boundaries: Essays in Honour of Professor M. P. J. van Knippenberg* (Münster: LIT, 2003).

⁷⁰ In addition to the fields discussed in this essay, it is important to note the bioethics debate continues at a fundamental level. See Dietmar Mieth, *Was wollen wir können? Ethik im Zeitalter der Biotechnik* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002); Konrad Hilpert and Dietmar Mieth, ed., *Kriterien biomedizinischer Ethik: Theologische Beiträge zum gesellschaftlichen Diskurs* (Freiburg: Herder, 2006), containing a wide range of predominantly Catholic positions contrasted with Protestant views—a political statement in itself; and Hille Haker, *Ethik der genetischen Frühdiagnostik: Sozialethische Reflexionen zur Verantwortung am Beginn des menschlichen Lebens* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2002).

ration with other disciplines.⁷¹ The authors allow scope for very different approaches, both philosophical and hermeneutical, including the contribution of biblical interpretation, as well as historical studies of the development of philosophical and specifically Christian ethics, with special attention to the tradition of German Catholic social teaching and the social doctrine of the magisterium. A separate section treats the relevance of the social sciences to ethical thinking, and there are normative interpretations of the person, the common good, solidarity, subsidiarity, sustainability, and justice. Specialized studies cover democratic responsibility and political participation, the neglect of biblical perspectives such as the liberative role of the poor and women, and the importance of education and equality of opportunity. Further studies treat the economic order in ethical perspective, the option for the poor and development, natural resources and intergenerational justice, conflict resolution and a culture of peace, personal development through the phases of life, health care and solidarity, the media and the public sphere, and subsidiarity and participation in the life of the Church.

Especially since Vatican II, some social ethicists sense that Catholic social teaching and Catholic moral theology have gone their separate ways.⁷² The movement among moral theologians to establish the “autonomy of ethics” (*autonome moral*) associated with Alfons Auer, Franz Böckle, Bruno Schüller, and Karl-Wilhelm Merks,⁷³ together with the “new political theology” of Johann Baptist Metz,⁷⁴ tended to play down “official” Catholic social teaching, the former because it subordinated rational argument to the authority of Scripture and the magisterium, the latter because of its neglect of social analysis and political reality. The theological reception of Jürgen Habermas’s discourse ethics⁷⁵ tended to

⁷¹ Marianne Heimbach-Steins, ed., *Christliche Sozialethik: Ein Lehrbuch*, vol. 1, *Grundlagen*; vol 2, *Konkretionen* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2004, 2005).

⁷² See the chapters by Baumgartner and Heimbach-Steins in *Christliche Sozialethik: Grundlagen* and Clemens Breuer, *Christliche Sozialethik und Moraltheologie: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit den Grundlagen zweier Disziplinen und die Frage ihrer Eigenständigkeit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003).

⁷³ For a many-sided discussion, see Karl-Wilhelm Merks, *Gott und die Moral: Theologische Ethik heute* (Münster: LIT, 1998).

⁷⁴ See Johann Baptist Metz, *Zum Begriff der neuen politischen Theologie, 1967–1997* (Mainz: Grünewald, 1997).

⁷⁵ Hans-Joachim Höhn introduced the notion of “comprehensive rationality”; see his “Soziale Differenzierung und plurale Vernunft: Komprehensive Rationalität als Basis einer Christlichen Sozialethik,” in *Christliche Sozialethik zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*, ed. Thomas Hausmanning (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1993) 91–110; see also Höhn, “Konsensus und Konflikt: Diskursethik als Paradigma einer Christlichen Sozialethik,” in *Brennpunkt Sozialethik: Theorien, Aufgaben, Methoden: Für Franz Furger*, ed. Marianne Heimbach-Steins, Andreas Lienkamp,

drive yet another wedge between social teaching and moral theology. However, Christian social ethicists have increasingly come to believe that mysticism and politics⁷⁶ must be brought into a relationship and that ethics must overcome its hesitations about dealing with reason's "other." Moreover, liberation theology and the ecumenical movement's "conciliar process" for Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation (JPIC) have also challenged Catholic social ethics to be more radical and eschatological.⁷⁷ Thus, important questions remain open in this search for methods appropriate to contemporary ethical thinking. In particular, the discussion of the Christian identity of ethics continues despite the insistence on the "autonomy of the moral" in the 1970s and 1980s. Under today's social and scientific conditions, the possibility of a specifically Christian social ethics is becoming a central topic.⁷⁸

and Joachim Wiemeyer (Freiburg: Herder, 1995) 135–51; Höhn, "Dezentrierte Vernunft: Fundamentelethische Konsequenzen der aktuellen Rationalitätskritik," in *Fundamente der theologischen Ethik: Bilanz und Neuansätze*, ed. Adrian Holderegger (Freiburg: Herder, 1996); and Höhn, ed., *Christliche Sozialethik interdisziplinär* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997). For Edmund Arens, Höhn "amputates" Habermas's discourse ethics, using its logical structure but missing its ethical implications; see Arens, "Sozialethik im Diskurs? Hans-Joachim Höhns Beitrag zu einer handlungstheoretisch begründeten Gesellschaftsethik," in *Jenseits Katholischer Soziallehre: Neue Entwürfe christlicher Gesellschaftskritik*, ed. Friedhelm Hengsbach, Bernhard Emunds, and Matthias Möhring-Hesse (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1993) 149–67. See also Edmund Arens, ed., *Anerkennung der Anderen: Eine theologische Grunddimension interkultureller Kommunikation* (Freiburg: Herder, 1995) and Arens, *Kommunikatives Handeln und christlicher Glaube: Ein theologischer Diskurs mit Jürgen Habermas* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997).

⁷⁶ A constant theme for Metz; see Marianne Heimbach-Steins in *Christliche Sozialethik* 157–70.

⁷⁷ See Norbert Greinacher in *Christliche Sozialethik im Anspruch der Zukunft: Tübinger Beiträge zur Katholischen Soziallehre*, ed. Dietmar Mieth (Freiburg: Herder, 1992) 129–53.

⁷⁸ See Hans J. Münk and Michael Durst, ed., *Christliche Identität in pluraler Gesellschaft: Reflexionen zu einer Lebensfrage von Theologie und Kirche heute* (Fribourg: Paulus, 2005) and Christof Mandry, *Ethische Identität und christliche Glaube: Theologische Ethik im Spannungsfeld von Theologie und Philosophie* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002).