

International Common Good in the Light of *Gaudium ET Spes* 26 & 74: A Moral Theological Study

Anozie Onyema

Catholic Institute of West Africa, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

When we talk about international issues, the meaning is pretty clear—issues concerning nations across-board. In this we wish to look at the issue of common good across nations. May be one could ask if there is any “Good” that is internationally common. The answer may seem obvious but a deeper look reveals something different, hence this article. In the same vein, the adage that “what is good for the goose is also good for the gander” sounds too theoretical to be real. In practical terms, experience shows that most people never enjoy what others lavishly expend. Some people wish themselves the pleasure of seeing the four walls of a school even late in their age, while some people graduate at an unimaginable young age. In this article: Common good across borders ...; we argue that the good prevalent in the developed nations should be made available to the developing nations as well. This does not mean a conformism, but a uniformity in diversity. The salvation of the human person for St. Athanasius does not concern only the soul but the whole of the human person, i.e., body and soul; this includes all human beings of any nationality. Analogically, the good of the human person embraces not just particular people, a chosen group, a hybrid but the entire humanity. One is able to strive forward in the face of difficulties if one sees oneself as part of a global community. Concretely, it entails leaders seek the good not just of the members of their particular nations, but also of members of other nations. The leaders of nations that do not adequately care for the global good of others would be very deficient, ineffective, and characterised as incompetent. In the same vein any individual, who clings to his or her particular nation or autonomy or seeks only one’s well-being without adequate reference to the global community or the macro group is surely on the false direction. Such a person is selfish and may sooner or later discover that without the macro-community, one’s reference point though the micro community would eventually not succeed adequately and may not fundamentally reach the self-fulfilment one desires.

Keywords: Common Good, Human Person, Justice, Morality, Across Nations, Global, Community

Introduction

“Common good refers to the sum total of social conditions, which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfilment more fully and more easily” (*Gaudium et spes* 26). This conception of

Fr. Anozie Onyema (*Ph.D*) is a priest of the Catholic Diocese of Umuahia. A Professor and the Head of Ethics/Moral Theology Department at the Catholic Institute of West Africa Port Harcourt. He is the Liaison Officer (Deputy Rector) and currently the President of The Catholic Association of Moral Theologians Nigeria (CAMTHN). He is member of the Catholic Theological Ethics in the World Church and Member of the Global Ethics. He is the author of *Morality in the Society – as the Body so the Society, 2011*; also, *Theological Ethical Moral Study (TEMS) vols 1&2*, Hamburg, 2013. other books and numerous articles in his area of specialisation.

common good has meaning if understood in the light of the nations. Groups and individuals, especially the developing nations cannot meaningfully function if they are excluded from the overall common good. Common good concerns the life of all human beings irrespective of where one finds oneself. This calls for prudence from individuals and citizens of various nations especially those in national leadership positions. Essentially, the fact of common good presupposes respect for persons of every nationality, which implies respect for fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person through which each nation participates in the global affairs. This implies that persons perform their obligations in both national and international levels. Common good demands that each person and by implication each nation be developed, since through the development of individuals, each nation is able to participate globally and optimally in the affairs of the global community (Siroco Robert, 2002, No. 167). This is true in terms of *Gaudium et spes* 74 which indicates that common good includes all the infrastructures that allow persons or group of persons optimally and ordinarily to achieve self-fulfilment.

For this to be possible there is need to accept God's moral command—moral law, which John Paul II holds that it is destined to intersect with human freedom. This happens in such a way that man's free obedience to God and of God's completely gratuitous benevolence towards man eloquently manifests itself in the crosspollination of interdependence not only of persons but of nations. This implies that obedience to God is not, as some would believe, a heteronomy, as if the moral life were subject to the will of something all-powerful, absolute, extraneous to man and intolerant of his freedom. John Paul II argues that if in fact a heteronomy of morality were to mean a denial of man's self-determination or the imposition of norms unrelated to his good, this would be a contradiction to the Revelation of the Covenant and of the redemptive incarnation. Such a heteronomy would be nothing but a form of alienation, contrary to divine wisdom and to the dignity of the human person (John Paul II, 1993, p. 41; Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986). Ronald D. Lawer suggests that John Paul II in answer to the question what basis could be offered as the grounds on which the individual and social rights grow, replies the basis is the dignity of the human person. John Paul II holds that man's greatness is both evident and always in peril, evident in the modern age, which has endlessly repeated its respect for the human person and formulated charters for human rights with great intensity (Lawer, 1982, p. 29).

On the one hand it is observable that from the depths of the human being it is certain that each person is endowed with inalienable rights and that the human person is intrinsically of inestimable value. This demands that human rights may never be violated anywhere irrespective of one's nationality. Regrettably, it is recognised that the modern culture doubts the transcendental value of the human person. This is attested to by the fact that though modern culture has praised the human person it has regrettably dehumanised, humiliated, and crushed the spirit of man, especially through selfish nationalism. It is also to be noted that this is an age where genocide, totalitarianism, and purges of repeated slaughter of whole populations have come to be. The experiences of war all over the world confirm this is an age in which killing of the other from a different nation has become an acceptable policy not just in the case of the unborn children. The incessant suicide-attacks mark this as an age in which killing the other is priced noble. Sometimes the aged and people of other nationalities are termed useless and meaningless and are in danger of being counted worthless. The argument for euthanasia on reasons of old age or terminal illness is a known case. Whatever the reason and argument may be there are rights which are intrinsic to the human person wherever one finds oneself, such rights can never be violated without one incurring great offence. The rights being referred to are not, in the first place conventional, those

which are recognised by the changing legislations of civil society, but they are rooted in fundamental principles, in the moral law which is based on being itself and which is immutable (John Paul II, 1983). On the basis of this the society should be organised in every nation such that the human person is adequately taken care of notwithstanding where one finds oneself. Precisely the common good across borders would help make this possible.

Common Good and the Human Person

For the Christian, it is necessary to reiterate that the concept of the human person is drawn not only and solely from what is both scriptural and trado-cultural ethics but what could be called in the strict sense Christian character of the message of Christ. As far as the human person is considered the Christian notion elevates the dignity of the human person by a consciousness of its affinity to the God as creator. In order to protect this dignity the Church for instance exhorts all to be committed to the elimination of injustice, to work for peace and the overcoming of hatred and violence, to promote man's dignity, to feel responsible for the poor, the sick, the alienated and the oppressed, the refugees and the exiles and the dispersed, just as for so many others whom our solidarity must reach—this cuts across nations. Bridges across nations would be built, if individuals are treated and recognized as such anywhere one finds oneself no matter one's nationality.

Common Good Across Nations

The fact of common good is understood as a good which is required by all the members of the community or nation. In this sense, it is not just a temporary good, an external good, but a good common to all—to be shared in by all persons of every nation and to be attained through the global (common) responsibility of all who make up the global society. Certainly, common good on the international scene does not contradict the individual end of each nation, since it is derived from natural law it cannot command what is intrinsically evil; however, it can prohibit an act, which though good in itself would in concrete circumstance be against a specific good. In the pursuit of the common good the individual nation's good is not neglected, nor is violence done to national integrity. The true good of the nations and the protection of the national integrity consist, in the observance of the natural law which imposes duties on global community as well as individual nations (Drummond, 1995, pp. 13-14). This is reiterated by Pope Paul VI when he says that no one may appropriate goods solely for his own benefits and private use alone, especially if others lack the basic necessities of life. He alludes to the Church Fathers, who hold that the right of private ownership may never be exercised to the detriment of the public well-being. Here one may interpolate that it is wrong for some nations and even persons to be extremely rich, while many other nations and individuals are stricken in abject poverty. In actual fact should there be a conflict between national (personal) need and global (public) need; obviously the global (public) need takes precedence. He further substantiates that all those involved in the education of the young should endeavour to provide for the common good with particular attention to an atmosphere conducive for the growth of chastity so that true liberty may prevail over license and the norms of moral rectitude may be fully preserved (Pope Paul VI, 1964, Nos. 22-23).

In this vein, it should be emphatically stated that just limits of jurisdiction of authority are fixed by the exigencies of the common good. The fact is that the common good has no other reason for existence than to aid the individuals irrespective of place of origin in the fulfilment of their personal destinies and to compensate for their natural deficiencies. Therefore, their personally isolated or spontaneously united initiatives, if sufficient

for the realisation of an objective through collective effort show the intervention of the global authority becomes superfluous and may even be harmful (Corrigan & O'Toole, 1994, p. 235). The implication is that a higher body may not replace a lower in what properly or strictly speaking belongs to the lower. This is true only when the lower is able and is in the position to discharge its duty. Otherwise, it would be over-demanding from the lower, what though belongs to it, but it is unable or is incapacitated to effectively implement.

The emphasis of the Second Vatican Council Fathers in *Gaudium et Spes* 74 that the common good comprises the sum total of all social conditions that lead to self-actualisation must in essence translate the will of the lawgiver in theory, which explains the common aspiration in functional terms. The Genesis narrative (Gen 1 and 2) teaches that God created male and female alike; black and white. The colour or gender does not diminish the image of God in any human being. St. Paul speaking on the equality of human beings before God holds that there is no Greek or Jew, no slave or master, no woman or man (Gal 3:28). In God through Jesus Christ all share in the divine nature of God. This imposes on all humans the need to work for the good and uphold what ennobles the other. This demands that all put the common good ahead of the personal or simple national interest to promoting the general community interest, the universal Church, and in fact the global community. The reason for this is that we belong to the one body of Christ (Pope Paul VI, 1964, No. 69). Concretely, Pope Paul VI argues that it is not permissible for individuals—this equally applies to nations, who have acquired much wealth even if this is rightfully earned through the resources and activities of their country to deposit such excess wealth just for their own use alone. Those who do so commit serious offence against the more poor nations in general and against individuals particularly. It may even become obligatory to expropriate these excesses in order to remedy the lacks of the other nations and individuals.

The Principle of Common Good

Common good concerns the life of all irrespectively of nationality and calls for prudence from persons of different nations, especially those in authority, which implies respect for fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person through which each performs one's obligations in the society. Common good demands that each person be developed, since through it each is able to participate optimally in the affairs of one's community (Siroco Robert, 2002, No. 167) and also in the global community. Since common good includes all the infrastructures that allow persons or group of persons either as individuals or as communities optimally and ordinarily to achieve self-fulfilment (*GS* 74), there is need to insist that what is basic to life be made available to all.

The implication is that structures would be erected that help people achieve their proposed ends. It means also ordinarily the art of using well whatever is available in a nation bearing the good of the each person in mind. This implies that each nation or group takes care of the need of its members, which by simple logic imposes on each the responsibility to care for what affects the other. In fact each has a duty towards the good of the other. Common good principle has both implicit and explicit morality. Implicit morality defines strategies for the pursuit of an event such that all draw from the overall event. This influences decisions on the exigencies one improvises as one attends to every event. The implicit morality compares with that morality, which however performs the task of internal evidence, which should naturally motivate the common goal. It is the driving force behind all engagements. It is similar to what Okonkwo Patrick calls functionally operative standard at the service of man's authentic development and ultimate self-realisation (Okonkwo Patrick, 2002, pp. 157-160). It demands that always questions be asked as to what is most needed, i.e., what competencies are

required for instance by a nation, what services should be anticipated for others, what are the available resources, the durability, energy, or expenditure, all taken together or individually, which serve the purpose in view especially for any nation. Therefore, the explicit morality in deciding what is good and essential at the global level sets out terms of reference and conditions for objective participation of the nations.

This when looked at from the purview of the global society shows that temporal good, though an external good, remains a good generally common and shared by all. It is attained through the common efforts and participation of all who make up the global society complementing individual national needs. In this case such a good expresses global/public peace and prosperity. Its relationship to national or individuals is also stipulated (Drummond, 1995, p. 13). To realise the common good entails clarity of purpose—clarity of perspective and responsible maintenance. For the functionality of common good the Church and the State must agree to serve the same end the good of persons of any nation. This implies that they should work together in principle for the realisation and promotion of the common purpose.

Church and State in Service of a Common Goal

There can be no real or true global society, where there is no adequate consciousness of the national common good. This indicates primarily that there can be no real peace in the world if there is no true notion of justice among nations. While it is the duty of the Church to preach justice and peace, the global community (local States as well) should make it a point of duty to see that there is fairness in the distribution of justice. This calls for the authentic observation of those things that promote peace and justice in the society first and foremost maintained. The social teaching of the Church would succeed with much difficulty if local governments and international body are completely on the opposite side. A glance at the desire of the universal Church and global concerns shows that both are fundamentally not opposed to each other. Both seek the good of the human person only through different methods. In effect both Church and the international community should strive to see that they provide ways and means to attending to the authentic need of the poor nations and the marginalised. Not just the Christians but all may no longer keep quiet over the injustices done in the global society. It is a global social responsibility binding on all to speak out with one voice, whenever there is a national ill. Until the members of the global community agree together over issues that concern the nations particularly and fight this commonly there may continue to be untold injustice.

The Church hierarchy should be able to lead the people always to let the Governments know what preoccupies them. It should be the moral duty of the Church to train the moral conscience of the people such that any Government that does not care for the people should be vehemently opposed, rejected, and demonstrated against and eventually a more humane Government elected. Experience shows that the human person needs life in society in order to develop in accordance with human-nature. On this assumption the canon law instructs that societies, such as the family and the state, correspond more directly to the nature of man (CCC 1892). Generally, the family offers each member the security and support one requires at various stages in life. It is still pertinent to ask what the end of the common good is all about. A clear picture of this would confirm its capacity to build bridge across nation.

The End of Common Good

The end of the common good or goal, which is also significant can be called the value, which is fundamental, namely. Analogically, this can be explained with a simple example that we all know through the

working of the body. St. Paul talks about the unity of the body in his unique Body-Analogy that indicates stupidity and selfishness of any part of the body works for its good only. For want of space the text (1Cor 12) is not reproduced here but it is recommended that it be read at leisure. Certainly, if all the parts of the body were only hand, or nose, or eye, or ear, just only one part of the body, we would not talk about human body, but a mass. Common sense shows that no part of the body works for itself alone. The strongest part of the body cares for the good of the weakest. Whatever any part of the body does is done for the good of the whole. Humanity is exactly like that. The body is worth the name only if each member does what it is supposed to do. In the same light humanity is so called only if each nation takes the interest of other nations at heart. The point is, if any nation refuses to do what she ought to do, it is equivalent to any part of the body refusing its function. However, this requires that competence be the essential factor in the organization of global community.

On the political system mostly in the underdeveloped nations, it seems it is the only place where people come into power without competence. How could someone become president who does not know the history of the nation one wishes to lead? There may be need to set national history exams for would-be leaders both at the national as well as the international levels. Specific leadership positions should be reserved to only those who have adequate competence. For any nation to succeed, and by implication global peace rests fundamentally on the availability common good for all within their various locations.

Application of the Common Good

A theocentric foundation is ascribed to African communalism by Dozie-Okafor, when he indicates that the communities at the various stages see themselves as related such that the society is seen in terms of a community of brothers and sisters. The sense of having the same root and of coming from the same soil remains quite pronounced prior to the events associated with liberal development. It is a common belief that all descended from the same ancestry and so everyone is (*Nwachukwu*) a child of God. The implication is that since all have a common root—a common ancestry, surely nothing, not even the quarrel some hours ago would be able to separate relations (Dozie-Okafor, 1994, p. 23). The binding string of communality makes one endeared to one's community. One is there not just for oneself but for the other. "A communal sense of life makes one responsible for oneself and for everyone else. It evokes in everyone a great degree of interest in the well-being of others, and in what others are doing to realize their well-being" (Dozie-Okafor, 1994, p. 25). The individual excellence is owed to the community. My progress is not just mine but ours. It is the community that gives the individual a lift, the so much desired force and encouragement which spurs one to reach the heights. Communal spirit in Africa entrenches the spirit of solidarity, such that the failure as well as the success of the individual is also that of the whole community.

This is made clearer in the novel: *The African* in which William Conton presents a portrait of the African interrelationship by sketching the expectation of the community over a young man who begins a new career. The young man's reaction to the letter he receives from his father shows the African sentiment over the individual and his community. The letter first brings him the congratulations of his father and the family on his success. Then the father goes on to remind him that he had now started to climb a palm tree which was high and difficult to climb, that many were watching his progress, and much ripe fruit was awaiting him on the successful conclusion of his climb. The father ends with the warning that if he failed to reach the top, those watching him both living and dead, would curse him for disappointing or failing them. On the other hand, if he reached the top in order simply to fill his bag with fruits for himself, he would surely become sick and fall to

the ground and die. But if he returned to his people to share with them the fruit of his labors, then all would sing his praise and thank him and honor those who had brought him to life (Conton, 1982, pp. 21-22). It is important to state that the efforts and labors belong to the individual; however, the community gives one the moral support and sometimes also material support as well.

The responsibility of the community over her members and the commitment of the community to carry and support the individual make it rather not in line with the African mentality to see one's success as one's lonesome effort. Every success can be called collaborative. What John T. Ford says about the Catholics and Methodists working together give support collaborative efforts. He says

In many places, such mutual acceptance—sometimes more implicit than explicit—has already resulted in collaborative efforts in charitable outreach, social initiatives, civic concerns, and humanitarian projects. In some places, Catholics and Methodists have cooperated in sponsoring vacation bible schools, interfaith dialogues and Christian educational projects. On the local level, Methodists and Roman Catholics have come together to dialogue about their areas of shared agreement. (Foraker, 2002, pp. 10-11)

Karl Marx argument that people become estranged from their human nature whenever they are prevented from assuming collective responsibility for the society and the institutions to which they belonged supports the view on collaboration (Baum, 1998). Karl Marx supports the idea that capital market is good, but since it does not protect the common good or the poor from exploitation by the rich, the market should be regulated by the Government and humanized by an ethically moral fraternal culture. This fact gives credence to stance nobody does everything! Each individual or nation has something to contribute for the common good.

The film-industry teaches a lot about interdependence; anyone who has watched the film: *Air Force One* would easily see why it is important that leaders care for their subjects. In that film some lost their lives in an attempt to protect Mr. President, who with the family was on board the *Airforce One*.¹ Clearly, without these people who sacrificed their lives for Mr. President there would be no way he would have survived with his family. The protection given to the Mr. President even started with the building of the presidential jet, a plane with a lot of features and facilities that guarantee safety. Although one would notice some lacks in the safety measures, the success of the battle in the air depended on the adequate coordination between Mr. President who was held hostage in his plane and the ground-crew.

The point of common good obviously shows that although the president had to take most of the decisions under an uncomfortable atmosphere, he was not just thinking of himself alone, which without the support and cooperation of the people on-ground and the readiness of many to sacrifice their own lives he would not have survived. Morality of the common good seen from this perspective demands a leader takes adequate steps to see to the good of the people he leads. One thing is certain; no leader can succeed without the sacrifice of a lot of people, sometimes, people who have not the least access to him. On the other hand, the people themselves should know that without their unanimous and unalloyed support any government no matter how determined is doomed to fail. In addition, it could be said that a wise leader knows that he would fail without the support of his subjects; therefore, he is bound to see to the good of each and every one of his members. A corollary is that wise people know that their support and contributions are needed if their government should succeed. This is why for instance; it is an offence to elude taxes. One expects as already stated that if people try to give their

¹ When the president is on board the plane with his apparatus such during presidential visit, such aircraft is regarded as Airforce One. However, in this case a film!

support and cooperation, then, the person at the top should be able to protect those below. In a word, analogically, the issue of the common good makes it reasonable that humanity sits in boats opposite one another; it is only the common good that forms the connecting bridge, without which they would remain sundered from one another. For persons in each boat to reach the other side there must be a connecting bridge—the common good. The maintenance of this bridge, that is the provision of the common is a moral duty incumbent on all, especially the leaders of developed nations. This calls for corresponding effort and response of the developing nations in order to have the required results.

Actualization of the Common Good Across Borders

Pope Benedict describes the common good in terms of loving and caring for the other. He holds that to love someone is to desire that person's good and to take effective steps to secure it. He notes that besides the good of the individual, there is another good linked to the community life. The common good for him is the good of "all of us", made up of individuals, families, and intermediate groups who together constitute society. "It is a good that is sought not for its own sake, but for the people who belong to the social community and who can only really and effectively pursue their good within it" (Benedict XVI, 2009, No. 7). He holds strongly that to desire the common good and strive towards it is a requirement of justice and charity. To take a stand for the common good is on the one hand to be solicitous for, and on the other hand to avail oneself of, that complex of institutions that give structure to the life of society, juridical, civilly, politically and culturally, making it the *pólis*, or "city". He further states that the more we strive to secure a common good corresponding to the real needs of our neighbors, the more effectively we love them. It means every Christian and of course everyone is called to practice this charity, in a manner corresponding to one's vocation and according to the degree of influence one wields in the *pólis*. This is the institutional path, which may be understood as the political path to charity no less excellent and effective than the kind of charity which encounters the neighbor directly, outside the institutional mediation of the *polis* (Benedict XVI, 2009, No. 7).

The commitment to the common good when animated by charity has greater worth than a merely secular and political stand would have. In effect all commitment to justice has a place within the testimony of divine charity that paves the way for eternity through temporal action. In essence man's earthly activity, when inspired and sustained by charity, contributes to the building a bridge across nations that eventually leads to the universal city of God, which is the goal of the history of the human family. In an increasingly globalized society, the common good and the effort to obtain it cannot fail to assume the dimensions of the whole human family, that is to say, the community of peoples and nations, in such a way as to shape the earthly city in unity and peace, rendering it to some degree an anticipation and a prefiguration of the undivided city of God. Pope Benedict observes also that once profit becomes the exclusive goal, if it is produced by improper means and without the common good as its ultimate end, it risks destroying wealth and creating poverty. He holds that economic activity cannot solve all social problems through the simple application of commercial logic. One fact we are vehemently confronted with is the fact the rich would have no peace as long as the poor, the marginalized, and downtrodden are discriminated upon and looked at as second class citizens. There is need to direct the pursuit of the common good, for which the political community in particular must also take responsibility. Therefore, it must be borne in mind that grave imbalances are produced when economic action, conceived merely as an engine for wealth creation, is detached from political action, conceived as a means for pursuing justice through redistribution (Benedict XVI, 2009, No. 36).

Conclusion

It is the belief of this article that through the availability of the common good world-over, bridges would be built across nations. The issue at stake is that if the basic common goods exist across borders: life, shelter, education, good roads, security, electricity, and water if made available everywhere there would be peace and harmony among peoples. This would establish the nations firmly on their own geographical locations. Migration would most certainly reduce drastically. If the basic necessities of life are provided people all over the global community would have less need to leave their homes for other places. If we take the issue of urban migration for instance, if the amenities available in the cities are made available in the villages, it would be superfluous to leave one's comfort zone to a place of probability. This also applies to the nations. If what one looks for in another nation is readily available in one's nation, it would be certainly most improbable that one leaves one's home for another nation to seek the same things. People are driven to move because of need one goes where one hopes to find what one seeks. Therefore, the surest way to build bridges across the nations is to provide solid education, good roads, good drinking water, constant electricity, adequate protection of lives and property to all the nations. To build bridges across nations it is mandatory to see that all the common good in the developed nations is also available in the developing nations. If good schools are available in one's country why would one leave for another country to be educated? There would certainly be no need to seek what one has in a more distant place. The fact is that driven by lack people are always on move in search of what they cannot find in their homes. It is the conviction of this article that the peace of the world lies in human hands, namely; providing the mere necessities of life all over the nations would instill less need and migration and engender acceptance and receptivity to complementarity.

References

- Baum, G. (1998). An ethical critique of capitalism: Contributions of modern Catholic social teaching. In C. E. Curran and R. A. McCormick (Eds.), *John Paul II and moral theology* (pp. 237-254). New York: Paulist Press.
- Benedict XVI, P. (2009). *Encyclical letter Caritas in Veritate*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Conton, W. (1982). *The African*. Ibadan: Heineman.
- Corrigan, J. M., & O'Toole, G. B. (Eds.). (1994). *"Person and society": Race: Nation: Person*. New York: Burns and Noble.
- Dozie-Okafor, C. (1994). *Towards integral nationhood*. Owerri: Lemmy Press.
- Drummond, W. F. (1995). *Social justice*. Milwaukee, The Bruce Pub. Co. 1955.
- Foraker, G. A. (January 2002). Yearning to be one, Y'all: Reflections on a Roman Catholic/United Methodist dialogue in Knoxville, Tennessee, Summer 2001. *Ecumenical Trends*, 31(1), 10-11.
- JOHN PAUL II, Human experimentation Genetic Engineering DANGERS OF GENETIC MANIPULATION October 29, 1983 (Address to members of the World Medical Association).
- John Paul II, S. (1993). *The splendor of truth encyclical letter: Veritatis Splendor*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Lawer, Ronald D. (OFM), 1982, 1982, *The Christian Personalism of John Paul II*, Illinois Chicago.
- Okonkwo Patrick, I. (2002). *Minorities and the problem of fairness—a social ethical enquiry with special attention to the problem of minorities in Nigeria*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag GmbH.
- Pope Paul VI. (6 August, 1964). *Ecclesia Suam, encyclical letter, on the church*. AAS 56 (1964).
- Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. (March 22, 1986). *"The truth makes us free": Instruction on Christian freedom and liberation—Libertatis Conscientia*.
- Siroco Robert, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace: The social agenda of the Catholic Church*. New York Burns & Oates.