

LECTURE GIVEN BY DR. JULIO FAUSTO FERNANDEZ, ASSISTANT  
SECRETARY OF JUSTICE AND PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF  
EL SALVADOR.-



The organizers of the INTE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY OF PAX ROMANA have designated me to develop before you the theme entitled "MAN AND THE BODY POLITIC"

I realize that I am not the person best prepared to approach a theme of such importance. If I have accepted this responsibility, which honors me so much, although it is above my intellectual capacity, - it is, only, because of spirit of discipline and as an expression of my sincere desire to serve, this great international movement "PAX ROMANA", which, signifies a hope for the humanity anguished of our days.

It is known above all that we Catholics, as such, are not obliged to profess a determined philosophy: We are only obliged to refuse the philosophical ideas which oppose the doctrines of our Religion. This liberty in choosing the philosophical doctrine contains implicitly the conclusion that, whatever be the adopted position, it may be criticized from distinct points of view from the chosen one. The complexity of the theme, together with the impossibility of choosing a point of view exempt from possible criticism, it has almost made me give up the task. Nevertheless, with the help of God, and your benevolence, I will advance in the best form I am able.

Following a methodological principle praised by St. Thomas Aquinas, it will be necessary, in this case, to proceed before all to make a series of distinctions, in order then to try to make an adequate synthesis.

With this purpose it will be necessary to define, first, the concept of a person; after, the concept of society, in order to stress what are the ends of a person and what the ends of society, with the object of being able to determine at last, although only in general terms, the attitude which the Christian ought to assume before the body politic of which he performs a part.

Of "man", we can give some definitions: he is able to be called "a rational animal"; we can define him as being social and also as a living organism conscious of himself. But I suspect that these definitions only take into consideration the man placed in the purely natural level. To the Christian there is more interest, much more, in knowing man in the aspect where this human being immersed in the natural world touches the supernatural level. Therefore, the supernatural dimension of the human soul, which is called to an eternal destiny, is that which ought to be stressed here, but, because of this, the theme is immediately transported from a physiological definition of man, to the definition of "person". It is, therefore, the concept of person which needs clarification.

The place which this concept occupies in the Christian philosophy is so important that Rideau has been able to write: "The Christian thinking has found in this idea of person a truly central idea, the nucleus of



of all relations which tie man to nature, to society and to God Himself, a which defines his attitudes before these realities."

According to the well known and old definition of Boecio, a person is "an individual substance of rational nature". According to this, not every individual is a person. We only call persons those individuals, who, owing to their rational nature possess a higher quality; those individuals which represent, more or less consciously, a role in the historical drama and who have something to say to others. When we affirm that man is a person, we mean that he is not only a piece of material, but an individual who sustains himself by intellect and will - a human being capable of thinking, of loving, of deciding for himself his own destiny; and individual who, in a certain way, is a whole and not a part; a microcosm which is able to contain the entire universe because of intellectual capacity, and, because of love, he is able to give himself freely to other human beings. In a word, a person is a rational individual. The rationality of man implies, on one hand, the essential liberty of a person and on the other the perfection of the intelligence and the will permits the generosity of human relations.

From what has been said it can be easily understood why the Christian philosophers have always been interested in the concept of person. But there is something more: a authentic Christian philosophy should not be able to separate itself from the principles contained in the Gospel. Now, the Gospel speaks a concrete language which one is not able to understand unless he takes into consideration that man in the sacred text is considered as a person, that is, as a free being who has a value of his own.

Always that man is treated, not as a thing, but as a "being", worthy of our love and to whom we are obliged to sacrifice even our own interests, we are considering that man in himself has a value. Our Lord Jesus Christ, upon offering his life for the Redemption of each and every man has given us the most sublime example of the way in which we ought to esteem the intrinsic value of the human person. There must be something very worthwhile in man when the Son of God suffered and died to redeem him - Jesus Himself has ordered us to love the human person in the same way in which He has loved Him: "As the Father has loved me, so have I loved you. There is no greater love that a man lay down his life for his friends" (Juan XV, 9, 12-13).

The importance which both the evangelical text and the Christian philosophy give for the intrinsic value of the human person brings with it various undeniable consequences: First: The internal freedom of man ought not only to be considered as a fact, but, in addition, esteemed as a value which ought to be respected at all cost.

Second: The dignity of the human person transcends the natural world and touches the supernatural world of grace.





Third: The unity of human kind is a fact which derives itself from the essential equality between men, as possessors, each one of us, of an immortal soul.

Fourth: The fraternal love to other is, for the Christian, not only a work of philanthropy, but a divine command.

Let us stop a moment to make brief general considerations about each of the conclusions made so far.

The importance which the authentic Christian gives to the liberty is such, that Grevill has been able to write: "Christianity is a personal religion which manifests the same ambition of the majority of modern doctrines: that of liberating the person from all menial restriction. It is not that we are saying to man that he ought to stop having human instincts or to try to be what he is not, but that he is invited to transform his heart because of his faith in Christ, before abandoning himself to his free will. Nevertheless, the principal force which it demands, is not to have a literal observation of the law and commandments, but to transform his soul because of true faith, to the end it will be done spontaneously finally, because of love. The ultimate ideal is the liberty, the liberty of the sons of God, because God does not want from the Christian that he obey because of interest or fear, simply, but that he show himself to be His son following the example of Jesus".

The understanding of moral and psychological understanding of man, brings as an immediate corollary the necessity of respect for the dignity of the human person, therefore, the recommendation of Saint Bernard is understandable, according to which the man ought not to forget ever neither his dignity of personal being, nor the divine origin of this dignity, to the end that he will have a just pride in himself.

Without pride whatsoever we are able to affirm that no philosophy has insisted so much on the concept of the dignity of the person now has analyzed so closely the essence of the personality, as Christian philosophy. In order to explain rationally as far as that is possible, the revealed Doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of the Person of Christ, in which there are two natures, the divine and the human, the Christian philosophy is seen to be obliged to stress in its metaphysics the greatest precision in the concept of person. On the other hand, this philosophy upon elevating the human person to a divine order, exalted the value of the personality.

In November of 1942, Pope Pius XII said: "Do you want the star of peace to rise and shine over society?--Work with all your forces to give to the human person the dignity which which God has enriched it from its origin". And in his Christmas message of the same year, he pointed out the basis of a Christian juridical order which has as its first point the respect for the human person, then the defense of unity of society and the family, the dignity and prerogatives of work and the juridical guarantees which defend man from another's free will. In 1945 the Pope insist continued to exhorting the building of "an socio-economical order more adequate with the divine laws and with the human dignity at the same time".



The Christian social doctrine bases itself in the Aristotelian-Thomistic concept of man. Man is not only material, nor only spirit, but a being between the purely animal world and the purely spiritual world; a composite combination in which material and spirit are united substantially and form a single individual person. In all the human acts it is the COMPOSITE which acts: it is the composite man, the substantial unity of the two elements, which think and build.

Because man is a rational animal, his interior world is ruled by its own laws, different from the laws which rule the natural world.

The world of reason has its own laws, different from the laws which rule the world of irrational life, in the same way in which living beings present phenomena which do not agree with inert nature. The human being does not move so much because of impulses coming from the outside as happens to inanimate things, nor does he have all his movements included in a self-regulated as the animals, but that he KNOWS his ends and can with liberty (with liberty of selection) direct his hands to a voluntary action. The rationality of man means, on one hand, essential liberty of the person, on the other, a perfection of the intelligence and will that opens possibilities of communication with others. Man is, in that way, an open entity: he tends by nature to the social life and to communication with other men, by means of intelligence and charity.

The language of Aristotelian metaphysics says that man (as the other natural beings) is composed of matter and form: his matter is his organic body,--its form, his spiritual soul. Matter here means the indeterminate element and can be of the same quality as the other beings. Form means the determinate element: that determines the nature of a being. Matter is the perfectible POTENCY and the form the ACT which gives the determined perfection. The individuality comes to man by the matter; the personality, on the other hand, through the form. Upon creating the place of man in society, we must consider his double aspect, of the individual and the person. That means that we must realize the special dignity that the spiritual personality gives to the simple material individuality.

Another natural consequence of the Christian concept of person, of the recognition of his liberty and of the respect to his high dignity, is the affirmation of the unity of mankind. It has been said with reason: "The concept of the unity of mankind is the Christian name, and more important, of the quality of the nature between men". However, the Christian philosophy in establishing emphatically the unity of mankind that has its roots in the quality of the nature between men, it does not fall into a leveling equalitarianism. Being essentially a realistic philosophy it can be unknown the multiple particular modalities of every being. Coming from the principle of individualization which Thomism affirms emphatically, the primacy of the quality of the essence over the singular diversification. "Then we can affirm at the same time the essential equality that joins men in the rational nature, and the particular natural disequities that are born from this same nature and disequity. But for the same



reason, we also see that equality is the principal and the disc secondary. It is from this that talking in an absolute way, the of essence means more than the individual diversities, and the than branches. "The generic unity between men as says His Holiness Pius XII in the encyclical "Summi Pontificatus" in October 20, 1929, it bases "In the unity of its origin in God, in its composite nature resembled in us, in a material body and spiritual and immortal soul; and in the unity of his immediate end and its mission in the world; in the unity of his habitant: the world, of whose goods all the men by the power of their nature can use to mantain and to develop his life ; in the unity of his supernatural end: God Himself, to Whom all of us should tend; in the unity of the means to get that end... "I... in the unity of his relation with the Son of God..., in the unity of the rescue made by Christ for all of us."

In so far as the fraternal obligation between men, we can say that if the first Christians felt somewhat perp-lexed when they asked, "Who iw my neighbor?", to present-day Christians should have no doubt that his neighbor is the one he should love, is every other man, no matter what his social position, his education, his origen or race, if we did not have the Divine Precept which says: "A new commandment I give you, that you love one another as I have loved you", it would be enough that all men are adopted brothers of Jesus Christ, and from that consideration emerges the obligation of reciprocal love and help that should reign between brothers. Making a synthesis of what we have said, we can affirm the following: The personality is realized in the full realization of the essential end of man. In other words, the person there is in every rational individual must be realized theologically, voluntarily, conciously and freely so that by his nature or essence man is called to realize.

Making a synthesis of what we have said, we can assert the following: The personality is fully realized in the free consecution of t he essential goal of man. In other words, the person there is in each rational individual may realize theologically, voluntarily, conciously and freely that by his nature or essence, man is called to fulfill. Every man has, as a consequence, the right to have the necessary means or instruments to perfect himself, which concerns with that wich is the cult of the personality. This right is an inalienable faculty. On the other hand,. The duties of man toward his own personality make irrenunciabile the nexssary right to the full realization of the person.

The dignity of the person means that the man, by the mere fact of being a rational individual, has the right to be respected as a whole. that he is master of himself and of his acts. Man, the human person, does not have, consequently, the value of a means or instrument, but the goal. This whole never, can be a simple instrument in the hands of the State because he is master of his own destiny, lord of himself and subject of rights have their source in the very rational natur . Persons have not been made for the State (like totalitarian doctrines want), but the State





for the person. The goal, not only of the State, but of the whole social life, its to dignify the person making possible that he may attain that fullness of its development by means of the free access to material and spiritual goods furnished by civilization and culture. That is why it is said that person has the value of a goal and the state the value of a means. There are somethings that are owed to the human person by only fact of being such a person. If the person is an independent whole and not only the part of a physical universe, necessarily he has the right to decide by himself about everything that concerns his personal destiny. In front any temporal power, a person is free to choose the way that he feels is the better to obtain the full development, and he is free to fulfill in the way he feels is right, the happiness of a person. Man has, thus, the right to fulfill his destiny, but if he has this right, he has also the right to do things necessary to realize this destiny. As notions of right and duty are correlative, it results that if a man has a right to the goods necessary to fulfill his destiny, coming from this right ther derives the obligation to make use of those goods for the conquest of the non-temporal goods and the duty to respect the liberty of autonomy of any other person. A declaration of individual and social rights of man should, therefore, be completed with a declaration of the duties and responsibilities of man to the communities of which he forms a part: family, community, and national and international communities. Both right and duty rest, in the last analysis, upon the characteristic of the person.

Another aspect that it would be good to mention here is that personality can only be fully realized within society and therefore, it is there where the rights of the person find their natural and proper place.

Once we have shown the social nature of man and following the same Thomistic principle we may distinguish so as to unite, it seems necessary to come to the investigation of what is the nature of society. In some political ideologies like the individualism and anarchism that is its logical consequence, we find below all this a sociological thesis that states that society has not a proper being, but the simple sum of individual beings. Those who tacitly or expressly maintain these additionist theory of society do not see the characteristic and specific nature of the social phenomenas. For them the individual is everthing: society does not mean anythin. Ther are no duties of the individual toward's the society, only exists the right of each man in relation to other, and you cannot therefore, restricte the absolute rights of the individual in the collective welfare.

In open antagonism with the agregacionist theory, we find the substantialist theory of the society, which makes of this a substantial reality, a being in and for itself with its own life, independent of the individuals whiche compose it. Within the substancialist thesis we are able, in turn, to point our three large tendencies: that of organic sociology, which conceive society as a sort of gigantic animal; that of romanticism, that had the idea of society being integrated by a national soul; and the hegelian that concieves it as objective or concrete spirit.



I will not try to analyse this substancialistic concept that betrays the social phenomenon, I just will limit myself to point out that as much as society is conceived as a being with its own life, there is a tendency to subordinate the individual, by an absolute way, to that gigant being that is society. Making an error contrary to the individualist theory, this sociological thesis subordinates men to society, sacrifices the human being in favor of a collective being that due to its value (importance and size, confuses the individual. Society, the State, is everything: the individual is nothing.

Face to face to this two thesis equally inacceptable, your arrive to the Christian conception of society that is, just the middle term in between two extremes so different. The powerful intuition of Saint Agustin, addressing the members of society which he calls "multitude" characterizes without doubt the social phenomenon in the following terms: "The souls of many men make necessarily many souls. But if they love each other it makes one soul. However we can not deny that there is in that union because union between man is not a highest union" In the scholastic terminology, this idea can be expressed affirming that society is not all. "one per se" that is to say it is not just one being but a union of beings, to which at a particular moment, may have a formal principle that gives unity and harmony, but considered itself, is a being. "one per accidens".

Fundação Cuidar o Futuro





Saint Agustin maintains that the soul of society is born from love among its members, or as Maritain says; "from civic friendship, profane image of fraternal charity. "This last author affirms that the temporal community is essentially by nature, a single friendship, union and he adds: "The first way to serve commun welfare temporarily is to remain faithful to the values of truth, justice and love that are the principal elements."

Saint Thomas Aquinas profundizing in the same thesis that Saint Agustin, accepts completely the aristotelian postulate that man is by nature a social animal. The man is certainly, a weak being and imperfect that submits himself to a thouthand of material exigencies and his conduct is conditioned by so many necessities that are natural, but thanks to his spiritual soul, is capable of perfections. His racional nature permits him to know the end that he is suppod to achieve and try to reach it by voluntary acts. So, recognizing the fact of his social nature, the man tries to accommodate his behavior to other men that together form the community, for a better organization of his life and to reach his objectives. The social group acquires by this circunstance its own end that is the comun welfare, to which the multiple ends of individuals remain in a certain way subordinated.

Saint Thomas affirms that between the individual end of each member of the grupo and the end of the colectivity, there is not only a difference of grade but also of cuality: "The comun welfare of society and the single welfare of each person are different not only in relation to quantity but to have a formal diferenciacion. "It can not be otherwise, because human beings posses a trascendental end that is related to his immortal soul. So it is understood, that the individual end can and must subordinate to the colective end when it concerns that certain earthly and temporal, but that same personal end is high above the comun end when it concerns the eternal interest of each singular soul. In this second aspect the personal well-being is high above the comun temporal welfare. For that reason the essentials bases of life in comun are the respect of human dignity and the rights of an inmortal soul.

The Christian thesis, brevely resumed by Grevillot can be expressed in the following terms: man is essentially social. A society is beyond everything, a community of the soul. One tries by a whole effort to engender a human-familiar-national-soul in which we al together accept and by which each of us will live. and as the person is at the same time body and soul the community of the soul must share the material help.

Bringing together what has been explained about the individual and the christian concept of society we reach the following conclusions: The person is not a whole only enclosed in himself, incapable to trascendthe narrow limits of his own subjectivity; is on the contrary, a person with an open mind that tends by his own nature to live in society and to relate with other people through his wisdom and love. The man is a social animal; but