THE CHURCH AND INTERNATIONAL ORDER

Renato Cardinal Martino†

FORTY YEARS AGO: PACEM IN TERRIS

Forty years ago, on the 11th of April 1963, Blessed John XXIII’s Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* made the “gospel of peace” resound throughout the world. Peace was a word both ancient and new: ancient insofar as it presented once more in human words what Jesus had said to the crowd: “Blessed are the peacemakers”; new because the word “peace” was spoken, then as now, at a time of tension and conflict among the peoples of the earth.

In his message for the 2003 World Day of Peace, John Paul II commemorated John XXIII’s Encyclical and recalled the serious international tensions that had then divided humanity. The Berlin Wall had been built only two years prior to the publication of *Pacem in Terris*, dividing and opposing two physical sections of a city and emphasizing the rivalry between two ideologies regarding the proper structure of society. The Wall marked daily life on each of its sides with opposing rules and rhythms that, as underlined by the
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2. Ephesians 6:15.


Encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, corresponded to a mindset of opposition and struggle.\(^5\)

Pope John Paul II also referenced the Cuban missile crisis, an event that brought humanity to the brink of nuclear war. The Cuban missile crisis made extremely clear the constant danger posed by the threat of “cold war,” in which humanity was condemned to “hop[e] against hope that neither an act of aggression nor an accident would trigger the worst war in human history.”\(^6\) In the context of those dramatic circumstances, there prevailed in John XXIII an innate optimism, or rather a great trust in Providence, that is, a deep conviction that the action of God the Father is always present in the life of every human being, in the history of every people, and in that of the entire human family.\(^7\) On the 25\(^{th}\) of October 1962, broadcast on Vatican Radio, he made a *vibrant appeal for peace* stating,

> Today We repeat that solemn warning. We beseech all rulers not to remain deaf to the cry of mankind. Let them do everything in their power to save peace. By so doing, they will spare the world the horrors of a war that would have disastrous consequences such as no one can foresee.

> Let them continue to negotiate, because this sincere and open attitude is of great value as a witness for the conscience of each one and in the face of history. To promote, favor and accept negotiations, at all levels and at all times, is a rule of wisdom and prudence which calls down the blessing of heaven and earth.\(^8\)

At present, humanity is plagued by human generated wounds, by wars, by divisions in structurally weak international organizations, by tense diplomatic conflicts, and by the danger of new causes of suffering for innocent men and women. In his time, Blessed John XXIII did not hesitate, in the midst of apparently insurmountable difficulties stemming from the two opposing factions, to put forth the courageous message of peace; a message that is not hindered by any

---

5. See Pope John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* [*Encyclical Letter on Social Concern*] ¶ 36 (St. Paul ed. 1987) [hereinafter *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*]. In this encyclical letter, John Paul II investigates the status of the then contemporary world and what is needed for authentic human development. In his discussion, he favorably refers to the important and relevant work of his predecessors, especially Popes John XXIII and Paul VI.


7. Id. ¶ 10.

barrier or misunderstanding, thereby establishing the foundation for peace on earth. With the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, the countenance of peace shone on both sides of the Wall and all walls. The Encyclical demonstrated to all people their shared unity in the one human family. It invited all to participate in the revolution of equality and mutual recognition, and it prompted all to recognize and promote the rights of each person, rights independent of where one was born geographically, one’s religious beliefs, or one’s economic, social, or racial status. The Pope spoke for the first time of a “universal common good” as an objective *sine qua non* for a world that was becoming more and more a single reality and that, because of this, suffered ideological, military, and economic conflicts. The language of international politics lacked a workable concept of peace that kept in mind the notion of a “family of peoples” or an “association of nations” that Pope Benedict XV discussed in his Encyclical *Pacem, Dei Munus Pulcherrimum*. Pope Benedict had developed his own vision for a League of Nations with which Blessed John XXIII sympathized in *Pacem in Terris*. These Popes both understood that peace could be pursued if there existed a mechanism to guide States in achieving unity among the people of the world.

What John XXIII did at that time, John Paul II is doing today. Present international tensions demand once more that the Church offer to humanity the very heart of her eternal message: the “gospel of peace.” All would have preferred to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of *Pacem in Terris* in an international climate charged with less tension, but human actions and historical circumstances have determined, instead, that this anniversary occur precisely in the midst of a very acute international crisis. All the more, therefore, does the Encyclical’s message take on particular importance today, allowing us to more adequately consider a renewed international order hoped for by all people of good will.

Like other Encyclicals, Blessed John XXIII addressed *Pacem in Terris* to all bishops/ordinaries in communion with the Pope; however, unlike other Encyclicals, he also addressed it to “the whole world and to all men of good will.” Blessed John XXIII understood

---

that a renewed international order could be achieved through the combined efforts of the Church and of all people of good will. I shall now develop this by addressing four points: (1) the international order—created by and for the people, (2) the international order’s ethical and juridical foundations, (3) the role of international organizations in maintaining international order, and (4) cooperation as the *sine qua non* of international order.

I. INTERNATIONAL ORDER:
FROM THE PEOPLE AND FOR THE PEOPLE

The Christian perspective regarding the international order, as proposed by the “gospel of peace,” is a universal vision of human history and of individual events. This vision was and continues to be presented as an aggregative factor, as a *unifying bond* for the peoples of the earth. A careful consideration of history reveals how Christianity has been decisive in spreading the message that peoples tend to unite not because of political events, economic projects, or ideological internationalism, but because unity is the desire of individuals and of peoples. The great public turnouts for Pope John Paul II’s worldwide apostolic visits illustrate the desire for unity among the many people of good will. On some of these visits, large groups of people who are neither Catholic nor Christian greet the Pope; his presence manifests the hope that they have met a kindred spirit who also seeks the perfection of solidarity among all people of good will. The “gospel of peace,” as it pervades the internal structures of society and the international sector, is characterized by its efforts to bring about a deeper, more authentic unity within the human family.

The unifying power of Christianity does not relativize or destroy the different peculiarities of an individual people, rather, it encourages the expression of these characteristics. Even if different identities are acknowledged, the Christian spirit seeks to distinguish these differences from the various forms of nationalism that tend to

isolate individual peoples, identifying the destabilizing effects that nationalistic self-centeredness can have. The Christian message strives to unite these healthy differences within a unifying framework of universal significance and value.

The Church’s social doctrine regarding the international order begins with the basic idea that persons all belong to one human family that aspires for unity. History has put forth different visions of “unity,” many of which are based on force or a desire for superiority or power on the part of some members of the international community. The Church’s social doctrine condemns as illicit actions that move in these directions and offers instead very different criteria for regulating the international order, such as those put forth in *Pacem in Terris*, i.e., that “relationships . . . must be harmonized in truth, in justice, in a working solidarity, in liberty.” The Church’s social doctrine, as applied to the principles of the international community and its juridical system, requires that relationships among different peoples and their numerous political communities find their proper regulation in reason, justice, law, and negotiation, while excluding recourse to force, violence, and war, as well as to forms of discrimination, intimidation, and deceit.

According to the Church’s social doctrine, the international order finds its origin in, is constituted by, and draws its sustenance from *the people and for the people*. The human family must draw inspiration from the values that persons considered as a whole—in their material and spiritual components—carry within themselves. Even today, unity must be built with force, not a physical force, but a moral and cultural force, present and alive in every person and the legacy of every people. The perspective offered by the Church’s social doctrine helps men and women become conscious of themselves, and of their

---


16. See *Pacem in Terris*, supra note 1, ¶ 132.

17. Id. ¶ 80.


19. Id. ¶¶ 4-7.
material components and endowments. These teachings also make men and women aware of their deepest spiritual aspirations. Furthermore, these teachings help define the foundational elements of the international order by showing people the meaning of a true community, both in its foundations and in its operation.

The centrality of the human person and the natural relationships among persons and peoples are, therefore, the fundamental guidelines provided by the Church’s social doctrine to the international community. Principle I of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development emphasizes this point: “Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development.” During the last couple of years, on more than one occasion, Secretary-General of the United Nations Kofi Annan has made this same point. The regulation of the international community must ultimately look to guaranteeing an effective universal common good for humanity, safeguarding the characteristics and identity proper to each people. From this perspective, international law is the instrument that guarantees a particular international order. The coexistence of the political communities individually propose the common good of their citizens and together tend to guarantee the common good of the entire human family.

In considering the international order outlined by the Church’s social doctrine, the international community represents the most significant level of coexistence of the different components of the human family. Therefore, the international community must rightly be based on the principle of subsidiarity. Accordingly, human

---

20. See generally id.


23. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 130-45; Gaudium et Spes, supra note 15, ¶¶ 83-92 (proposing guidelines for building an international community which promotes a universal common good, while respecting diversity of peoples).


25. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 140-41. The principle of subsidiarity has been explained by Pope John Paul II in this way:
society structures itself first with the family, then as a civil society with its forms of social organization, next in the form of individual States and, finally, it comes together as the community of nations.\(^{26}\)

Considering the substantial profile of the international order, the Church’s social doctrine presents the international community as a natural and necessary community, the foundation of which lies in human nature itself, in the equality of all people and in their natural tendency to gather with others.\(^{27}\) This doctrine looks upon the international community as a “family of nations,”\(^{28}\) as a true community of peoples, opposed to the reductive concepts that explain the international community as a simple form of aggregation. The international community is, moreover, a juridical community that presupposes the membership of States on the basis of their respective sovereignty, and without bonds of subordination that would deny or in any way limit their independence.\(^{29}\)

II. INTERNATIONAL ORDER: ETHICAL-JURIDICAL FOUNDATIONS

The Church’s social doctrine bases its concept of an international order on ethical values and law, regulating the coexistence of the different political communities.\(^{30}\) Ethical values and law are universally recognized requirements for making international life a reality. The direct recipient and builder of an international order must be the human person, recognized in his fundamental equality with others, without regard for his social, ethnic, linguistic, or

---

\(^{26}\) See generally Pacem in Terris, supra note 1. The first four parts of Pacem in Terris consider in turn relations between men, relations within one state, relations between individual states, and relations within the world community.

\(^{27}\) See id. ¶¶ 130-35.

\(^{28}\) Pope John Paul II, Address to the United Nations, supra note 13, ¶ 14; see also Pacem, Dei Munus Pulcherrimum, supra note 10, ¶ 17.

\(^{29}\) See Pope Pius XII, Allocution In Questo Giorno di Santa to the College of Cardinals (Dec. 24, 1939), in PRINCIPLES FOR PEACE 632 (Harry C. Koenig, S.T.D. ed., 1943).

\(^{30}\) See generally PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS ON THE POLITICAL ORDER ¶¶ 277-301 (Francis J. Powers, C.S.V. ed., 1952) (discussing conditions necessary for a new world order).
religious considerations or limitations.\textsuperscript{31} It is precisely this equality that makes it possible to recognize in every area of human life the foundations of an ethical-juridical order. All people must submit to this order; consequently, States, formed by the people and for the people, must act according to prescribed norms put in place to guarantee human coexistence. International order must regulate the life of States, in relation to their own citizens, or anyone else within their borders, such as visitors or refugees, and in their relation to other States.

The failure of States to respect the rudiments of a universally recognized and currently in force ethical-juridical order or, even worse, their violation of such an order, leads to the deterioration of international relationships. The Church’s social Magisterium (including papal Encyclicals from Benedict XV to John Paul II) has repeatedly warned of this danger, especially in the more serious crises that have marked international life in our day.\textsuperscript{32} This stresses the need for a universal moral norm that is effective and which allows no deviation, insofar as it is an expression of the shared conscience of humanity.\textsuperscript{33} A moral norm establishes and strengthens an

\textsuperscript{31} See generally Pope John Paul II, Veritatis Splendor [Encyclical Letter Regarding Certain Fundamental Questions of the Church’s Moral Teaching] ¶ 97 (St. Paul ed. 1993) (“Even though intentions may sometimes be good, and circumstances frequently difficult, civil authorities and particular individuals never have authority to violate the fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person. In the end, only a morality which acknowledges certain norms as valid always and for everyone, with no exception, can guarantee the ethical foundation of social coexistence, both on the national and international levels.”).

\textsuperscript{32} See Pope Benedict XV, Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum [Encyclical Letter Appealing for Peace] ¶ 11 (1914), reprinted in CARLEN, supra note 10, at 143, 146 (“Let the Princes and Rulers of peoples remember this truth, and let them consider whether it is a prudent and safe idea for governments or for states to separate themselves from the holy religion of Jesus Christ, from which their authority receives such strength and support. Let them consider again and again, whether it is a measure of political wisdom to seek to divorce the teaching of the Gospel and of the Church from the ruling of a country and from the public education of the young. Sad experience proves that human authority fails where religion is set aside.”); Pope John Paul II, Evangelium Vitae [Encyclical Letter on the Value and Inviolability of Human Life] ¶ 12 (St. Paul ed. 1995) [hereinafter Evangelium Vitae] (“This culture is actively fostered by powerful cultural, economic and political currents which encourage an idea of society excessively concerned with efficiency. Looking at the situation from this point of view, it is possible to speak in a certain sense of a war of the powerful against the weak: a life which would require greater acceptance, love and care is considered useless, or held to be an intolerable burden, and is therefore rejected in one way or another. . . . This conspiracy involves not only individuals in their personal, family or group relationships, but goes far beyond, to the point of damaging and distorting, at the international level, relations between peoples and states.”).

international order, enabling it to effectively guarantee the peaceful coexistence of peoples. This ideal is the foremost objective of the Church’s social doctrine concerning the international order: to link international relations to a concept of international justice as an essential component of the common good.34 The achievement of justice, both in regard to relations among States and to the economic and social growth of all peoples, requires regulation that is able to respond to the changing and the ever more unparalleled needs of the international community.

In the relations among States, the primary need to defend the human person has gradually led to the creation of a new “right of nations,”35 with a greater recognition of its binding character on the subjects of international order. International norms, which were initially aimed at the more effective guaranteeing and defending of the fundamental rights of persons, have been progressively extended to the rights of peoples.36 In a parallel manner, these norms have broadened their scope, moving from the consideration of civil and political rights alone to those with an economic, social, and cultural content.37 The evolution and broadening of the scope of international norms are necessary and inevitable for the increase of the level of cohesion among international peoples. This evolution revolves around fundamental principles, among which the respect for human rights is emphasized.38

Moreover, we must keep in mind the policies of the “cold war,” which greatly affected international relations and justified arms-

---

34. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 84, 91-93.
36. Cf. id. (“Not only has there been a development in awareness of the rights of individuals, but also in awareness of the rights of nations, as well as a clearer realization of the need to act in order to remedy the grave imbalances that exist between the various geographical areas of the world. In a certain sense, these imbalances have shifted the center of the social question from the national to the international level.”).
37. Id. ¶¶ 6-11 (listing the rights enumerated by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical Rerum Novarum). Pope John Paul II goes on to state,

God has imprinted his own image and likeness on man (cf. Gen. 1:26), conferring upon him an incomparable dignity, as the encyclical frequently insists. In effect, beyond the rights which man acquires by his own work, there exist rights which do not correspond to any work he performs, but which flow from his essential dignity as a person.

Id. ¶ 11.

38. See Centesimus Annus, supra note 25, ¶ 47 (discussing and encouraging the development of an authentic understanding of human rights).
spending based on the principle of *deterrence*. The abandonment of this mindset has created the need for States to deal with international controversies on the basis of recognized common rules, entrusting them to negotiation and arbitration, and rejecting the idea that justice can be accomplished by recourse to violence or force.\(^{39}\) With the means available to the international community in its juridical order, and on the basis of the past experience of humanity, the use or threat of force must, in concrete practice, be rejected:

> No, never again war, which destroys the lives of innocent people, teaches how to kill, throws into upheaval even the lives of those who do the killing and leaves behind a trail of resentment and hatred, thus making it all the more difficult to find a just solution of the very problems which provoked the war.\(^{40}\)

We must affirm the juridical instruments, already existent in international law, that are proposed as alternatives to armed force. Juridical instruments must be rethought, thereby making them correspond to the effective needs of our contemporary international community, and, above all, reinforcing the scope and logic of these needs. Practices such as mediation, conciliation, and arbitration must be institutionalized and transformed by authoritative agencies possessing adjudicatory functions and operating on the international level.\(^{41}\) As principles of international law providing for the peaceful resolution of controversies, they are instruments that correspond to the principles of international legality and to the primacy of law, and are, at the same time, guarantees of freedom for the States. The observation often emerging from international events, even recent ones, is that certain instruments for the resolution of conflicts do not lead to the results that were intended. The way to peace therefore exists, but the will to use it appears to be lacking.

In the perspective outlined by the Church’s social doctrine for a renewed international order, the international community must no longer view itself as a simple instance of States coming together, but it must be effectively transformed into a structure in which conflicts can

---

39. See *id.* ¶ 21, 23.

40. *Id.* ¶ 52.

41. See Pope John Paul II, *Address to the International Court of Justice* (May 13, 1985), in *15 ORIGINS* 13 (1985); *Centesimus Annus*, supra note 25, ¶ 27 (“What is needed are concrete steps to create or consolidate international structures capable of intervening through appropriate arbitration in the conflicts which arise between nations, so that each nation can uphold its own rights and reach a just agreement and peaceful settlement vis-à-vis the rights of others.”).
be peacefully resolved and the interests of individual parties protected based on the criteria of true justice. True justice recognizes the primacy of law by respecting the fundamental principle of good faith: “Just as . . . in individual states a system of private vendetta and reprisal has given way to the rule of law, so too a similar step forward is now urgently needed in the international community.”

III. INTERNATIONAL ORDER: THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The activity and evolution of international law must ultimately aim at regulating peaceful international coexistence through a suitable use of juridical institutions to resolve controversies. In addition, international law must endeavor to foster real social and economic development, thereby overcoming the persistent and dramatic inequalities between countries, geographic areas, and populations.

In the areas of social and economic development, there is an urgent need for international political action that aims at the twofold objective of peace and development through the adoption of coordinated measures. The current phenomenon of globalization that is creating a growing interdependence makes such action all the more necessary.

According to the Church’s social doctrine, interdependence is more than a moral value, it is an essential objective fact, and the prerequisite for the organization of international affairs. The transformation of the atmosphere among nations from one of conflict to cooperation, the increased number of States, scientific progress, industrialization, and the bridging of global distances, have all made the need for an international political-juridical organization of a permanent and efficient character more acute. The problematic

42. Centesimus Annus, supra note 25, ¶ 52.
43. Cf. id. ¶ 21 (noting that “[t]he United Nations . . . has not yet succeeded in establishing, as alternatives to war, effective means for the resolution of international conflicts” and that “[t]his seems to be the most urgent problem which the international community has yet to resolve”).
44. Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 121-25.
45. See Gaudium et Spes, supra note 15, ¶¶ 83-85; see also Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, ¶ 39 (proposing solidarity as being the path to peace and development).
46. See Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, ¶ 38 (discussing “the growing awareness of interdependence among individuals and nations”).
47. See id. ¶¶ 38-45 (discussing the concept of interdependence and its relation to the virtue of solidarity in international institutions).
nature of the issue revolves around institutional terms, and more
precisely, the role of international agencies. The enduring hope is that
it will, at last, be possible to rely on effective intergovernmental
bodies, which will orient and verify the success of policies and
actions.48 Such structures require a consensus among all States in
order to attain the common good of the entire human family, a goal
that is, at present, unachievable by States as single entities, regardless
of their prominence in terms of power, wealth, or political clout.49

Progress through a “family of nations/peoples” can help towards
this goal. The United Nations, founded in 1945 and continued
vigorously in the successive years with the addition of specialized
agencies, has helped to achieve common objectives.50

From the very beginning, the Church’s social doctrine has
couraged the institutionalization of international society,
recognizing as its specific purpose the building of a truly universal
community of peoples.51 In the present phase of stable and
accelerating international integration, the Church openly encourages
this process, continuing to point to justice and equality as its
inspiration.52 In its systematic reading of this phenomenon, the
Church’s social doctrine has always hoped that greater space would
be given to the positive and propositional role that international
organizations were increasingly taking on.53 This role finds support
in the very mission of the Church, provided that it is inspired by
respect for the person and for human rights, and also strives towards
the attainment of the universal common good.54

The Church’s social Magisterium continually calls for the
establishment of public powers on a worldwide level, a worldwide
authority, which is dependent upon the ethical-juridical order
presiding over international relations.55 A worldwide authority

48. See Centesimus Annus, supra note 25, ¶ 58.
49. See id.
50. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶ 142; see also Populorum Progressio, supra
note 14, ¶ 78.
51. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶ 7 (stating that the establishment of an international
community is “urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good”).
52. See Pope Pius XII, Radio Message on Vatican Radio (Sept. 1, 1944), in 36 ACTA
APOSTOLICAE SEDIS 249 (1944).
53. Id.
54. Id.
55. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶ 137 (“Today the universal common good poses
problems of world-wide dimensions, which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by
the efforts of public authority endowed with a wideness of powers, structure and means of the
addresses how intergovernmental bodies should act to function effectively and authoritatively with regard to States, while at the same time being more than simple instruments of cooperation. The presence of a worldwide authority has been a constant desire throughout history and has always, despite the changing perspectives that accompany different historical periods, been understood in light of one fundamental aspect: its authoritative function lies in an ethical-juridical order rather than in a central body, differentiating it from the situation with the State. In this regard, the Church’s social doctrine emphasizes the need for the concept of democracy to be the inspiration for the action of international bodies, above all so that on the international level there can be equal representation of States and, especially, of the interests and objectives of the universal human family.

The mutual interdependence of peoples and countries constitutes a necessary and sufficient motive for bringing about cooperation that is regulated by law and ordered towards the common good. Many of the problems within individual States inevitably end up involving all other States. An international political authority, even if necessary for the stability of international relations, can only fulfill a subsidiary function with respect to the individual subjects that come together to form the international community itself, as long as the interests of the human family are truly sought (in this case considered on the universal level). The structure and exercise of powers at the international level must serve, but not replace, the individual political communities; they must contribute to the ordered exercise of activities and functions by the different internal communities so as to foster full respect for both the rights of persons and of the intermediate bodies at work within these internal communities.

---

same proportions: that is, of public authority which is in a position to operate in an effective manner on a world-wide basis. The moral order itself, therefore, demands that such a form of public authority be established.”

56. See generally id. ¶¶ 130-45 (discussing the reasons for and the purpose of a worldwide authority).

57. See PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS ON THE POLITICAL ORDER, supra note 30, ¶¶ 277-301.

58. See, e.g., Centesimus Annus, supra note 25, ¶ 58 (asserting that it is necessary that in international economic agencies “the interests of the whole human family be equally represented”).

59. See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 140-41 (discussing the principle of subsidiarity in relation to a worldwide public authority).

60. Id.
Other factors also contribute to the establishment of an international order. These are factors, already at the foundation of the international order, which the Church’s social doctrine considers necessary to bring about unification: equality and fairness in negotiations;\(^{61}\) the territorial sovereignty of every country and, consequently, the inviolability of borders;\(^{62}\) respect for treaties and shared involvement in the drawing up of norms leading to good faith;\(^{63}\) respect for minorities;\(^{64}\) an effective disarmament;\(^{65}\) the promotion of a culture of peace;\(^{66}\) and the concrete distribution and equitable use of the earth’s resources.\(^{67}\)

IV. INTERNATIONAL ORDER AND COOPERATION

Events in history, and especially those that have led to open conflict, affirm the conviction that the differences between peoples and nations can be overcome—with the help of God’s Providence—through joint efforts, that is, the establishment of extensive networks of relations with common objectives, and through effective cooperation.\(^{68}\) The necessary collaboration, fruit of the social nature of people and of different political communities and nations, must be sustained and directed by criteria that make it possible first of all to identify suitable objectives for the different sectors in which the

---

\(^{61}\) See Centesimus Annus, supra note 25, ¶¶ 10-12 (stating that solidarity and respect for the individual must underlie any valid international order); Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, ¶ 39 (claiming there must be a mutual respect and solidarity among nations for a true international community); Pope John Paul II, Address to the United Nations, supra note 13, ¶¶ 5-11 (holding that the right of individual nations must be respected by all other entities and concluding that there must be a respect for cultural or ethnic differences).

\(^{62}\) See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 120-24 (holding that there should be no violation of a State’s integrity and freedom, that “no country may unjustly oppress others or unduly meddle in their affairs”).

\(^{63}\) See Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, May 23, 1969, art. 26, 1155 U.N.T.S. 331, 339 (“Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith.”).

\(^{64}\) See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 94-97 (calling for the proper treatment of minorities); Populorum Progressio, supra note 14, ¶ 62 (holding that racism and extreme nationalism are obstacles to universal solidarity).

\(^{65}\) See Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶¶ 109-19 (calling for disarmament).

\(^{66}\) See Evangelium Vitae, supra note 32, ¶ 28 (rejecting a “culture of death” for a “culture of life”).


reality of international relations is lived out, for effective needs and for true availability. The need for cooperation arises directly from the will of peoples, which in many different ways expresses the rejection of a coexistence marred by conflicts and violence.

Cooperation at the international level makes it possible to guarantee a mutual understanding, thereby giving rise to concrete unity of action among States, forms of inter-State organizations, and those other forms of association expressed in civil society that operate on the international level. However, in order to reach this understanding, the international community must bridge the gap caused by different levels of development, either in the economic sphere or at the level of political power, and thereby increase the ability of all States to participate actively in international relations. This strengthens the authentic meaning of the fundamental principle of equality among political communities that is the basis of international law. This same principle of equality exists in the very foundation of the United Nations, as recognized by Article 2 of its Charter. Mutual equality is the fruit of a shared origin, of the so-called unity of nature, from which is born the natural law and the use of right reason, principles which must be applied to the choices and goals of the political, juridical, and economic order of international life.

Cooperation is not only essential for situations directly connected to economic life, to interdependence, or to the phenomenon of globalization, but is also, above all, an expression of solidarity, a virtue and mode of behavior that every person in some measure seeks in his own life, as well as in the social relations of a community. The different sectors—juridical, economic, social, financial, technological, and scientific—all point to an international cooperation.

Cooperation in development merits special attention. It is the predominant goal of every initiative aimed at eliminating obstacles that prevent development or that place at the periphery of

---

69. Cf. Gaudium et Spes, supra note 15, ¶¶ 85-86 (listing useful norms for cooperation among nations).

70. See Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, ¶ 39 (“a real international system may be established . . . on the foundation of the equality of all peoples”).


72. Cf. Gaudium et Spes, supra note 15, ¶ 29 (explaining that all persons have a basic equality and fundamental human rights insofar as they possess a rational soul and are created in God’s likeness).

73. See Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, ¶¶ 38-40.
development so many peoples who already suffer under conditions of great instability. For a large portion of the world’s population, development remains something foreign, capable even of restricting the progress of an economy already at the limits of subsistence. Cooperation in development also means denouncing exploitation, poverty, and oppression, all of which involve entire groups of people who are denied the opportunity of acquiring the necessary knowledge to express their individual creativity and to allow their potential abilities to emerge. 74

V. CONCLUSION

I began by referring to Pacem in Terris and its dignified teaching, which, insomuch as it relates to the international order, remains the most systematic and enlightening document of the Church’s social Magisterium. I wish to conclude by referring to Pacem in Terris once again, suggesting for your careful consideration a passage that I find inspiring and stimulating. Blessed John XXIII, recognizing in our time the imperceptible but real movement from fear to love in the relations between individuals and peoples, gives expression to his hope by stating:

There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating, men may come to discover better the bonds that unite them together, deriving from the human nature which they have in common; and that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: that between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, a love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold in form and productive of many benefits. 75

The hope of Blessed John XXIII is also our hope; the heart of our work is to bring about a world characterized by justice and peace.

74. See generally Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, supra note 5, for a thorough discussion of the role of the world’s people and the Church in promoting an “authentic development of man and society.” Id. ¶ 1.
75. Pacem in Terris, supra note 1, ¶ 129.