

**RECOVERY OF SOLIDARITY TO SAVE**

**THE COMMUNITY**

**(A TRUE REVOLUTION OF THE SPIRITS)**

**BY MEANS OF INTRODUCTION:**

From an eminently praxeological point of view, contemporary society reveals itself as a group of people institutionally organized to cooperate with each other for the achievement of common goals and the ones that, within the context given by them, each person pursues.

Thus and by virtue of the gregarious nature of man, community constitutes the necessary and essential framework for the existence and development of the human person. It is, as it were, the scenery where the individual human being specifies his identity and develops his life; striking up intimate social ties, which penetrate and nourish him, contributing to his constitution. This is the reason why the individual life project of each person only attains full viability and sense in the context of a communal project of *Common Good*, to which he must be subordinated.

Both the achievement of common interests and individual interests depends directly on the direct or indirect collaboration between the members of a society; that is to say, the development of interpersonal relationships of cooperation which results in the fulfillment of *Common Good*, understood as a

group of social conditions necessary for the achievement of Happiness (in its Aristotelian sense) and the Fullness of the person (this from an earthly point of view, as it were, to what we can add, from the transcendental view contributed by Christianity and without denying anything previously asserted, that such social conditions favor the salvation of the soul).

In that effect, it was asserted that: “institutional life becomes full and its benefits reach everyone (the good truly becomes the ‘common good’) only when people make acts of benevolence and solidarity, in a broad sense, making and helping to make as if the interests of others were their own interests because they, due to their real condition, cannot give to receive nor do for others to do something for them, to the precise extent of what is considered fair for a cooperative relationship”. **(1)**

Knowing that, at present, we are far away from having reached the common good mentioned, our particular interest is to understand why our modern and postmodern societies have not been capable of achieving this common good.

The first explanation we find lies in the philosophical-anthropological individualism (as a conception of man) and in the cultural individualism (as a vital attitude, temper and existential modality) passed on by Modern Age. Legacy in which one finds a “blind” and anarchic concept of freedom, empty of all ethical content and without any superior purpose, legacy which has become the “rule without rule” that prevails the conduct of many of our contemporaries.

This unfortunate legacy of Modern Age has resulted in a radical relativism (both concerning ideas and the private and public conduct of people) which covers different orders but shows the

most eloquent and catastrophic “sides” regarding morality. It is about an absolute relativism, which has invaded almost everything, whether we are talking about university senates, cultural and social spaces, homes or the private life of each person.

As we can see, this process has its origin in Modern Age: “Man is conceived as a solitary being who does not accept a belonging which binds him decisively to anyone or chains him to a substantive belonging. He has already broken with God due to his arrogant control of reason which allows him to ‘look down on God’ as a disposable hypothesis. And he had also broken with nature, which he has radically disillusioned and turned into an object of appropriation. Now he breaks up with solidarity towards humankind: neither family nor motherland”. **(2)**

It is appropriate to remember how, even though he was surrounded by modernist currents which dominated Occidental thought and life, a brilliant man like Alexis Henri Charles de Clérel, Viscount of Tocqueville (better known as Alexis of Tocqueville; 1805 - 1859) **(3)**, openly denounced individualism as the factor of “destruction of societies” **(4)**; and at the same time he highlighted the “communal spirit” as a “great element of order and tranquility”; demanding also from his contemporaries, moral qualities, a sense of responsibility and passion for the public good **(5)** as principles of action and rules of normal conduct, which was complete opposite to the idea of the “healthy individual selfishness” that Adam Smith (1723 - 1790), “father” of economic liberalism, made public the previous century and marked as the motor for the economic dynamism. **(6) / (7)**

### **ANTHROPOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF SOLIDARITY:**

For the purposes of rediscovering and re-establishing solidarity as a guiding principle – fair and natural – in the creation of human interactions, the first step is to recover, not only at an intellectual level but also at an experiential level, the sense of men gregarious nature and the consequent interdependence between them. From that “inherent and intrinsic dependence”, caused by the multiplicity of communal bonds that penetrate and bring us together, directly contributing to our own personal identity and bearing on the path, happy or unhappy, that follows our existence.

This is to understand and internalize in a profound and upright way the inevitable responsibility everyone has within the well-being of the group. The answer to this responsibility will be solidarity, not as a superficial feeling – purely emotional – due to the injustices and hardships of our neighbor but as the “firm and persistent determination to common good: that is to say, for the good of all and each one, for all of us to be truly responsible for everyone” **(8)**.

St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out that we are, in some way, debtors, just by the mere fact of existing. In the first place, debtors of our own parents who gave us life. Debtors of our ancestors because the foundation of our identity comes from them. And also debtors of the Motherland where we were born and of those who make up the political community in which we develop our own personal life project.

## **THE ANTI-SUPPORTIVE “LOGIC” OF CAPITALIST LIBERALISM:**

### **In the socio-political level:**

In the light of the aforementioned, we can say that the guiding

“logic” of capitalist liberalism contradicts, open and directly, the solidarity demands emerging from the typical human nature. In this respect, it is a current of ideas essentially anti-natural.

In fact, the capitalist liberalism is an ideological construction built on a wrong anthropological conception, eminently individualistic, which does not know the intrinsic social ties that contribute to the constitution of a person and in which strengthening lies the possibilities of Happiness and Fullness.

Actually, according to the anthropological conception on which capitalist liberalism is based, the human being is, first and foremost, an individual; he does not need others to achieve personal Fullness, he only turns to others for convenience related to the fulfillment (or a better fulfillment) of material needs, striking up purely “extrinsic” relationships and, as a consequence, relationships that are essentially contingent, changeable, replaceable and even, “negotiable”.

Regarding this, capitalist liberalism has created a false idea of society, according to which this is not a natural “product” that comes from the social nature of man but a sort of voluntary “invention” of himself, motivated by utilitarian reasons and based on a hypothetical “social contract”.

The aim of society first, and then of the State, would be to ensure the greatest range of possible freedoms for each one of the individuals involved, preventing conflicts and taking part in those which, in spite of everything, will eventually arise. But everything revolves around individual freedoms; in the liberal socio-political model, everything is arranged for their fulfillment. The function of the government is limited to watch over the maintenance of the “external” order of relationships, and from

there, the individual is left to his own fate. In short, it is about ensuring fields of personal freedom for each individual to do what he wants within these fields, according to their own goals and wishes.

From such principles, capitalist liberalism promotes – directly or indirectly, depending on the variant we take into account – selfishness, that is to say: the opposite to solidarity.

Because on the one hand, it is supported the idea that “my rights end where the rights of others begin”, but on the other hand, as a counter rule, it is advocated the idea that “if my neighbor is sick, hungry or suffers”, “this is neither my problem” nor the political authority's. In the light of this position, such circumstances do not create “political” obligations that fall on the state's government shoulders nor civic or social “duties” for the citizen, based on solidarity, and that on the heels of it, involve and compromise other members of the organized community with regard to the misfortune of the affected party.

Thus, capitalist liberalism has designed a state model (called “gendarme”) which disregards the luck of every member of the community. It is a state in which the government (in the term's broadest sense) is indifferent, “agnostic” and “deserter”; is excessively limited in its functions and legal authorities, keeping away from what is happening in several of the most important levels of social life (economic, cultural, educational, etc.). And its confessed “non intervention”, within the reality of facts and as Arturo Enrique Sampay, Esq. observed, is translated into a form of interventionism in favor of the strongest (His Holiness Pío XI said, as early as 1931, in his famous “Quadragesimo Anno”, that the strongest usually were the most morally unscrupulous).

### **In the socio-economic level:**

Whereas in the economic field, capitalist liberalism is based on another false premise, according to which the mere sum of personal property results in common good (here limited, strictly speaking, to a simple wellness).

In accordance with this, from the enrichment of one of the members of society necessarily derives the major enrichment for the entire society, by the “grace of the invisible hand of the market” (free market).

This “invisible hand” represents a hypothetical auto-regulative attribute of the “market”, whose activity and operation are “automatic” (almost “magical”); this market would operate through the law of supply and demand, in a similar way to the Divine Providence. This, in the sense that it would be able to create an objective wellness for every member of the society, from their individual actions displayed in mutual competence, securing in a subjective and exclusive manner their own personal benefits. That is, we would be in the presence of a “mechanism” capable of offering “supportive and generous” social benefits from “selfish” individual behaviors. A “recycling”, notoriously similar to those that the traditional Christian thought attributes to the Divine Providence, of which the popular Argentine wisdom accounts for in an illustrative and metaphorical manner, through the saying “God writes straight with crooked lines”. **(9)**

Thus, from the liberal ideological point of view - which like modernist thought - is essentially anthropocentric and immanentist:

- The “free market” appears in the central spot once reserved to

God.

- The “invisible hand” of the market reveals itself as a remedy of the Divine Providence acting in human history.

- The “law of supply and demand” acquires the hierarchy traditionally reserved to divine “commandments”. As a consequence, there was a tendency to subordinate to this law all other principles and precepts (religious, moral, and/or legal).

- Selfishness is exonerated from the traditional reproaches that were put on it. Since, by the “grace of the market’s invisible hand” it becomes “functional” with regard to common good.

When “thinking economy”, capitalist liberalism makes a double “institutionalization” of selfishness.

On the one hand, it starts from the negative anthropological assumption according to which men only move for the fulfillment of their goals, interests and desires. In the light of this, man is not a naturally sociable being but a naturally individualist, who always tends to seek and maximize his own benefit.

On the other hand, thanks to the “market’s invisible hand”, now selfishness has positive effects, no matter what we think of it. And no matter how reproachable we may find this from a moral point of view, it must not be eliminated but promoted... If with Machiavelli there was a break-up between politics and moral, with the economic thought of capitalist liberalism there was a break-up between moral and economics...

However, the reality of facts, the real economics! (so stubborn!), showed in a short time how false these approaches were,



producing concrete results completely opposite to previously formulated omens... Far from the progress expected and wellness promised, from – approximately – the middle of 19th Century on, social injustices expanded and worsen pushing many national communities to the edge of civil war and social breaking up (consequences to which the Marxist socialism – another product of Modern Age and, in a sense, “son” of the capitalist liberalism – contributed). **(10)**

In conjunction, during 20<sup>th</sup> Century, some new political regimes were creative and courageous enough to plan and implement economic models based on and organized according to the ones proposed by liberal capitalism (depending on each case, those models could be supportive, conciliatory, cooperative, communal, corporative, related to work’s demands, state planning, etc.). Against all gloomy premonitions from liberal economists, many of those regimes achieved great economic and social successes, surprising the entire world (especially, in those cases in which such successes had been achieved in a short time).

As a consequence of such “impudence” from “reality”, supporters of the capitalist-liberal ideology confronted the heated critics that – as was to be expected - began to appear from the most varied spheres. Therefore, they tried to find useful arguments, beyond their own ideological borders, thus giving rise to interesting combinations in the wonderful “world of ideologies”.

One of the most interesting cases arose due to the application of different Darwinian conceptions (coming from biology, now immersed in a profound crisis, even within its original scientific field). From this application derives the explanation according to which poverty is not only inevitable but, in parallel, turns out to

be “functional” and in the end, positive because is part of a process of “natural selection” that is produced inside the market (here, we bump into a new “invisible hand”, less generous and more strict). But with the gradual loss of prestige that suffered the ideas of Darwinian style and which was not unknown to the negative effects that resulted from these ideas in the socio-political field, this version was left behind, trying out new ideological “constructions” useful to support old and original liberal ideas, so battered by events...

So, for example, as soon as Ronald Reagan was head of government of the United States, it was announced “in a scientific way” that “for helping the middle class and the poor, rich people should have their tax rates reduced...” According to the promoters of this outlandish theory, which combines absurd and cynicism, the rich will invest the saving from tax rates in factories. Besides, they now alleged with more cynicism than nonsense that, “if you feed the horse enough oats, some will pass through to the road for sparrows.” (Others will express the same concept saying, “when the rich’s glass is full, the leftover is for the poor”).

Arthur Laffer “did his share”: he invented a curve that no one knows where he got it from (on the subject, John Kenneth Galbraith, with genuine irony, asserts that Laffer drew a free-hand curve on a paper napkin at a dinner in Washington). According to Laffer’s “discovery”, if tax rates are increased so is tax revenue. But Laffer asserts that this is true only up to a certain point, beyond this, the higher the tax rates, the lower the revenue. From there, he infers that when it reaches that point — and he states that most countries have already reached it — if tax rates are reduced, tax revenue increases. The tax rates’ reduction to rich people to help the poor was “scientifically”

justified because, thanks to this, there will not be fiscal deficit but the State's coffers and the private investment will be enlarged. **(11)**

Soon after, another American economist, George Gilder, indicated that in his concept, the economical growth was inevitably elitist, in the sense that it increases rich people fortunes, extolling a few men who could produce more wealth. According to Gilder, economical iniquities not only were inevitable but also, necessary and positive (as their increase), since without them, there would not be wealth growth.

The same author added to this that, poverty is also good from the particular point of view of those who experience it. This is so, as he explained, because poverty constitutes an incentive that the poor needs to overcome its own situation. Another well-known economist contributed to this proposition, Charles A. Murray, nonetheless its fallacious nature. According to Murray, the Welfare State, social legislation and policies of social assistance are responsible for poverty because so much help stops private initiative and willingness to work of the poor. And as a consequence, it claims the immediate elimination of all institutional frameworks connected to social welfare — the only thing that has to be maintained, just for humanitarian reasons, is medical assistance to the unemployed. (Of course that it does not matter, in any way, the defense of some policies purely “welfare”, which can produce this “demoralizing” effect. In fact, the implementation of such policies usually works like a “patch” of an order of things marked by social injustice. In these cases, it is about a “concession” from the system to the poor and that tends to avoid crisis and to prevent the removal of unfair structures).

### **In the religious, moral and theological levels:**

In this way, capitalist liberalism comes to the absurd of elevating selfishness to the rank of virtue. Rash assertion that appears explicitly postulated, for example, in the book entitled “The Virtue of Selfishness” by the Russian-American novelist Alisa Rosenbaun, better known as Ayn Rand, and the Canadian psychotherapist Nathaniel Blumenthal, better known as Nathaniel Branden.

Such promotion of this anti-value, selfishness, constitutes a true axiological subversion that had terrible harmful effects on different areas of reality (mainly, related to a social, cultural, political, economical, family and psychic level). For the moment, the crude social injustices that tear up national societies on the inside, distorting at the same time, the relationships between them — in this respect, the existing abuses and disparities in the relationships between “North-South” are more than emblematic.

In other words, it is about a dangerous moral imputation that throws terrible consequences — those already became a reality or are about to — on very different dimensions of human life. So much so that, it also had a great impact on a religious level. For example, another book by the aforementioned author Rand, “Atlas Shrugged”, puts forward the ethical foundation of the capitalist liberalism taken to extremes, through a fictitious story in which two leaders of the civil society are brought face to face (in particular, businessmen) with the government (the “bad guy”). In its way, the book represents a kind of “manifesto”, used by the current owners and executives of big multinational corporations as a “moral support” or “source of legitimacy” for

their plans, aimed at globalizing the capitalist sign.

Among those who paid tribute to the author, we can find not only very powerful and well-known men like Alan Greenspan (ex-president of the Federal Reserve of the United States) and several advisors of George W. Bush, but also leaders of Luciferian cults like LaVey, whose book “The Satanic Bible” puts forward a view of the world inspired by Rand’s ideas. **(12)**

From this viewpoint, capitalist liberalism arises as an episode more connected to the anthropocentric revolution of Modernism — beyond the intentions of the different supporters — against Natural Order, Divine Law, Eternal Law and ultimately, God...

### **SELFISHNESS AS A BREAKING FACTOR OF SOCIETY AND OF THE PERSON:**

Selfishness conspires against the strengthening of social ties, weakens and even breaks the ties that preserve the unity of social mesh. However, not only society is damaged by the solvent action of such pernicious agent. From the point of view of the person, thought as an individual, the break-up of social ties caused by selfishness impoverishes his own personality and contributes to his dehumanization (that is to say, it denatures him). Thus, expounded the crude falsehood of one of the many dilemmas commonly proposed by modern thought — in many of its different versions and currents — such as the alleged opposition between the individual and society. Because, as said before, from the degradation of ties constituting society directly derives the impoverishment of personality and the distortion of the elements which constitutes it.

In other words, crisis of society have their immediate reflection on the life of the individuals. That is, if society “goes wrong”, the

individual goes wrong.

This is clearly evident in the current state of collective sadness installed and spread in some postmodern societies. As far as we know, this sadness is directly connected to the problems derived from the assumed selfishness as a vital attitude and rule of life.

### **THE PSYCHOLOGICAL “ALARM”:**

Such harmful effects on the person, thought as an individual, were stated in some studies carried out by the psychologists Gérard Schmitt and Miguel Benasayag, and explained in their book “The Era of Sad Passions.” The first conclusion of this book indicates that most of the people who use the French psychiatric services are people whose suffering does not have a real and own psychological origin, but reflects the vague sadness that characterizes contemporary society, pierced by a constant feeling of insecurity and scarcity. **(13)**

According to both authors, the prevailing feeling of sadness has its origin in the “death of God” **(14)** and from the theological optimism visualized as evil, the present as redemption and the future as salvation. Just as in the subsequent failure of the modern substitutes of God (the “goddess of reason”, positivist “science”, “communist society”, etc.).

This cause can be found in deeper moments than the subject concerned, but to which is closely connected. Since “God is dead” — from a theological perspective — men are no longer brothers between themselves.

Moreover, like the Catholic priest Joseph Kentenich — founder of the Schönstatt Movement — advised, as “God is dead”, the entire “body of connections” where man takes part and forms

himself — with other human beings, wealth, nature, etc. — begins to enervate and disintegrate. Once that “body” is destroyed, man does not form himself but “deforms” himself, degenerating himself not only spiritually and mentally but also physically. **(15)**

The chaos of the “body of connections” leads inevitably to its break-up. From this, derives the person’s isolation and impoverishment, and the distortion of his personality (as we have already accounted for). In short, as the English writer Chesterton noted, if we remove the supernatural, we are left with nothing, not even the natural (including the human). **(16)**

Needless to say that this “epidemic” of sadness is directly related to the loneliness into which postmodern man is plunged, packed like “bugs” in major cities, “depersonalized” among his masses, and “egged” by the merciless rule of competition that prevails in the market, incapable of building up profound, strong and stable sympathetic and social ties...

We can provide more illustrative information in researches on the mental health of the population of more than fourteen countries, carried out by Dr. R. Kessler, from Harvard University and Dr. T. B. Ustun, from the World Health Organization. According to those researches, on average, 10% of the population suffers from mental disorders. This average has been taken from, for example, the 8% corresponding to the Italian society and the 26.40 % recorded among Americans. **(17)**

With regard to those researches, the more common ailments are panic attacks, phobias and posttraumatic stress. These problems suggest an innovative type of fear: fear to the “other”. The “other” as a threat and factor of disturbance. This fear

prevents a reinforcement of emotional and social bonds, blocks all confidence and empathy, places the “other” on an insuperable "alienation", helps to strengthen his own seclusion, and in this way, lays the foundations for its own increase, creating a sort of “vicious circle” with feedback.

**BY MEANS OF CONCLUSION:**

Solidarity constitutes one of the primary conditions of *Common Good*.

The recovery of solidarity as a guiding value and principle of human relations depends, at a great extent, on the rediscovering of our own nature.

That is to say, first and foremost, the challenge of recovering solidarity as an organizing central theme of communal life requires a spiritual, cultural, moral and academic renewal which sweeps away the anthropocentric, individualist and relativist waste that Modernism left behind after having suffered its own ruin — because, by the way... Postmodern Age is nothing but the crisis of Modern Age, its “corpse”, its “ruins” spread around a big chaos.

The recovery of solidarity does not go through an “assistencialism” more or less neat and “generous” (like the European social democracy and the Argentine “picket”). “Assistencialism”, as implied above, ends up being functional to the unjust order of things installed by Modern Age. Such recovery requires a radical, systemic-structural change that begins with the perception of ourselves (that is to say: of who we are, where we come from, what do we do here and where do we go) and ends up with the political system.



It is about recovering solidarity for the reorganization and strengthening of social ties, inspired by the ideal of creating a community with the highest internal communion in ideals and participation of everyone in their realization; a community where one is in the other, with the other and for the other. Since only a community — like this one — is worthy of man, and only idealist and supportive men are worthy of such happy community.

---

**NOTES:**

[1] “Argumentación sin dogmatismo y crítica sin escepticismo”. Invenio. Year 2. Number 3. Rosario (Argentina). 1999. Page 41.

[2] “Aproximación a la Modernidad”. Aníbal D’Angelo Rodríguez. EDUCA. Buenos Aires (Argentina). 1998. Page 80.

[3] The German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (1839-1912) asserted: “Tocqueville has been the best political analyst since Aristotle and Machiavelli”.

[4] In accordance with: Touchard, Jean, “Historia de las Ideas Políticas”, Editorial Tecnos, sixth edition, Madrid (Spain), 1979, page 410.

[5] In accordance with: Touchard, Jean, Op. Cit., page 410.

[6] This conception, on which we will refer later on, assigns to gain, to profit itself, the nature of the economy’s ultimate objective.

Within this framework of thinking, eagerness to gain does not

recognize any limits of any kind, not religious, moral, political or legal.

These ideas caused the break-up between economics and moral, releasing the first one of its traditional submission to the second one.

**[7]** According to Jean Touchard, “the topic of freedom dominates the entire book of Tocqueville and gives it unity”. It is appropriate to say that freedom was his main object of interest. However, Tocqueville did not believe in the “blind” freedom proposed by the liberal orthodoxy. That dysfunctional, anarchic and destructive freedom, detached from all religious orientation, ethical direction and legal limits. That “mad” freedom, capable of breaking up the structure of social ties.

On the contrary, Tocqueville proclaimed a “freedom that is moderate, regular and controlled by beliefs, customs and laws.” This freedom (not the other one) represented, according to his own words, his life’s passion (“Souvenirs”, page 74; in accordance with: Touchard, Jean, Op. Cit., page 410).

**[8]** “Sollicitudo rei socialis”. Document of the Church’s social doctrine, number 38.

**[9]** In this regard, it seems appropriate to remember how the great German writer, Johann Wolfgang Goethe, introduces Mefistofele in the story told in his “Faust”: “Ein Teil von jener Kraft, Die stets Böse will und stets Gute Schafft” (“I am part of that power which eternally wills evil and eternally works good.”).

**[10]** The Marxist socialism represents the most important answer in that the modern matrix was capable of confronting political, social and economic madness caused by capitalist liberalism.

As a last resort, tied to the same philosophical foundation that once supported the “construction” of capitalist liberalism, and imprisoned by many of its own prejudices, Marxist socialist could not give a genuine, mild and effective solution to the serious social problems in that time.

On the contrary, in the light of the historic events following its coming on stage (specially, the civil wars that broke out — since the Marxist thinking is a classist doctrine of struggle that rejects any possibility of social conciliation — and the horrifying genocides carried out by its supporters in many different countries like Russia, Ukraine, Poland, China and Cambodia, just to name a few examples) it can be asserted that Marxist socialism contributed a lot to the aggravation of the crisis to which it tried to react.

By this stage of the events, it is not difficult to discern clearly how the socialist currents influenced by Marxism got dialectically involved with the capitalist-liberal structures, produced a negative “synergy” with each other, trapped national communities in the middle and increased the harmful effects that each current produced.

From this viewpoint, Marxist socialism has come to confirm the intrinsic “weakness” of Modern Age, the inconsistency of its foundation, the impossibility of its proposals, and at the same time, its destructive and suicidal view.

Marxist socialism represents the proof that Modern Age is incapable of resolving the problems it has caused. And therefore, of the urgent need all contemporary men have to definitely “get out” of it, letting it die in the past and “burying” once and for all its remains (that is to say: “Postmodern Age”). Being this and not

other, the major cultural and social challenge of our time.

**[11]** In accordance with: Labaké, Juan Gabriel, “Neoliberalismo, Globalización y Estrategia Nacional”, Ediciones “Nueva Forja”, Colección “Jauretche”, number 1, Buenos Aires (Argentina), January 1998, pages 4, 5, 9, 10 and 11.

**[12]** In accordance with: Lesta, José and Pedrero, Miguel, “Claves Ocultas del Poder Mundial”, EDAF, Madrid, Spain, 2006, pages 140, 141, and 142.

**[13]** Italian newspaper “La Repubblica”, 06.01.04, article “Noi, malati di tristezza” by Umberto Galimberti.

**[14]** It is worth remembering that, long before, in his famous books “The Gay Science” and “Thus Spoke Zarathustra”, the German philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900) informed about the “death of God”. This death, according to the Teutonic genius, was a “murder” committed by modern man.

**[15]** The aforementioned German catholic priest, who was born in 1885 and died in 1968, considered that — based on what another “schönstattiano” priest explained — “the main problem in today’s world is that modern man is incapable of thinking, living and loving organically. Why? Because he does not have an organic connection to reality. And why does this happen? Because he does not know how to link with each other the different values and realities created by God, because he does not know how to establish real personal connections with God or men. Father Kentenich catalogs today’s world crisis as a crisis of a body of connections. It is essential to save this body of personal connections. Connections to what? To creatures by means of which God leads the world, governs it, shows himself and transmits his life to us. Men cannot reach God if they do not

see themselves as creatures united with Him. That is our job. (I Jn. 4, 12, 20)” (P. Hernán Alessandri, “El Padre Kentenich”, Editorial Schoenstatt, Chile, 1989, page 33).

**[16]** The absurd modern anthropocentric aspiration, which consists of dethroning Divinity to establish man instead, led to his ruin.

From this point of view, “modern age” is like a gigantic and pretentious “Tower of Babel”, thus revealing to ourselves “postmodern age”, like the tragic and scattered rubble of the absurd construction already fallen down.

When apostatizing his Creator, man loses the sense of self-respect, demeaning and neglecting himself. He blocked Heaven with his skyscrapers, losing his way and sense. Far from liberating himself, his rebellion subjected him to the worst tyrannies.

**[17]** Argentine newspaper “La Nación”, 06.03.04.

**(\*) Pablo J. Davoli** was born in Rosario, Argentina, in 1975. He is a lawyer. He has been teaching “Political Law”, “Constitutional Law”, “Labor Relations” and other subjects, in the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences of Rosario (Argentina Catholic University), the Faculty of Economics Sciences of Rosario (Argentina Catholic University) and other institutions. He has also given lectures and written multiple articles on various topics of Political Philosophy, Political Theory, Geopolitics and Legal Sciences.

