

5.2 Social action of the Church

We must begin by remembering that for Arizmendiarieta, the intervention of the Church in the social question is never about apostolate work with the purpose of winning workers for the Church: Arizmendiarieta is firmly convinced that the social question has no solution outside of the doctrines of the Church, since neither liberalism nor collectivism provide any acceptable solution. Sometimes, Arizmendiarieta declared in the first National Assembly of Technicians of Catholic Action, what leads us to think about social work is not necessarily this feeling of the good of the worker, a generous feeling of justice or charity, but rather a rather narrow zeal and interest in the conquest of souls, as if they had to be won with a baited hook (CAS. 143).

When the Church's social doctrine is referred to, in reality, very ancient principles are referred to, as he himself will underscore—basic things, like the dignity of man, of the worker, etc., but which still are waiting to be put into practice. The social doctrine of the Church, which later admits various possible formulas for being put into practice, is the basis of the search for the “Third Way,” beyond collectivism and liberalism, blind violence and unlimited freedom.

Arizmendiarieta does not want to conceive of the social action of the Church “as something that can and must be constrained in the narrow limits of a formula and of assorted formulas designed *a priori*. While it is true, on some occasions, that the perfect is the enemy of the good, when it comes to social problems, it is easy to find that, in fact, certain manipulated and massaged formulas, magnificent in their apparent structures, are not viable, or that working to carry them out with the purity of their schematic simplicity entails so many drawbacks that, in fact, it is not worth the trouble of adopting them as redemptive signs” (Ib. 175). Liberalism, collectivism—Arizmendiarieta recognizes that all systems have positive aspects, and all of them have somehow contributed to the development of mankind. If there is a need to strive to find other solutions, it should not be so much to combat those systems, but to find solutions that are more appropriate to human dignity.

A unique, concrete formula, fixed in all its terms, which need only be put into practice, cannot be deduced from the Church's social doctrine, or from the Gospel. The gospel is a source of inspiration, not a cookbook. By “social action” (of the Church), Arizmendiarieta understands, therefore, “a disposition of the spirit with which one runs in parallel with the times, a detachment from formulas and the ballast of interests, so that one can empirically accommodate aspirations and confront problems, because every moment and every place has a particular character” (Ib.).

Christians have been unable to create social order in accordance with their doctrines. It could be said that there has not even been a serious attempt to do so: Christians possess good doctrine and bad praxis, or rather, no praxis (Ib. 45-46; 87), a sad fact, which, for Arizmendiarieta, turns out to be an incentive and a reason for optimism, given the failure of the other two paths.

Together with those who still maintain a relationship and a certain faith in the Church, the principles of Christian social doctrine must begin to be expounded. But these constitute a minority, with the immense majority of the workers separated from the Church, at least in the sense of that they expect nothing from her. To talk to them about the encyclicals will not make much sense, because they will immediately respond that the encyclicals have already existed for a long time, but that Christians themselves are not capable of putting them into practice, and it is as if they did not exist. This is why Arizmendiarieta thinks that “we do not so much need the Encyclicals, but rather men who have assimilated the doctrine and the spirit of these Encyclicals” (Ib. 18).

“The great enterprise that the Christian apostolate must undertake in our day is the restitution of trust to those masses that still remain faithful to her, at least externally, and then the attraction of all those who are distant” (Ib. 104). But that trust can be only won “when we have provided workshops and factories with men who have an exquisite social sense, with men with a well-developed social spirit, capable of promoting social action in tune with the circumstances in those sites; men capable of earning the trust of their workmates, men to whom the others look and who constitute carriers and representatives of all the desires for justice and equity of the others” (Ib. 18).

A worker is not won with good words. Many workers, says Arizmendiarieta, have no difficulty recognizing that the Church possesses an excellent social doctrine, better and more perfect than any other (Ib. 104-105). Nor do they fail to recognize, many of them, that all that the term “socialism,” or “communism,” can evoke has provided meager results to respond to the need of contemporary man. Not everyone, even among the very followers of such doctrines, is fooled by the illusion that the socialization of the means of production is capable of resolving the grave issues of life in all aspects. “But they conceive of us Catholics as incapable of applying even the smallest part of our doctrine, and it tells them nothing that a given law is inspired by Christian principles, because they see that all that is trampled every day by others who ceaselessly flaunt their Catholicism. We will not win these with exposure to doctrine. I do not mean that the preaching, instruction or teaching of social doctrine are unnecessary—far from it. They are not enough. Nor has it usually been the speculative arguments

of Marx's *Capital* that has brought them to the enemy ranks, but rather the actions and the spirit of men who, imbued with those ideas or justifying their social reaction to injustice with those ideas, have been able to gain their trust and have been able to confront injustices with integrity" (ib. 105; cf. ib. 18).

There is no reason to see any contradiction between this last statement and Arizmendiarieta's insistence on underscoring the strength of truths, of ideas. Rather, Arizmendiarieta has always insisted that ideas should be embodied in people. Arizmendiarieta then demands dedication to study from those men with social spirit, who must gain the trust of their workmates, (SS, II, 251-251; CAS, 105-107). "We must form these elements. This should be the first concern of our apostolate" (CAS, 105).

Social action, understood in the sense indicated above, was spread especially through Catholic Action. Catholic Action, Arizmendiarieta insists endlessly, should not be identified with any social formula. "It must be kept in mind that in this social field, the fundamental difficulty of every advance, for one and all, is the excessive attachment to immediate and personal material interests" (ib. 176).

This insistence on denying the possibility of identifying the Church's social doctrine with a concrete formula makes one think that the issue was not so much a general principle, but a problem posed by a State that defined itself as Catholic and its economic policy as inspired by the social teaching of the Popes. Arizmendiarieta did not want to allow himself to be framed in any political Upper Room, nor did he want to allow Catholic Action to be. "What Catholic Action has never been, is not, and will never be, is a vine that needs political support." (SS, II, 233-234).

Working people, he already says clearly in 1945, see the Church at the service of the State. "The Army, the Clergy and the Falange are the three claws of the capitalist; it is said and believed as dogma among them, and it is difficult to uproot this idea from their mindset. It is not enough for us to instruct them in social doctrine. With that, we will not win their trust; they already recognize that we know how to preach a very good doctrine. They need to see us together with them, suffering with them. We need to win their hearts" (PR, I, 91).

Among the causes Arizmendiarieta cites (1945) for Catholic Action not working well in the Diocese of Vitoria, with its established religious spirit, and where so many other religious associations are flourishing, is a "suspicion among a very numerous sector of the faithful, from the moment it was presented at the end of the war, coinciding with the consolidation of the dominant political situation, about the political undertones of the people who, in those moments, began to appear among their ranks and

their leaders, who were almost inevitably welcomed and trusted by the rulers, because of the intelligence and mutual cooperation between the civil authorities and the leaders of Catholic Action in gatherings and public events, which gave attendees the conviction that Catholic Action and this regime were all one, and mutually supported each other, and because of the publications, flags, hymns, etc., that confirmed those suspicions, all of which constitutes a powerful motive that has created an attitude that is little less than hostile in a very high percentage of the people, many of them sincerely religious (...). There are towns where those suspicious people make up as much as eighty percent, and in most towns of Guipuzcoa and Biscay they make up more than sixty percent” (PR, I, 70-71).¹

Arizmendiarieta tries to reinforce Catholic Action as a means of Christian social action precisely because he hopes for it to be able to gather to its bosom all sincerely Catholic people, and those of lively social consciousness. “It is,” he says, “the only association that can make the Church independent of the guardianship of political parties and of partisan Catholics who do so much damage when they do not know how to leave that partisan overtone out of their Catholic behavior. It offers a channel for ordered, effective, uniquely Catholic behavior” (Ib. 75).

“It is not necessary,” he repeated in 1955 in Saturrarán, “for those of us who want to present ourselves as Catholics to act on a plan as a united front, we could almost say as a compact group, with a single way of interpreting the social doctrine of the Church. The social doctrine is abstract and general enough that various interpretations can always be made of it, and, on the other hand, social life, in turn, is also complex enough that the behavior of different people can take a variety of forms. The only unforgivable thing for those who call ourselves Catholics is, perhaps, conservatism and inaction. The action can be highly varied, if we attend to circumstances of form, of rhythm, and of vigor. No doubt Christian groups of men from various origins and political-social labels have carried out magnificent social work. Let us not forget that many of the attitudes that at one time were described as extreme or excessively bold and reckless, with the passage of time, we have found to be normal and sound. The experience of what has occurred in this field of social activity predisposes us to be cautious about being too quick to condemn certain attitudes as revolutionary, and therefore inappropriate” (CAS, 235-236).

Arizmendiarieta wanted to save the independence of the Christian message at all costs. “We are all cramped,” he wrote in his notes. “The Church, the ecclesiastics, the secular, both employers and workers. We each have our idol, our solution, our formula, and behind that, our own love, if not our pesetas, to defend, conserve or increase. Which is good, because it is ours. If there are no great souls, it is not because there are no

¹ Among the causes for Catholic Action of the Diocese of Vitoria not working well, the lack of faith in it on the part of the workers is mentioned, and, most surprisingly, on the part of the priests themselves and the clerics because of ignorance, etc., and because “they suffer the consequences of that silent campaign, ably carried out against Catholic Action and against the influence of the secular cleric, particularly by the Fathers of the Company of Jesus, from the pages of their very widespread magazines, and more, from the centers that they direct and even the retreats and exercises directed at priests, from the most remote village to the rooms of the Diocesan Seminary itself, and not excluding exercises directed at the secular, where, even when they do not say anything directly against Catholic Action and they abstain from orienting souls towards themselves, they always allow some commentary or some little phrase to escape, leaving a bad taste. This work, not being silent, has continued to make a dent in the mood of the priests themselves, to say nothing of the faithful” (PR, I, 72).

souls capable of heroic acts, but rather, they are incapable of daily service, of small sacrifices. If there is no Christian social action in tune with the times... it is because every one is comfortable and surreptitiously installed in his selfishness or comfort. Souls are not opened... Souls open to hearing others..., souls open to admitting the goodness of different formulas... and trying them out in practice..., souls that hold dialogue...” (Ib. 176).

In fact, Arizmendiarieta, as early as 1946, did not hide his sympathies for democratic socialism, especially for British laborism, as can be seen in his writing on the right to property (CAS, 68-69; 71, 76), sympathies that manifested rather indirectly through all his writings of these years.

5.3 The priest's work

Disregarding other reasons or principles which advised this position, Arizmendiarieta preferred political and social neutrality of priests towards parties and associations because he considered it urgent to remake unity in the people (PR, I, 19), in his concrete case in Mondragon, where “fratricidal struggles, hatred, and vengeance have, for many years, opened some very deep wounds, which must be healed” (SS, II, 226-228; PR, I, 17). The idea that it was necessary to forget the old positions—liberals, Marxists—and to start to raise a new order, on new foundations, was very profound in him. For this reason, it was necessary to be able to renounce the formulas and know how to dialogue among all, to raise up the new order.

It will demand of every priest an identical posture of material and spiritual austerity. “It is not possible to approach the social field without a great detachment from material goods, but nor can anything effective be done day by day without a nearly absolute spiritual detachment. By”spiritual detachment,” we mean a lack of concern for, and the relinquishment of, all those ideas and feelings that are purely and exclusively evangelical. We have to ignore all other ideological constructions to be able to approach the masses. What the times have produced are as variable as the times themselves, and can even be debatable by the necessary people the times have provided to themselves” (CAS, 192).

He compares the social apostle with David, who must confront a powerful giant who has all the elements in the world in his favor: Goliath, the authentic figure of temporal power, of money, of ambition, of overlapping machinations. With his armor, he is hidden from every human risk and can challenge anyone. To confront him, David first tried on Saul’s royal armor, but saw that it was too heavy for him. He chose to fight with poor weapons and freedom of movement. “The social apostle of our days needs that interior freedom, which he will enjoy if he conforms to values, with evangelical affections and interests. This is how he can be molded to everyone, and will be Hebrew with the Jews, and Hellenic with the Greeks: he will be no more

than Christian, Christian above all” (Ib. 193). Only with this disposition will a priest be able to come to a meeting of the workers and enter into dialogue with them; it will be possible for the trust which the poor once placed in Christ to be reborn.

Here is the catalogue of virtues Arizmendiarieta establishes for the priest who wants to act in the workers’ world: 1. Freedom, 2. Disinterest and detachment, 3. Spirit of sacrifice and service, 4. Austerity, 5. Charity (Ib. 209). Elsewhere, these virtues are reduced to three: freedom, austerity, and industriousness, the latter revealing a new aspect, compared to the first catalog cited (Ib. 214). Naturally, Arizmendiarieta did not pursue any systematic goal in establishing such lists of virtues of social apostles, but it will be helpful to observe how he reasoned its necessity. “The life of the priest who wishes to support his teaching with life,” he says, referring to industriousness, “has to be one of intense work, because in the mentality of the people who surround us, work is one of the great undisputed values, and perhaps for many, we priests are little more than undesirable bureaucrats, because they do not see us as consecrated to work. Between them and us there will be a stream of mutual sympathy from the moment that they can consider us true workers: let us work on what we can. Let us work in schools, let us work in assistance to the sick, let us work in the formation of youth, let us work even in the care and cleaning of our temple. Let us be the first worker of the parish or the town. But let us work also disinterestedly” (Ib. 212-213).

With these dispositions and virtues, the social apostle will be able to establish relationships with the working masses. But the temples and parish centers, Arizmendiarieta observes, are not the places where they tend to congregate: whoever wants to approach them must go and coexist with them wherever they ordinarily are. Only there can there be spontaneous and natural contact, since forced or imposed contact makes souls close and all action elusive. The priest must be present in the places of recreation, of meeting, in the neighborhoods of the workers, and his physical presence must be accompanied by a “sincere and intensive social co-existence and true spiritual rapport. This experience and rapport require of the priest a sufficient sensitivity, no longer just to understand, but even to intuit the problems and concerns of the worker” (Ib. 134-135).

However, Arizmendiarieta is absolutely opposed to the appointment of chaplains of factories, while he is sympathetic to the movement of worker priests. The chaplain of a factory will be inevitably seen by the workers as an ally of the boss; and if he is truly interested in the situation of the workers, he will easily enter into conflict with the directors of the business (Ib. 135-136).

The social apostle must be informed on social doctrine, but does not

need to be a social technician who knows how to resolve concrete matters. He must inspire; workers themselves must learn to search for the concrete solutions required. "The people, the masses, are not demanding this or that social work from us, this or that activity, but rather this spirit of understanding, this compassion and intelligence about their moral and material problems" (Ib. 193). Many priests excuse their social apathy, alleging that they are not given concrete orientation, that they do not know about that. Arizmendiarieta is confronted on several occasions with this objection (Ib. 175, 193, 210, 214, 226, 235). "Nor have they told the doctor what prescription he has to give on every occasion," responds Arizmendiarieta (Ib. 210). It is impossible to proceed with received prescriptions and formulas. There would be no lack of doctors, if this system of prescriptions and formulas was possible.

"... There is a warning that the social problem is posed in a field of technical efficiency, with such a complexity of elements that are presented concatenated such that, when it is difficult to foresee the circumstances of their development or evolution, certain reservations must be accepted in the concrete formulas.

We, however, are always demanding concrete solutions, and we regret that the Church often does not offer a palpable, ponderable, sensible Christian social program for all. We need not talk about the danger of giving undue credit to very concrete solutions or formulas, imposing on them all the weight and all the authenticity of an exclusively Christian interpretation of the Gospel message, always so enduring and so current in all situations.

The Church always offers principles and, above all, a magnificent spiritual potential to overcome all subjective and objective obstacles that contribute to maintaining social unease between men.

The Church is the guardian of the true dignity of man and subordinates the combination of all the elements which condition man's existence to the demands of his dignity and destiny" (Ib. 226).

This is how, free from formulas, the task of the social apostle is fundamentally reduced to two fields: formation of consciousness and the promotion of social initiatives (Ib. 96 ff.).

Arizmendiarieta laments that the Church, with its preaching and teaching, has managed to create a fairly accurate mentality and standard in the masses about other matters in life, and hardly done anything to build social consciousness. Where are the campaigns against abuses in commerce, against excessive profits in sales and industry, against insufficient wages, against immorality in business? The silence of the Church compromises very sacred interests. In imparted moral instruction it is undoubtable, says Arizmendiarieta, that the teaching of moral principles as applied to professional life is lacking (Ib. 96-97). There are silences that are betrayals.

Secondly, the social apostle should promote entities in the defense of the

poor, of aid and social development. In what industrial town of our diocese, wonders Arizmendiarrieta, could businesses, individually or collectively, not implement health or life insurance, on their own, long before the State made them do so, and, naturally, with lower premiums than those that are demanded now, and with more morality and efficacy in its application? If there was spirit and social initiative, practices of this kind would not be lacking. But in general, we continue to expect that it will be the State that takes care of giving solutions, forgetting what we ourselves we could solve, and what, even after the State has intervened, still remains to be done. What town or industrial zone cannot provide means to put an end to the plague of tuberculosis? However, nothing is done, and the day will come when the State will have to intervene, costing much more and having to bear all this burden. The same thing could be said about housing, teaching, etc.

Finally, the Church possesses various centers of social action, like dispensaries, etc. It is urgent that the workers themselves take responsibilities in such centers. "We all recognize the hazards of disorganized and irresponsible masses, and the urgency of transforming them into an organized and responsible people. For this, it is necessary that each one, or the majority of society, feel an interest and responsibility for something. Even when worker participation seems premature to us in some positions that require a lot of preparation and maturity, we are not ever going to obtain those conditions if we continue to exclude them from everything, as if they were minors, making them maintain a passive stance" (Ib. 141). Social assistance works are to provide workers with material relief, but these works can also provide a spiritual satisfaction as great or greater than the material, from the moment in which their thought, opinion or judgment is given a role in their organization and orientation. There is no motive to avoid their participation; on the contrary, they must participate, if they are not to be condemned to inevitable opposition or passivity. Workers, like all others, have a sensitive heart, and their feeling of dignity is hurt with the excessive paternalism that is shown by treating them as minors.

The social doctrine of the Church requires that the worker find a place on the job as the intelligent and responsible being he is. In words of the prelate M. Ruoast, "if one wants the worker to work, it is necessary to not treat him as a beast of burden, but rather as an intelligent being who is made to understand the need for his effort (...)... He must be freed of his status as passive subordinate, to become an intelligent collaborator" (Ib. 93). The Church should begin by applying this principle to its own house. The Popes call for worker participation in even the running of the national economy, but then we find ourselves reticent to agree to their participation in a town dispensary (Ib. 197). "We do not pay due attention to the need to treat the laborers or workers, or men in general, like intelligent beings. And

we would affirm that, in this, we priests run into a great difficulty, because almost by the very nature of our dignity, we tend to be authoritarian, absorbent and personalist, and our works can easily suffer from this defect” (Ib. 196).

5.4 Christianity and social emancipation

Can the Christian struggle against injustice? How are justice and charity related? These two matters should be dealt with here briefly, even though Arizmendiarieta’s reflections that we will present are from later times.

5.4.1 Gospel and social struggle

The first issue emerges from the Beatitudes, which define the Christian: blessed are the poor, the meek, the persecuted, etc.; “resist not evil; rather, to the one who strikes you on the right cheek, offer the other also; to the one who would sue you for your tunic, give also your cloak,” etc. (Matthew 5:39 ff). How can such texts coexist with a decisive spirit of struggle social?

Arizmendiarieta responds by quoting the following words of Mounier: “The Christian can accept, for his perfection, suffering the injustice that strikes him. It is a question of private asceticism. But the Christian is not alone in the world, and can reconcile, without contradiction, the desire to not fight injury with the duty to struggle against the establishment of injustice in the world. A regime like modern capitalism is a sort of social sin. It is no longer against affliction itself that the Christian must fight, but rather against Evil. And it is well-known that such combat requires everyone” (FC, IV, 61; Ib. 62). What is in question is what Christian consciousness can give of itself socially. And for Arizmendiarieta, there is no doubt that the cooperative experience, for example, is a practice of the development of methods of combat and self-improvement inspired by this Christian consciousness. “Bread for me,” Arizmendiarieta recalls, “is a material problem, but my neighbor’s bread is a spiritual problem” (Ib.), clarifying that bread means the synthesis of all human problems.

The answer does not seem at all satisfactory: every legitimation of social struggle is made to rest on the rights of one’s neighbor, not on one’s own, which, apart from perhaps not being very realistic, is clearly insufficient within Arizmendiarieta’s general conception. In effect, he recognizes, on the one hand, that a certain level of material well-being is necessary for personal development: from which it should be deduced that man must struggle for himself, at least until he has insured the minimum level necessary to save his human dignity. And, on the other hand, Arizmendiarieta conceives of man as a being in constant development, by his very nature, which also seems to demand the struggle against impediments to personal development. Social struggle, therefore, should be able to be legitimated

both in the name of one's neighbor and in one's own name. Arizmendiarieta does not do so, perhaps to highlight the values of generosity, solidarity, etc., and because, without doubt, putting man himself as an end and objective of the struggle puts him in danger of falling into the same thing for which he has so sharply criticized liberalism and collectivism. Even with all this, and although the idea of inalienable personal development is the most fundamental part of Arizmendiarieta's conception (continuous creation), juxtaposed with this are the teachings on evangelical meekness, which certainly are not in the perspective of human development and promotion, without considering that between the positions, some conflict may emerge.

In Arizmendiarieta's religious thought, without doubt, creation plays a much more important role than redemption, which is to say, original sin does not seem to have a place in him, and the cross is reduced to little more than personal asceticism. Because of all this, his concept of the Christian closely resembles a humanism of an ascetic cut, in which God equals the absolute Ideal (without forgetting his significance as Creator) and Jesus Christ appears as the Teacher and moral model (not without reason does he consider Cicero and Seneca as very close to Christianity) (SS, I, 109-110). Consequently, Arizmendiarieta's Christian man always appears as "most human," "most man," that is, most free, most generous, etc. Man, incomplete nature, is brought into its human plenitude by Christianity. These are habitual expressions of his: "neither as a man, nor as a Christian," "no Christian, or even a humanist" can talk, for example, about justice without referring to charity, etc.

It is surprising, therefore, that for him the idea of social struggle and, most concretely, of the meaning of cooperativism, is a complement to the passion of Christ, an idea that appears only once in his writings, during Holy Week of 1962. It seems like another test, as many of his ideas were born along the way.

Arizmendiarieta wants cooperators to deepen in the "cooperative mystique," to realize the value and scope of what they are doing, and of the rich content of the cooperative movement. The ideal is vast, without limits, a truly revolutionary idea, Arizmendiarieta insists. "A new world is being born today, there is a clear trend towards a new society, one that is more just, more human, and in this tendency, we cooperators have a very important role to play." Cooperators cannot be satisfied simply because things are going well for them, or because they have been able to demonstrate the error of the many who opposed such an experiment, arguing that it was a utopian ideal and not realizable in practice. It is certainly not about that: "it is simply and fully about the birth, and about collaborating on the gestation and delivery, of a new society, of a new world. Let us not forget, birth is painful" (FC, I, 105). The cooperator should never forget that being

a cooperator could, one day, perhaps not so distant, demand true sacrifices and deprivation, and that he must be willing to accept them.

Other than the distances, between the passion of Christ and the cooperative movement, a marked parallelism can be noted: as Christ, “in the pains of his passion, gave birth to a new man, a new society,” so the cooperative movement, between sacrifices and deprivation, cooperates in the birth of a new man and of a new social order. Arizmendiarieta uses the words of Saint Peter, that it is necessary “to complete what the Passion of Christ lacks.”

“It is, then, and I do not believe it is presumption to say so, a task of co-redemption, a collaboration with Christ in the redemption of men, at the same time as it is a collaboration with God in the task of creation and its perfection” (ib. 107).

This work, Arizmendiarieta keeps insisting, must demand from us sacrifices, selflessness, surrender to others, frequently quashing our disorganized material interests and our selfishness. The position of the true cooperator must be one of openness, of generous acceptance and total surrender to the requirement of the ideal. “I think that we all, more or less, dream of Easter day, we yearn and sigh for the birth of this child that we are gestating today, of that society made for man, tailor-made and at his service, in that society, which undoubtedly will arrive, as the radiant morning of the Resurrection arrived, in which man, served by all things and master of them, becomes ever more man, more free and happy, and definitively nearer to God and open to the grace of the Redemption. But let us not forget that radiant Easter came after the painful Passion” (ib.).

5.4.2 Charity, complement of justice

Many times charity has been understood as a “replacement” for justice (or rather, for the lack of justice) (SS, I, 127), which turns out to be insulting for those who are charitably served. Charity, in this sense, can only be vanity or hypocrisy, and not what it should be, the “complement of justice.” Whoever does not feel it and does not practice it this way can be considered a trafficker in feelings that man does not have for sale (PR, I, 178).

The Christian, who believes in transcendence, must be equally able to embody faith in earthly realities. It continues to be surprising that Arizmendiarieta, generally very attentive to data, statistics and problems in his reports, in the *Elkarte Eguna* of 1974 has a special reminder to those for whom “the living of transcendence does not attenuate substantivity and the interest in the tangible, visible, temporary, and therefore, the appeal and cultivation of other energy coming from, or nested in, the deepest recesses of the human spirit, faith and hope as well as charity, interpreted

in its most theological sense, complement or harmonize with all the more circumstantial or temporary commitments” (CLP, I, 226).

No Christian, or even humanist, can talk about social justice without likewise referring to charity. The reason is that the law wants to establish an order of reciprocal duties and rights between men, starting from the recognition of their equality and dignity. But the establishment of such an order finds a large obstacle in the human will, in selfishness. “The only force that, above all else, can make us want and respect order is mutual love. That effective, broad, and generous love can only sprout from a Christian religious conception, which encompasses everyone as children of God and unites them in the common destiny of the present and future life. Justice needs the complement, the excellence of love, Christian charity” (CAS, 41-42).

Charity urges us, then, to the fulfillment of justice, and is a social bond that invigorates all others and perfects them. If, in our world, charity is regarded with suspicion, even with contempt, it is because it has been disfigured. “Love denies no right, but rather makes it less rigid. It reduces no duties, but rather makes them easier. It does not destroy social distinctions, but takes away the abyss which lies between them. All the social vices that oppose love, such as envy, hatred, anger, contempt, and pride, are causes and sources of injustice, while love, in social life, results in comprehension and mutual tolerance, in resolving differences and union” (Ib. 42).

Finally, Arizmendiarieta states, along with the *Quadragesimo Anno*, that justice alone, even the most perfect, could make the differences and causes of social struggles disappear, but would never be able to unite hearts and link spirits. Therefore, “without the climate of charity, justice will be incapable of assuring true social peace and general well-being” (Ib. 43).

It no longer seems surprising that Arizmendiarieta considers the Eucharist “the great social sacrament,” “the Christian culmination of the rights of mankind, of the rights of man” (SS I, 210-211). For a believer, who accepts that “each man, each Christian, is a veil that covers the Most High, which is why the neighbor is Jesus Christ present in him” (SS, I, 135), loving God means loving one’s neighbor, and vice versa. In this way, “the proclamation of the rights of Jesus Christ is the affirmation of the rights of the disinherited” (Ib. 218).

We can conclude with the observation, now understandable, that for Arizmendiarieta, religious life, generally, fulfills very “human” functions. This is how the sacrament of penitence is considered in the perspective of the austerity necessary for the conquest of freedom (“Christian penitence as a means to ones own liberation.” SS, I, 178), prayer as a means of obtaining inner tranquility and firmness, etc. Arizmendiarieta has a won-

derful phrase, which he appears to owe to A. Carrel, that deserves to be transcribed: “Prayer produces as palpable effects the proper functioning of the glands, which is reflected in that air of satisfaction, joy, optimism...” (Ib. 236).

6. Doctrinal framework

What sources nurtured Arizmendiarieta’s thought? It has already been indicated, when talking about the family, that the thought of the early Arizmendiarieta should be understood, basically, as a development of Christian social doctrine, as it was habitually developed in the academic life of seminarians. Now, trying to frame it more broadly, there is the need to insist on this again, though without forgetting that this was not his only source.

An in-depth study of Arizmendiarieta’s sources does not turn out to be easy, because in his writings, he very rarely cites the sources used. This difficulty is compensated by the fact that his library has been preserved almost intact, as well as his file cabinet and his notes.

His religious thought (God the Father, Divinity of Christ, nature and grace, etc.) seems to rest on the theological literature that was common among priests around the years of the Civil War. It is notable that, with his theological studies finished in 1940, almost no theological books found access to his library after that. Hans Küng is an exception. This continues to be significant.²

The opposite happens with social issues: his library was endlessly enriched in this field. (In the bibliography we attach at the end of the book, the titles from his library have been collected which may be considered most significant).

However, when it comes time to frame or historically situate Arizmendiarieta’s thought in general, two sources or spheres should be especially highlighted, from which and in which he developed constantly: these are Christian social doctrine and the Personalist philosophy (Maritain, Mounier). Below we refer to both, briefly, leaving the relevant details in each case for the relevant place.

6.1 Pontifical doctrine

The feeling of finding oneself in a world in bankruptcy, or in a total crisis of ideas and values, must have been very personal in Arizmendiarieta; his formulation is closely tuned to pontifical texts at all times.³ It is interesting here to underscore, first and foremost, the eminently moral and religious, not analytical, character of this vision.⁴ The following text from Pius XI could serve as a good summary of Arizmendiarieta’s thought as expressed

² From what we have been able to infer with difficulty, the theological books most used for his conferences and sermons appear to have been the following: Buysse, P., *Los fundamentos de la fe* [*The Fundamentals of Faith*], *Dios, el alma y la religión* [*God, the Soul and Religion*], Ed. Litúrgica Española, Barcelona 1930. Olgiati, Mons. F., *Sílabario del cristianismo* [*Syllabary of Christianity*], Ed. Luis Gili, Barcelona 1940. Sertillanges, A.D., *Catecismo de los incrédulos* [*Catechism of the Unbelievers*], Ed. Poliglota, Barcelona 1934. As can be seen, the apologetic and rationalist tendency strongly dominates.

³ In Pontifical doctrine, this vision has formed part of their fierce opposition to the modern liberal or democratic world until very recently. Such reactionary aspects are not lacking in Arizmendiarieta’s thinking, either, in his early years. This is why an explicit acceptance of democracy is not found in Arizmendiarieta until Pius XII’s Christmas radio message of 1944; “freedoms” generally will be judged negatively, and he will insist that the Church is indifferent to any political regime; he longs for the religious unity and solidity of medieval principles, even though, on the other hand—doubtlessly due to Maritain’s influence—he approves of the death of “that Christianity.” In all this, Arizmendiarieta will experience a radical evolution.

⁴ Calvez, J.I., Perrin, J., *Iglesia y sociedad económica*, Mensajero, Bilbao 1965, 466-467, 474-475, 491.

in his first texts: “Humanity, regrettably, moved away from God and from Jesus Christ. This is why it has come to fall from the previous state of happiness into this abyss of evils, and this is why all the attempts made to repair the evils and save the remains of so many ruins frequently fail. God and Jesus Christ have been excluded from legislation and government, the source of authority has been put in man, not in God; because of this, laws have lost the guarantee of true and imperishable sanctions, and have stayed detached from the sovereign principles of the law, whose unique source, according to the pagan philosophers themselves, such as, for example, Cicero, was the eternal law of God. The fundamentals of authority have disappeared, because of the suppression of the fundamental reason for the right of the ruler to rule and the obligation of the governed to obey. The inescapable consequence was the cataclysm of all human society, lacking any base or solid defense, and made into a prison of political actors who struggle for power, seeking their own interests, not the interests of the homeland.”⁵

According to this (theological) vision of history, all evils—wars, revolutions, injustices and social disorder—come from mankind having distanced itself from God. More concretely, social injustices that, according to Pius XII, “cry to heaven” with their gravity, have the following “causes”:

- marginalization of religion in public and social life, which is thus deprived of firm principles,⁶ with the consequent moral deterioration.⁷ All other causes must be understood as an explanation of this one.
- the violence unleashed by “modern freedoms,” that have “divided nations into two classes of citizens.”⁸ With the ancient guilds now dissolved, and the order that kept the weakest protected now broken, “the times senselessly handed the solitary and defenseless workers over to the inhumanity of business owners and the unbridled greed of competitors.”⁹
- individualism or “individualist liberalism”¹⁰ and, additionally,
- selfishness, “which orders and subjects everything to its exclusive benefit, completely ignoring or infringing on the good of the rest.”¹¹
- greed, usury, avarice, etc., that have become universally accepted in the liberal economic order, being practiced with all honorableness “under a different appearance.”¹²

It should be added that moral corruption, the ultimate root of social conflicts in the Pontiffical analysis, is not exclusive to the dominant classes: it has also taken over the working classes, causing struggle without quarter between classes. Pius XI expressed it in what has become a celebrated phrase: “From the factories, inert material comes out ennobled, but men are corrupted and are made more vile.”¹³ In a society with corrupted leaders, the corruption of the subjects seems a condition of self-defense and survival: “the leaders of the economy,” says the Pontiff himself, “following a path so deviated from righteousness, it was natural that workers would

⁵ Pius XI, *Ubi Arcano*, in: *Pontifical Doctrine, Social Documents*, B.A.C., Madrid 1959, 564 (in the future, this edition of social papal documents will be cited by the initials DS/BAC).

⁶ Leon XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, DS/BAC, 312.

⁷ *Id.*, 311.

⁸ *Id.*, 346-347. It should be observed that Leo XIII seems to take as his own the Marxist thesis of society divided into two antagonistic classes.

⁹ *Id.*, 312.

¹⁰ Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*, DS/BAC, 856.

¹¹ *Id.*, *Caritate Christi*, DS/BAC, 782.

¹² Leon XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, DS/BAC, 312.

¹³ Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, DS/BAC, 760.

wander *en masse* into the same abyss.”¹⁴ We underscore, finally, that since Leo XIII (*Quoad Apostolici*), the so-called “social doctrine” of the Church¹⁵ has tended to reduce liberalism and socialism (or communism) to identical common causes.¹⁶

The two World Wars appeared in this perspective as the best evidence that a social order is not possible while disregarding God, which is to say, “the natural and traditional basis of society.”¹⁷ “The present troubles,” Pius XII declared on the eve of the Second World War, “are the most impressive argument for Christianity, as there cannot be a greater one. From the gigantic vortex of errors and antichristian movements, such bitter fruits have been harvested, that they constitute a condemnation whose efficacy overcomes all theoretical refutation.”¹⁸

This was the first source of Arizmendiarieta’s thought. Today’s reader, who is probably somewhat surprised by what we have discussed, also needs to be able to situate it in the atmosphere in which it had its origin. During the first half of the twentieth century, all Western thought, on the left or right, is dominated by the feeling of bankruptcy, from O. Spengler, who believes the sinking of the West is unstoppable, to the last Scheler, Klages, Ortega y Gasset, for whom it is rationalism that has entirely failed in the face of life, and even the Marxists and Personalist thinkers, for those whom liberal civilization has definitively entered into the phase of violent self-destruction, or the existentialists, not to mention the so-called “conservative revolutionaries,” more or less neighbors of fascism. Among these thinkers, it will be the Personalists, as has been said, those who will have the most influence on Arizmendiarieta’s thinking. But this general atmosphere was also reflected in the Church, including the Spanish Church. Following the short triumphalist parenthesis, in which doubts seemed no have place, the end of the Second World War brought the old issues back to light. That something was failing miserably in Western culture was unquestionable: two consecutive world wars demanded an explanation that reached the root of evil.

With the conflict over, *Ecclesia* wondered, between the victors and the vanquished, who was truly bankrupt. “Christianity has not failed,” it responded, “but rather the negation of Christianity.” Arizmendiarieta gives the same response. No, there cannot be peace without God.¹⁹ And, more concretely, without God, there cannot be social peace. As Pius XII declared in his message to Spanish workers: “without the Church, the social question is unsolvable.”²⁰

Point by point, as we have been able to verify, the young Arizmendiarieta adheres, in the topics he deals with, to the Pontifical teachings, well equipped with quotes.

¹⁴ Id., 760.

¹⁵ For the current discussion of this concept, see Chenu, M.D., *La “doctrine sociale” de l’Eglise comme idéologie*, Ed. du Cerf. Paris 1979.

¹⁶ Calvez, J.L.- Perrin, J., op. cit., 111.

¹⁷ Pius X. Letter of 25 August, 1910, in: *Pontifical Doctrine, Political Documents*, Library of Christian Authors, Madrid 1958, 408.

¹⁸ Pius XII. *Summi Pontificatus*, 20 October 1939. In all these ideas—social disasters as a result of moral decay, wars as a result of sin, chaos originates from the abandonment of God, etc.—Arizmendiarieta is immersed in a broad theological tradition which, through St. Augustine (cf. Pegueroles, J., *El pensamiento filosófico de San Agustín*, Labor, Barcelona 1972, 110-111) connects with Deuteronomic and prophetic thought in the Old Testament (cf. Von Rad, G., *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1, Ch. Kaiser, Munich 1969, 346 ff., 395 ff.), even though it is necessary to recognize that “crime and punishment” connection certainly overflows the margins of confessions. However, these aspects do not constitute more than an introduction to Arizmendiarieta’s own thought. Our interest is, first and foremost, in that they illuminate the genesis of Arizmendiarieta’s thought, in which the ethical foundation will prove to be decisive.

¹⁹ “Where Christ does not reign, there is constant war,” we read in Buomberger, F., *La crisis de nuestra cultura y las leyes eternas*, Biblioteca de Promoción Social, Cádiz, 1942, 20. Arizmendiarieta used this book extensively in his discussions of the current crisis. Various literary references (Montesquieu, p. 10; Dupanloup, p. 21, etc.) could likewise come from the cited study.

²⁰ Pius XII, Address to Spanish workers, 11 March 1951, DS/BAC, 1098.

Beyond what we have said, this also constituted, at least on the more explosive issues, a whole method to prevent possible censorship and reprisals. Years later, at the time of the Vatican II and of John XXIII, we still see social apostles who faced situations under a dictatorship, armed with pontifical quotes. In Arizmendiarieta's writings, the massive use of pontifical texts disappears almost entirely by the late '40s. But until then, it was also very frequent for him to raise social demands or harshly criticize injustices based on Christian social doctrine. It is, without a doubt, the same tactic which can be seen today in some countries, where criticism of "real socialism" seeks support in texts by Karl Marx.

However, Christian social doctrine will soon seem insufficient to him, and, above all, "too scholastic" and abstract. It must come down, he says later, from the Olympus of ideals to the "vulgarity" of real facts.²¹

In this descent, he seems to have needed other help more urgently than Christian social doctrine.

6.2 Personalist roots: Maritain

The authors with the most works in Arizmendiarieta's library are Ortega y Gasset and Maritain.

A direct influence of Ortega y Gasset on Arizmendiarieta's thinking does not seem to be detectable, unless it is a very vague and generic influence. It is instructive in this respect to observe which passages Arizmendiarieta underlined in Ortega's texts in his reading²²: they are precisely the ones that seem to coincide with Arizmendiarieta's very characteristic vision of the open man, creator of himself through action, through invention. To limit ourselves to a single example, in the book *Meditation on Technique*, the following text is underlined: "In the hole that overcoming his animal life leaves, man takes on a series of nonbiological chores, which are not imposed on him by nature, which he himself invents. And precisely that invented life, invented as a novel or a work of theater is invented, is what man calls human life, well-being."²³ At the end of the book, we again find this passage underlined: "But human life is not just a struggle with the material, but also man's struggle with his soul."²⁴ These are classic Arizmendian thoughts.

We said in the conclusion of the previous section that Christian social doctrine ended up seeming too distant from reality to Arizmendiarieta (similarly, he would counterpose, in 1945, real Marxists and book Marxism, cf. CAS, 18). We wish to transfer here one last text of Ortega, strongly underlined by Arizmendiarieta in pencil:

"It is proper for the intellectual who is close to things to manage them; material things, if he is a physicist, human things if he is a historian. If the

²¹ Letter from 8 November, 1974 A.D. José María Setién (Arizmendiarieta Archive).

²² It must be observed that the library, in this sense, cannot be an exhaustive reference for us. Arizmendiarieta knows and cites in his writings works that are lacking today in his library (for example, Ortega's *La rebelión de las masas* is missing, and the same thing is said of important works by Maritain). Still, a detailed study of underlined passages in Arizmendiarieta's books could be illuminating.

²³ Ortega Y Gasset, J., "Meditación de la Técnica," *Revista de Occidente*, Madrid 1957, 33.

²⁴ *Ib.* 100.

German historians of the nineteenth century had been more political men, or even more "men of the world," perhaps history would today be a science, and together with it, a really effective technique would exist to act on large collective phenomena, before which, it is said with shame, modern man is like Paleolithic man before the lightning bolt.

The so-called 'spirit' is a too-ethereal power, which gets lost in the maze of itself, of its own infinite possibilities. It is too easy to think! The mind, in its flights, finds little if any resistance. Therefore, it is as important for the intellectual to experience material objectives and learn, in his dealings with them, a discipline of content. The bodies have been the teachers of the spirit, as the centaur Chiron was the teacher of the Greeks. Without things that are seen and touched, the presumed 'spirit' would be no more than dementia. The body is the gendarme and the pedagogue of the spirit.

(...) All the creators of the new science realized their consubstantiality through technique. So it was with Bacon and Galileo, Gilbert and Descartes, Huygens and Hooke or Newton."²⁵

Ortega, still without seeking a confrontation with the regime, was far from being the master of thought who wanted Francoism in the 40s.²⁶

The teachers consecrated in the new "Spanish science" were, rather, Donoso Cortés, Menéndez y Pelayo, Balmes, the latter even with the express recommendation of Pius XII²⁷ and the support of *Ecclesia*, voice of the Spanish Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.²⁸ On the contrary, the same magazine had not hesitated to severely criticize Ortega's thought.²⁹ And, in 1946, censorship would expunge some writings considered inappropriate (i.e., republican) from the edition of his *Complete Works*. "Just the sound of the name of Ortega y Gasset after the war, amplified by demagogic claims, brought very dangerous resonances of separatism, picaresque, individualist "me-ism," in the spirits of the Spanish and in the homeland itself."³⁰ The mere fact of such a (relatively) numerous presence of the works of Ortega y Gasset in Arizmendiarieta's library is significant. Indeed, the topic awaits a more detailed analysis.

The influence of the Personalists turns out to be very palpable and concrete throughout all of Arizmendiarieta's work, especially that of Maritain and Mounier. Because Arizmendiarieta is an essentially Personalist thinker, we will have to return to this topic consecutively in the various chapters. Here, we will limit ourselves to the question that concerns us: the perception of the crisis of Western culture.

Remember the first chapter of Maritain's *Humanismo integral*, which discusses "the tragedy of humanism."³¹ The description of the crisis Arizmendiarieta has given us, though without the clarity and brilliance of the original, continues to be a faithful echo of Maritain's analysis.

Alongside the Supreme Pontiffs' "theology of history" and as a com-

²⁵ Ib. 96-97. One page earlier, 95, the critic of the "universidaditis" (FC, III, 306) underlined: "Galileo is not in the University, but rather in the arsenals of Venice, among cranes and winches. There, his mind is formed."

²⁶ His return from exile in August of 1945 had been interpreted as a sign of approval from the regime, cf. Gallo, M., *Histoire of l'Espagne franquiste*, Marabout Université, Verviers 1969, vol. 1, 188. This illusion will soon vanish.

²⁷ Rodríguez de Coro, F., *Colonización política del catolicismo*, CAP, Saint Sebastian 1979, 165-170, 186. See also Tamames, R., *La República. La Era de Franco*, Alliance, Madrid 1975, 579.

²⁸ *Ecclesia*, 19 August 1944, 791.

²⁹ *Ecclesia*. 2 May 1942, 429-430.

³⁰ Rodríguez de Coro, F., op. cit., 153; cf. 501, note 16.

³¹ Maritain, J., *Humanisme intégral*, Aubier, Paris 1968, 17-43. Keep in mind that this book, published for the first time in 1936, is the text of the lessons taught by the author at the Universidad de Verano de Santander in 1934, and published in Spanish with the title *Problemas espirituales y temporales de una nueva cristiandad*, Signo, Madrid 1935.

plement to it, Maritain could represent for us a “Christian philosophy of history,”³² which was very characteristic of that era wracked by the crisis. The dissolution of the Middle Ages and of its sacral forms, writes Maritain, has given way to a profane civilization, which has separated itself progressively from the Incarnation: from the worship of man-God, it moves to the worship of mankind, worship of the pure man. Maritain characterizes the spirit born of the Renaissance and the Reformation as the spirit of the “anthropocentric rehabilitation of creation.” We have a perceptible symbol of this process in the transition from Roman or Gothic art to Baroque.³³

After analyzing the various stages of this process, Maritain shows how the very dialectics of anthropocentric humanism, of faith that “man himself is the center of man,” has led to this tragedy of humanism, to “inhuman humanism.”³⁴ To be able to properly understand it, it must be observed that, for Maritain, as for Arizmendiarrrieta, the transcendent dimension belongs essentially to all humanism. This dimension should be understood in the most general sense of self-improvement, transfiguration of modern man, aspiration to a superior reality of transformed human nature, which can be understood, for example, to include the aspiration to the Marxist new man, not only the Christian new man. In this sense, the heroic element would constitute a basic element of all humanism. To offer man what is purely human as an aspiration, says Maritain with Aristotle, “is to betray man and to desire his disgrace, because, by the greatest part of him, which is the spirit, man is called to something better than a purely human life.”³⁵ Humanism, he continues, “essentially tends to make man more truly human, and to manifest his original grandeur by making him participate in everything in nature and in history that can enrich him (“concentrating the world in man” as Scheler approximately said, and “expanding man to the world”); it demands, at the same time, that man develop the potentialities contained in himself, his creative force and life of reason, and to work to make the forces of the physical world instruments of his freedom.”³⁶

So, then, the tragedy of humanism (the three tragedies of man, of culture, and of God) begins when, with the pretension of radical humanism, it was desired to dispense with all transcendental reference, “enclosing” man, essentially open by nature, in himself. At the dawn of the modern era, rationalism, first with Descartes and then with Rousseau and Kant, forged an image of the human personality, haughty and splendid, unbreakable, jealous of its eminence and of its autonomy and, finally, essentially good. Every external instance was excluded, whether this was an instance of revelation or of grace, of tradition, of any law of which man himself was not the promulgator, of a sovereign Good that asks for his will, even of an exterior objective reality to measure and regulate his intelligence. But in little more than a century, observes Maritain, “this proud anthropocentric personality has died out, has collapsed rapidly, dragged into the dispersion of its

³² On the debate on a “Christian philosophy,” cf. Bars, H., *Maritain en nuestros días*, Estela, 1962, 219-288.

³³ Maritain, J., op. cit., 24.

³⁴ *Ib.* 36.

³⁵ *Ib.* 9-10 (the translations are ours).

³⁶ *Ib.* 10.

elemental materials.”³⁷ First Darwin and then Freud showed that man, so highly deified, is no more, in the deepest part of his being and of his origin, than “the fatal movement of polymorphic larvae of the subterranean world of instinct and of desire (...), and that all the beautifully rendered dignity of our personal consciousness appears as a deceitful mask.”³⁸ The person appears as a battlefield on which blind forces face each other in conflict—the libido and the instinct of death. Man, wanting to pass himself off as an angel, appears as a monster.

This process of rapid decomposition of anthropocentric humanism has not prevented us, confesses Maritain, from continuing to claim human sovereignty with more energy than ever. Except, this no longer lies in the individual human person, but rather in the collective (State, nation, race, class).³⁹

Alongside this tragedy of man—we hope that in the preceding ideas, their close relationship with Arizmendiarieta’s thought could be recognized without difficulty—the tragedy of culture has developed, which we will outline briefly. At first, there was an attempt to set up human order based on reason alone (16th-17th centuries, the classical period). After that, an awareness developed that a culture that intends to separate itself from supernatural norms should take sides against them: this, then, is about freeing man from every religious “superstition” and of assuring the human spirit earthly well-being (18th-19th centuries, the bourgeois period). The twentieth century represents the third stage, the revolutionary stage, in which man, being no longer able to bear the machine of this world, starts a desperate war to make an entirely new humanity emerge from radical atheism.⁴⁰

Maritain, in the middle of the war, blamed this for “the current disintegration of family life, the crisis of morality and rupture between religion and life, and in the end (...), the crisis of the state and of civil conscience and the need for democratic states to be reconstructed according to a renewed ideal.”⁴¹ He also warns of the need to “cure reason, disintegrated by a collective delirium and by the racist and Nazi cancer.”⁴²

“Our need and our crucial problem,” he writes, “is to return to find the natural faith of reason in the truth.”⁴³ But, he underscored, above all, the need the West has to renew itself in its sources of Christian inspiration: “(...) If the present agony of the world is, first of all, in my opinion, the sign of a supreme crisis of the Christian spirit, which, for so long, was forgotten and betrayed in the democracies, and against which political totalitarianism emerged as a definitive threat, it is obvious that a renewal of the Christian conscience and a new work of evangelism will be the primary and incontestable conditions of this undertaking of moral re-education that man in our civilization so badly needs.”⁴⁴

³⁷ *Ib.* 37.

³⁸ *Ib.* 38.

³⁹ *Ib.* 39.

⁴⁰ *Ib.* 39-41.

⁴¹ Maritain, J., *La educación en este momento crucial*, Desclée de Brouwer, Buenos Aires, 1950, 153. See pp. 162-163 on the importance of family education.

⁴² *Ib.* 180.

⁴³ *Ib.* 191.

⁴⁴ *Ib.* 179.

Always moving within these schemas of interpretation, the early Arizmendiarieta understands the crisis that has already exploded in two world wars, not as a circumstantial or partial crisis (economic, for example), but as the crisis of the very fundamentals of a civilization, with all its principles and values, which, beginning by deifying man, has ended up consecrating the slavery of man by man, or his nullification in the collectivist ocean. Removing from the heart of man, says Arizmendiarieta, that feeling of fear of a God who rules or governs the world with his laws means man ends up rushing into the abyss and roasting on the fire that he himself has caused. "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him," he exclaims with Voltaire (SS. II, 211).^[^ch1-94]

This portion translated by Steve Herrick. Licensed by In Situ under CC-BY-SA.