# Marginalization and Suffering plus a Non-Interventionist God

*Ramon D. Echica*

*The problem of evil vis-à-vis a good and loving God is often premised on our faith that God created a perfect world. The thesis of this article is that God deliberately created an imperfect world so that human beings can participate in the process of perfecting this world. Suffering is part of an imperfect world but we are tasked to eliminate it.*

## Introduction

As I write this essay, several newspapers with local or nationwide circulation are showing pictures of hundreds of people queuing in order to buy a kilo of National Food Authority rice. These pictures give a human face to the current problem of soaring and increasingly unaffordable price of rice. It is safe to assume that most of these people who lined up to buy rice live below the poverty line. Since rice is the staple food of most Filipinos, its being unaffordable can potentially inflame growing disenchantment with the current administration of President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo. But rice is not the only commodity whose price has gone up inexorably. The prices of almost all basic commodities and gasoline have gone up. The price of gasoline goes up every week, affecting not only the middle class person who drives a car but also the poor and low-income commuters.

Far from home, a cyclone wrecked havoc on Myanmar[1] and the casualty is estimated to reach more than a hundred thousand people.

1. On May 2, 2008, cyclone Nargis hit Myanmar killing more than a hundred thousand people. We cannot have an accurate casualty count since the military regime downplayed the damage to avoid a political fallout.

Neighboring China was also hit by an equally lethal earthquake.[2] While a cyclone and an earthquake are beyond human control, still the poor are more vulnerable to calamities such as these. After all, earthquakes of greater intensity have hit California and Japan and cyclones have victimized other parts of the United States but the extent of the damage was considerably less and restoration was faster.

The above paragraphs hopefully would give us pictures of current forms of suffering. In view of the theme of new forms of marginalization, we can cite a classical liberation theologian, the late Ignacio Ellacuria.

> Among all the signs we see – some of them obvious and some barely perceptible – in every age there is always one that stands out, in the light of which we can discern and interpret all the others. That sign is the historically crucified people, which is always present although the historical method of crucifixion constantly changes. This crucified people is the historical successor of the servant of Yahweh, still deprived of human form by the sin of the world…[3]

After presenting pictures of suffering today albeit necessarily briefly, we submit our thesis that the current social and economic problems are parts of a world which has never been made perfect but whose perfection is a project which we are tasked to participate in. Moreover, God never directly intervenes in solving these problems. Rather, men and women are challenged to look for human solutions to current human problems.

2. Central China was devastated by a killer quake on May 11, 2008. The number of casualties reached around 12,000 people.

3. Ignacio Ellacuria, "Discernir el signo de los tiempos," *Diakonia* 17 (1981), 58, cited in Jon Sobrino, *Where is God? Earthquake, Terrorism, Barbarity, and Hope,* trans. Margaret Wilde (New York: Orbis, 2004), 51.

## IMPERFECT WORLD

Increasing scientific data on the evolution of the universe[4] (not to mention biological evolution) have put into question Augustine's theodicy. According to the Doctor of Divine Grace, there was an idyllic state where the original man and woman lived. This state was destroyed when the two rebelled against God.[5] Scientists today would tell us that there has never been a problem-free, (much less a death-free) world. Teilhard de Chardin once wrote, "No matter how far back we look into the past, we find nothing that resembles this wonderful state…As far as the mind can reach, looking backwards, we find the world dominated by physical evil, impregnated with moral evil… we find it *in a state of original sin*."[6]

This insight of Augustine, which became the catechetical explanation of the origin of evil, actually goes beyond Genesis which states that "God saw everything was good." Never does the first book say that God saw everything to be perfect.

But Augustine's premise of a perfect world was not the only answer to the theodicy question. Even a century earlier than Augustine, there was St. Irenaeus, a second century Bishop of Lyon. Although he also asserted that in the Garden of Eden all the needs of Adam and Eve were met, he also explained that while the human being is created in the image of God, s/he is called upon to grow into God's likeness. To put it simply, Adam and Eve were initially immature. In their immaturity, they disobeyed God. However, the

4. Cf. Stephen Hawking, *A Brief History of Time: from the Big Bang to Black Holes* (New York: Bantam Books, 1988), 120 ff. Hawking gives as a picture of the universe that started very hot and cooled off as it expanded.

5. Cf. Augustine, *City of God,* trans. Gerald G. Walsh, Demetrius B. Zema, et al. (New York: Image Book, 1958). The whole Book XIII deals with the consequences of the sin of Adam. In Chapter 1 of the same book XIII, Augustine writes, "…had our first parents complied with the obligations of obedience, they too would have attained, without interruption of death an immortality like that of angels and an everlasting happiness." In Chapter 21, Augustine argues for a literal understanding of the Garden of Eden, against an allegorical interpretation.

6. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Christianity and Evolution,* Rene Hague, trans. (San Diego: Harvest Book, 1969), 47.

very obedience of Christ enables the human being to be partakers of God's immortality. This obviously implies that perfection involves a process and is not given once and for all.[7]

It may be objected that Irenaeus was referring primarily to the human being and not to creation in general. This may well be true but the premise of his conclusion is that no creature can be greater than the creator. A creature, by definition, is imperfect. Thus, what can be said of the imperfection of the human being is also true of all creatures. In his words,

> If, then thou are God's workmanship, await the hand of the maker which creates everything in due time; in due time as far as thou art concerned, whose creation is being carried out.[8]

Irenaeus is clearly stating a principle which should be true of all creation: all beings are re-created by God. This interpretation is further buttressed by the fact that he was combating the Gnostics who believed that corporeality and evil are intrinsically connected. To counter Gnosticism, the Bishop of Lyon insisted that the whole history is the ongoing redemptive process of God. The human being cannot be taken away from earthly history in order to be saved.

---

7. While we contrast the positions of Augustine and Irenaeus here, we can also compare the understanding of the world as undergoing the process of perfection on the one hand and the cosmological optimism of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz on the other. Coming from the premise that everything has a reason and that harmony of the monads has been pre-established, Leibnitz held that this world is the best world God could possibly create, for God must have a reason for creating this world and not another. Cf. Leibnitz, "The Perfection of the World" in *An Introduction to Philosophy: Ideas in Conflict,* ed. Peter Windt (New York: West Publishing, 1982), 466-469. Leibnitz cautions us from making hasty conclusion on the imperfection of the world based only on the evil and injustices we currently witness. What we witness is tiny in relation to eternity. If we are only able to see the whole picture, "what appears as carelessly daubed on the canvass was really done by a painter with very great art."

8. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies,* IV, xxxix, no. 2. The translation is taken from Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* Vol. I: *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus* (Massachussets: Hendrickson, 1995).

This Irenaean theodicy is more in conformity with contemporary scientific data. It has gained approval of many theologians.[9] In relation to our theme, among its advantages are its openness to the idea of ongoing evolution of the world,[10] and the paradigm of the whole of history as under divine tutelage. We can also say that his soteriology, that it was the obedience of Christ that saves us, would go beyond the catechetical (and juridical) view that only the death of Jesus saved us.

However, even if Irenaean theodicy has advantages over the Augustinian answer to the problem of evil and even if an appeal to history makes sense to contemporary sensitivity, still it has its own problems. For one it still interprets the Genesis story as factual. To be fair, this is to be expected from all theologians at that time. But more importantly, the model emphasizes going back to the time of the pre-fall. Liberation theologians would prefer to see a construction of a new heaven and earth, and not going back to the past.[11]

Despite these problems, Irenaeus is cited not because we want to trivialize present suffering by simply saying it is part of an imperfect world. His theodicy reminds us rather that the absence of evil can only come in the eschaton.

A word about the symbolic character of all explanations of evil is necessary before we go to the next section. In *The Symbolism of Evil*,[12] a groundbreaking attempt to understand how different people have tried to understand evil, Paul Ricoeur theorized that myths are prior to the philosophical explanation of evil. He argued that we need to go beyond the literal meaning so that a second much deeper meaning (a surplus to the first meaning) can be unveiled. The disclosure comes because symbols give rise to thought.[13]

---

9. John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love* (Norfolk: Fontana Library, 1974). Although he is not treating the theodicy question as such, see also Roger Haight, *Jesus, Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1999), 215-219.

10. It would be anachronistic to expect Irenaeus to appropriate evolution in the scientific sense of the word.

11. Cf. Juan Luis Segundo, *Que Mundo? Que Hombre? Que Dios*? (Santander: Editorial Sal Terrae, 1993).

12. Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).

13. Ibid., 347 ff.

Let us take the symbolism of the serpent and the Adam in Genesis as examples. In Ricoeur's attempt to go to the second level of meaning, the serpent signifies that "in the historical experience of the human being, every individual finds evil already there; nobody begins it absolutely."[14] Adam, on the other hand, would symbolize that evil is part of interhuman relationships – "it is tradition, and not only something that happens."[15]

Since we are criticizing Augustinian theodicy, let us cite how Ricoeur would see the deeper meaning of it. In his analysis of the Pelagian-Augustinian controversy, Ricoeur explains that while Augustine's concept of original sin is full of myths, he adds:

> …Pelagius can be right a thousand of times against the pseudo-concept of original sin. Nevertheless, Saint Augustine transmits with this dogmatic mythology something essential that Pelagius completely misunderstood. Perhaps Pelagius is correct in his quarrel with the mythology of original sin, and principally with the Adamic mythology. But it is Augustine who remains right, through and in spite of this Adamic mythology.[16]

What are the meanings of Augustine's understanding of original sin that Pelagius failed to see? Augustine saw the situatedness of human freedom (in contrast to Pelagius' Sartrean understanding of it) and the communal understanding of sin.

In view of the symbolic understanding of evil, does our critique of Augustine's theodicy still hold water? While the symbolic interpretation is enlightening, and may nuance our critique against Augustine's explanation of how evil enters into the world, it does not negate the critique itself. After all, many catechetical interpretations

14. Ibid., 257 (inclusive language supplied).

15. Ibid., 258.

16. Paul Ricoeur, "'Original Sin': A Study in Meaning," in *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, ed. Don Ihde (Evanston: Northeastern University Press, 1974), 281.

of Augustine's theodicy do not go beyond literality.[17] Furthermore, official Church documents like the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* still embrace a literal understanding of Augustinian theodicy.[18] It can be said, therefore, that Augustine's understanding of the origin of evil is open to many misinterpretations.

## A Non-Interventionist God Who is Asking the Human Being to Participate in the Project of Building the Kingdom

A new answer to the theodicy problem is the concept of a non-interventionist God. Many contemporary theologians[19] try to "exculpate" the Deity with this concept even as they give different strands to God's non-interventionism. For our purposes, it is sufficient to present the main lines of thought of process theology and of kenotic understanding of creation presented by some scientists/theologians.

### Process Theology

For some, process theology offers the best solution to the classical problem of theodicy: God's omnipotence or God's love? The problem can be summarized thus: if God cannot prevent evil, then

17. Cf. Louis Morrow, *My Catholic Faith* (Manila: Catholic Trade School, 1963), 49. Morrow states that the chief punishment of Adam which we inherit through original sin are: death, suffering and ignorance and a strong inclination to sin. Morrow further explains that by original sin we became subject to disease and death and the inclination to evil.

18. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993), 400.

19. Harold Kushner, *When Bad Things Happen to Good People* (New York: Avon Books, 1983). In his novel interpretation of the Book of Job, the Jewish rabbi believes that even if God wants all the righteous to be happy, it is not always within his power to bring about happiness. Evil sometimes happens without a reason. See also Denis Edwards, "Resurrection and the Costs of Evolution: A Dialogue with Rahner on Noninterventionist Theology," *Theological Studies* 67 (2006): 828-833.

God is not omnipotent. If God can prevent evil but does not do so, then God is not love. Process theology resolves this issue by qualifying God's power. Process theology escapes from the dilemma by a nuance of God's power: In principle, God's power is not coercive but persuasive. This non-absoluteness of God's power is metaphysical and not a matter of voluntary self-limitation.

Let us explain this point further. Process theology holds that God's influence in the world can only be a natural part of the causal processes. In other words, there is no direct intervention, i.e., no miracles coming from God. This is so because "God always exists in relation to a multiplicity of finite centers of power" and therefore "God cannot be powerful in the sense of literally having all the power."[20] Consequently, God cannot impose God's will unilaterally because even the Deity has to compete with other entities whose bad habits may be deeply entrenched.

The above point may be better grasped if we point out Alfred North Whitehead's thesis that all actual entities[21] or genuine individuals, which are constituted by actual occasions,[22] are capable of experience, of apprehending data outside of itself, and of "making decisions." Understandably therefore, God cannot force the divine will on every thing, just as God cannot impose the divine will on an uncooperative human being. To illustrate, it was not God's will that Mt. Pinatubo would erupt in such a destructive a manner. But being an actual

20. David Ray Griffin, "Process Theology and the Christian Good News: A Response to Classical Free Will Theism," in *Searching for an Adequate God: A Dialogue between Process and Free Will Theists*, eds. John B. Cobb and Clark H. Pinnock, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 12.

21. These may include plants, animals (including humans) or entire environments.

22. Since this point, even if it is crucial to the understanding of process philosophy, is not directly related to the theodicy question, we explain it in this footnote and not in the main text. In Whitehead's philosophy, all actual entities are structured societies of occasions of experience. All events affecting an actual entity become part of it just as an actual entity also becomes part of another actual entity that it influences. In other words, every actual entity is both an object and a subject (or superject in Whitehed's terminology). This actual entity receives and exerts efficient causation. By choosing which occasion can influence it, an actual entity also becomes an agent of its own self-constitution. Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology* (New York: Harper, 1929), 134ff.

entity constituted by its own history of actual occasions, it could not have been coerced by God not to erupt.

In this schema, where do we situate God and creatures? Whitehead's philosophy envisions creatures as the primary efficient cause. God surely has an initial aim in this universe but it is up to the creature how to realize it. Moreover, God does not know future contingent events until these actually happen. God cannot know the decisions of actual entities until the time the decisions are made.

While process theology may have rescued the idea of a loving God, a question arises whether the power of God has been so emasculated that this being seemingly cannot be considered as belonging to the category of the divine. Besides, how can God be the ultimate source of hope if His power is limited? Referring to the idea of a limited power of God, John Polkinghorne raises crucial objections.

> It is a noble concept, but it is open to question whether the deity has not been so evacuated of power that hope in God as the ground of ultimate fulfillment has been subverted. The issue is whether the presentation of the divine vision of fulfillment will be sufficient in itself to bring about its own realization, or whether creation also stands in need of the action of divine grace for this to be achieved. The matter can be put in bluntest terms whether Whitehead's God could be the one who raised Jesus from the dead.[23]

Furthermore, in Whitehead's scheme, how can we be assured that the values of God will eventually emerge triumphant?

## The Kenosis of God in Creation

Aware of the strengths and difficulties of process theology and at the same time unable to go back to classical theism's concept of an omniscient and omnipotent God, some theologians and scientists

23. John Polkinghorne, "Kenotic Creation and Divine Action," in *The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis* (Grand Rapids: Eeerdmans, 2001), 92.

propose the paradigm of kenosis as a way to understand the relationship between God and creatures. Whereas the concept of kenosis has traditionally referred to the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity,[24] these theologians/scientists would suggest that creation also involves the self-emptying of God. Whereas the limits of God's power are metaphysical in process theology, God voluntarily empties the divine self in kenosis. But what does God empty the divine self of?

Polkinghorne lists the following attributes that God has emptied the divine self of:[25]

1. Kenosis of omnipotence. This implies that God allows creatures to develop by themselves. In this manner, God cannot be blamed for the evils in this world.
2. Kenosis of simple eternity. This means that time is a reality which applies even to God. For instance, God knows events as they happen. It follows that there was a time when God still did not know what event was yet to happen.
3. Kenosis of omniscience. This follows from the example cited in the preceding paragraph. God's knowledge is limited to what is currently knowable.
4. Kenosis of causal status. God allows the divine self to be a cause among other causes. In short, God gives creatures their role as co-creators.

Related to the idea of kenosis is the theme that the evolution of this universe is built into the process of creation. Ongoing evolution is part of divine kenosis that allows redeemed matter to develop towards self-actualization. This process involves evolving fruitfulness.[26] Following Frank Tipler's anthropic principle that the universe was pregnant with life *ab initio*, Polkinghorne believes that after the big-bang, carbon-based life was made possible. This

24. Philippians 2: 5-11.

25. *The Work of Love*, 102-105.

26. John Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World* (New Haven: Yale University, 2002), 3-6.

possibility eventually, albeit extremely slowly, led to the emergence of human life.[27]

The process of evolution or "continuous creation" continues. It is in this context where God allows creation to develop itself where we situate evil in this world. The answer is that because of kenotic sharing of power, God cannot be responsible for evil in this world. Kenosis necessarily leads to blind alleys: "There is an unavoidable cost attached to the world allowed to make itself."[28] Although Polkinghorne seemingly is more concerned about physical evil, what he says about it can be true of moral evil as well.

The next question is where this universe is leading to. The question takes a crucial twist in view of the threat - which is supported by scientific data - of future cosmic annihilation. Furthermore, if our causality is respected by God in His kenosis, what happens to the good that we have done on earth? One answer lies in the ultimate basis of our faith in destiny beyond death. Polkinghorne asks a rhetorical question:

> If…God allowed primeval process to unfold over billions of years, why should we not expect the same to be true of cosmic ending?... We should not underestimate divine patience – hence our emphasis throughout on the developing nature of creaturely being.[29]

Valuing the causality of creatures, Polkinghorne stresses the continuity of this earth and the definitive fulfillment in the eschaton. Polkinghorne rejects the idea of eschatology as second creative act *ex nihilo* and embraces *creatio ex vetere*. But while there has to be continuity between this earth and the future new creation, there is

27. John Barrow and Frank Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford: Oxford Univesity Press, 1986), cited by Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World*, 4-5. Cf. also Polkinghorne, "Eschatological Credibility and Teological Processes," in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, eds. Ted Peters, Robert J. Russel and Michael Welker, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 43.

28. John Polkinghorne, "Kenotic Creation and Divine Action," in *The Work of Love: Creation as Kenosis*, 95.

29. Ibid.

also an element of discontinuity "to insure that that the new creation is not just a redundant repetition of the old."[30]

## Liberation Theology

Non-interventionism of God may not be an accurate term to describe liberation theology's answer to the theodicy issue. But we retain the term just the same to relate liberation theology to the previous models.

In its attempt to do theology from the perspective of non-persons, classical liberation theology sees God intervening in history but through human beings. This is part of a larger theological framework that "the history of salvation is the very heart of human history."[31] In other words, there is no separation between the liberating action of God and of the human being. Thus, liberation theology avoids Pelagianism because it does not state that liberation is the work of human beings alone. The human being, through the grace of God, is made partner in the work of perfecting this world. In the words of Ignacio Ellacuria,

> …there is a single human history in which God and human beings intervene, so that God's intervention does not occur without some form of human participation, and human intervention does not occur without God's presence in some form.[32]

But why is there evil in this world? It is Juan Luis Segundo who combines original liberationist and scientific perspectives. He

30. John Polkinghorne, "Eschatological Credibility and Teleological Processes," in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, 50. While Polkinghorne advocates a kenotic understanding of God's action vis-à-vis creation, there is one form of kenosis which he cannot accept: the kenosis of novelty. For him, God cannot be restricted to act in the future only as God acted in the past. See Polkinghorne, "Kenotic Creation and Divine Action" in *The Work of Love*, 105.

31. Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1973).

32. Ignacio Ellacuria, "The Historicity of Christian Salvation" in *Mysterium Liberationis: Some Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology,* ed. Jon Sorbino (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1996), 254.

appropriates the scientific concept of entropy. This refers to the irreversible process of energy to disintegrate into simpler and less usable forms. This inevitable dissipation of energy would mean that, in the course of time, processes tend toward disorder rather than order. An illustrative example is the aroma inside the kitchen that tends to dissipate after a while.

How is this law of science appropriated by Segundo? He asserts that, in human beings, entropy manifests itself in our innate or structural inability in view of our limited energy to fully realize our intended projects. There is always a gap between our desires and their realizations. While we all endeavor to build a perfect world, such world can never be constructed by one generation as all our humanizing projects will be subjected to entropy. This reality, Segundo believes, is analogous to concupiscence.

But concupiscence here is not a punishment we inherited from our first parents. It is not equivalent to our proclivity to evil. It is rather the limitation of our energy, a limitation which is needed in order for all generations to contribute to the ongoing construction of the kingdom of God. Indeed, if some generations could absolutely and permanently realize their projects for a better world, then succeeding generations would have nothing left to accomplish. Then life would be reduced to nothing but an entrance exam to heaven.[33]

Entropy, therefore, is not necessarily negative. It is part of God's plan for human collaboration in the process of gradually perfecting this world. With affinities to Irenaeus' understanding of an imperfect creation, Segundo believes that God deliberately made the world imperfect in order to invite human beings to participate in the process of perfection.

But there is an opposite vector to entropy: negentropy. Whereas entropy disables us from completely and permanently realizing our dream for a perfect world, the grace of God, as a negentropic force, assures us that our liberating praxis here on earth can be used by God as materials for the ongoing construction of the kingdom. All historical liberation, by the very nature of being historical, cannot

33. The very presence of entropy means that the movement towards the reign of God is not naively and inexorably linear.

have a permanent effect. But the presence of grace in us is our assurance that we can be boldly creative in coming up with ideologies[34] in our attempt to liberate the marginalized.

There are some problems in this kind of theodicy by Segundo. For one, it seems unable to evidently explain deliberate evil, like the torture of humans by fellow humans. It seems naively optimistic as an explanation for deliberate marginalization. But on its plus side, this theory seems to be consistent with the Thomistic view that all human beings want to be happy but evil happens when we take the wrong turns toward happiness.[35] Furthermore, the theory can serve as a basis for a call to creativity in our means to combat marginalization.

## Conclusion

Even though the different "theodicies" discussed above offer different qualifications and nuances, they also agree on many things. First, process theology, kenoticism, and liberation theology all agree that the world is imperfect but it moves towards greater perfection. Second, and this is related to the first, process theology, kenotic understanding of God, and liberation theology, all take this world as evolving. Thirdly, process theology, kenoticism, and liberation theology all welcome human participation as contributing to the absolute.

Most probably the most difficult thesis to accept is that God does not or cannot intervene. This goes against a long line of Christian tradition that presupposes that God can and does intervene in worldly affairs. The whole practice of petition prayers is premised on God's capability to intervene. A Christian cannot simplistically and nonchalantly trifle with this long held tradition.

But, on the other hand, it is also true that God's capacity to intervene has been taken by many in an infantile way. In other words, many have taken the notion that God is up there in heaven, occasionally

34. This word is understood by Segundo as a means to realize our values. Juan Luis Segundo, *Faith and Ideologies* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1985).

35. *Summa Theologiae*, I-II, 2, 1-8.

intervening here on earth whenever He is called. This has led to some immature notion that God favors one people over another. Moreover, if misunderstood, this notion would de-emphasize human responsibility. The synthesis can be that God acts but only through human and worldly causes.

In the end, the question of how God operates in this world to prevent suffering is not entirely knowable. Without saying that to raise the issue is to engage in needless speculation, we can be inspired by countless ordinary men and women who, without raising these questions, contribute their own share for the betterment of this world for a world with less suffering.[36]

**Ramon D. Echica**
**Seminario Mayor de San Carlos/School of Theology**
**Juan Luna Avenue, Mabolo, Cebu City**
**Email: monnanatu@yahoo.com.ph**

36. There are recent attempts to document the lives of such men and women. See Ton Danenberg, Carlos Ronquillo, Jose de Mesa, eds., *Fired from Within: Spirituality in the Social Movement* (Quezon City: Institute of Spirituality in Asia, 2007) and Anna Hidalgo and Alejandra Otamendi, eds., *Profiles Encourage: Ordinary Filipinos Making an Extraordinary Difference* (Manila: Anvil, 2008).