

precisely *because* it is sign—also represents the very essence of that body, which is to be purely signifying.

As with all sound politics, the eucharist must avoid the antithetical errors of reformism and false utopianism. This is what it means to say that the bread is the body of Christ. It is the *bread* which is his body—this sign of the current, quotidian world. The eucharist is a mediated, discursive affair. It is not as though a real heaven suddenly breaks rudely in upon us, triumphantly overriding our everyday life. But if the fact that the bread is still a material signifier guards against the blank disconnection between present and future which is false utopianism, the fact that its signified belongs to an inconceivable future refutes any mere reformism. It is for this reason that the doctrine of the real presence is of no interest either to the New Ageism which imagines that it lives in the future already, or to the Old Fogeyism which has no quarrel with the future as long as it turns out to be a repetition of the present.

1 'See in particular Slavoj Žižek, *The Ticklish Subject* (London, 1999).

## The Death of Jesus: Its Universal Impact

Louis Roy OP

Numerous people concerned with spirituality or religion nevertheless reject Christianity's claim — particularly forceful in the Letters of St Paul — that Jesus is the universal Saviour. As Daniel Helminiak aptly puts it,

in the contemporary situation the scandal of Christianity is its insistence that Jesus of Nazareth was God-incarnate on earth. Today's scandal is to suggest that Jesus was divine in a way that no other human being was or can be.<sup>1</sup>

I am convinced that many reject this aspect of Christianity because it is misunderstood. Thus I would like to present it in a way that may bring its meaning to light. Many contemporary exegetes and Catholic theologians have renounced the 'high Christology' which underpins the doctrine of Redemption. However, if one purifies it of certain unfortunate

interpretations acquired in modern times, the classic soteriology maintained by Catholicism may turn out to provide the best account of the Christian experience of salvation. Insights into this Catholic conception can also aid interreligious dialogue.

### **Causes and Effects of the Death of Jesus**

Neo-scholastic theology focuses upon the *effects* of the death of Jesus, that is, upon what his passion merited for humankind. This position risks suggesting that the Father demanded the expiation made by his Son as precondition for his forgiveness. Since it can be inferred that God directly willed the suffering of Christ, one is likely to overlook the contingent, human factors that brought about his passion.

In reaction against this lack of attention to history, the exegesis of the past fifty years has emphasized the actual *causes* that led to the arrest and condemnation of Jesus. By uncovering the sources of the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish authorities of his time, this exegesis helps us realize that the violence he endured was a consequence of his prophetic praxis. The life of Jesus explains his death. By making this clear, exegesis underscores the social origin of this drama.

While such attention to the causes of the death of Jesus is indispensable, still we must not overlook the *effects* that this death has had for the life of humanity.<sup>2</sup> Contemporary theology should explore the question: what unique outcome has Jesus' death entailed for the human race? How does it surpass the significance of the death of a Socrates, of a Gandhi, or of a Martin Luther King?

### **A Movement Coming from God**

An adequate response to this question requires that we envision the entire existence of Jesus as a movement coming from God, and not as a mere earthly episode subsequently ratified by God. In the former case, it is the eternal Son of the Father who becomes incarnate and who brings about a salvific effect with universal impact. In the latter case, it is a matter of the tragedy of an admirable but purely human life, which terminates not in Good Friday, but rather in the Friday of the great failure. As with Socrates, Gandhi and Martin Luther King, the death of Jesus, when taken as a tragedy, constitutes an expression and a symbol of that depth to which certain individuals can attain when their conduct is inspired by faith and love. From this perspective, Jesus appears praiseworthy in terms of coherence and courage. He certainly proves to be a great model, but one cannot very well see why the New Testament proclaims him Saviour of the world.

The theological alternatives, therefore, are the following: either Jesus

is essentially a human being whom God recognized as exemplary by raising him from the dead; or Jesus is the concrete face of the transcendent mystery, the human nature personally assumed by the eternal Son, whose love, manifested in his earthly existence, exercises a universal impact. In other words it is his divinity that makes his life, death and resurrection actually change the course of history. As Anselm of Canterbury stated, the divinity of Christ ensures the efficacy of redemption, while his humanity constitutes the free response and collaboration of the human being. As the Head of his Body, he unites all believers in his saving work by sharing with them his Holy Spirit, who enables them to love as Christ loves. At the time of his resurrection, he bestows on them this Holy Spirit who inspires their commitment and elevates them to the dignity of true cooperators in the work of salvation.

Although such great figures as Moses, Gautama or Muhammad wielded a vast influence by their example and their teaching, Christ accomplished something more decisive. Being both God and man, he alone brought about an astonishing reversal: the transformation of evil into good, from a desperate situation to a situation of hope. He alone had the divine-human power to straighten out the downward path of oppression espoused by sinners, and to make it an upward trail. Thanks to him, the descending movement of disobedience, of fleeing God, was converted into an ascending movement of obedience, of being orientated towards God. By willingly entering into the free fall that had resulted from fear and hatred, Jesus travelled a trajectory that became a curve, a loop terminating in an ascension. As God incarnate, Jesus alone was able to use suffering as the vehicle of a definitively victorious love, once and for all.

In the case of Jesus Christ, the liberating movement commences with God and is completed with man. The Father sends the Son and the Spirit in order to save the world. The liberating dynamic originates from the Father and is concretized differently in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. The Son accomplishes 'objective' salvation: a new situation is created for the human race. The Holy Spirit accomplishes 'subjective' salvation: grafted into Christ, each individual can enter freely into this new situation.

In each of these two stages, what is achieved is not the result of mere human forces, but rather the result of divine initiative. First of all, Christ, the author of our liberation, is the Son equal to the Father; he assumes a concrete human nature by which means he infuses his love into the emptiness caused by evil. Secondly, in the reconciliation with God, it is not the spirit of the sinner that changes itself; only the Holy Spirit can transform weakened wills and darkened intellects.

## Do René Girard and Others Go Far Enough?

Many readers of *New Blackfriars* know that the French thinker René Girard has shed much light on mimetic desire and on the scapegoat mechanism by which societies endeavour to minimize and control the damage brought about by violent rivalries. Unfortunately Girard always understands sacrifice in terms of the scapegoat mechanism. Consequently he interprets the New Testament's accounts of the passion and resurrection as a rejection and a total dismantling of the sacrificial system.<sup>3</sup> All the same, in a recent work Girard recognizes that the New Testament never resorts to the term scapegoat' but speaks of the 'Lamb of God'. Still, he maintains that although the latter word is better than the former, there is no significant semantic difference between them.<sup>4</sup> I'll explain this difference later in this article.

Whereas Girard often misreads passages from the Bible,<sup>5</sup> one of his followers, Raymund Schwager, gives us a very helpful analysis of the various biblical trends regarding sacrifice. He shows that the prophets of Israel criticized sacrificial rites and that the Epistle to the Hebrews portrays Jesus as the high priest who abolishes the Temple's sacrificial provisions.<sup>6</sup> Schwager points out that we cannot readily situate Jesus in the framework of cultic sacrifice. Notwithstanding my positive interpretation of the temple worship in Israel (which will be proposed further on in this essay), I agree that we do find some discontinuity between the Old and the New Testament regarding sacrifice.<sup>7</sup> Yet I must add that there is also an analogical continuity.

Girard and Schwager set up an exaggerated opposition between their narrowly defined notion of sacrifice (which they observe in most religions, including Judaism) and the differently construed notion of sacrifice that I would argue is exemplified in Jesus' case. Schwager might very well contradict himself by holding at the same time that (a) the passion of Jesus should not be interpreted in terms of sacrifice and (b) the mass is a sacrifice (a dogma that he accepts as a Catholic theologian).<sup>8</sup> If *lex orandi lex credendi* remains a fundamental guideline, can we ignore the liturgical invitation to view as sacrifice not only the mass but equally the passion of Jesus? Furthermore there are numerous texts in the New Testament that suggest a sacrificial construal of Christ's death.<sup>9</sup>

I would submit that we ought to think of the passion of Jesus analogically, on the model of what 'self-sacrifice' means in ordinary life. Firstly, in an obvious and somewhat superficial manner, we sacrifice when we give up something for the sake of a higher good. Sacrifice is the renunciation that occurs whenever choosing x entails renouncing y. Any choice involves sacrifice. Secondly, sacrifice' acquires a more profound meaning when a commitment requires voluntary suffering.

Parents give up much for their children. Thirdly, we observe the phenomenon of heroism, for instance, if a son throws himself on his mother's attacker at the risk of being killed.<sup>10</sup> Jesus' self-sacrifice takes on its deep meaning as the highest degree on this scale. He sacrificed his life and offered it to God for the sake of all human beings whom he loved as his brothers and sisters.

Girard realizes that those who understand the significance of Jesus' resurrection move out of the infernal cycle of violence that plagues the human race. Yet he has little to say about God's role in this astonishing reversal. He insists that God would have shown himself to be a violent agent, had he approved of the sacrifice of Christ perpetrated by the Jewish and Roman authorities. But this is an ambiguous assertion, which means: (1) God did not directly will (and did not actively orchestrate) the death of Christ; (2) God did not even permit it. Girard does not take into consideration Acts 2:23, 'This man, handed over to you [Israelites] according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the law.'<sup>11</sup> He has no room for a Thomist understanding of divine providence and for the Augustinian distinction between willing and permitting. For him if God permits the passion, he absolutely wants it and orders Jesus to march towards it in a self-immolating way which takes us back to the worst kind of sacrifice.

Girard does not go beyond the modern caricatures of St Anselm's soteriological theory. Still we must concede that Anselm's speculation has its difficulties, particularly his assertion that God's honour was damaged and the suggestion (put forward not by Anselm but by some of his followers) that he needed to be placated. As if not only humankind but God also had to be changed thanks to Jesus' suffering! However weak this aspect of Girard's thought is, in light of his magnificent anthropological contribution let us not reproach him too severely for having been impeded by those theological stumbling blocks.

On such theological issues Schwager's outdoes Girard's contribution. In particular he links the theme of universal salvation in Jesus with the declaration, based on Psalm 2 and Acts 4:25-26, that all human beings allied themselves against God and his representative.<sup>12</sup> He attributes this universal attack on God and on Jesus to the deeply-set resentment we feel against God because of the evil that afflicts us. Such ambivalence towards God, which is usually unconscious, has been uncovered by the Book of Job. Schwager's insight consists in highlighting humankind's hidden hatred for God, operative in the execution of Jesus and overcome thanks to Jesus' identification with all sinners and to his resurrection.<sup>13</sup> We have here a twofold universality: of enmity and of reconciliation.

To conclude this short incursion into Girardian territory, as far as the

notion of sacrifice is concerned, neither Girard nor Schwager ascribe it to the passion that Jesus voluntarily accepted. What is missing in their understanding seems to be this aspect stressed by Otto Semmelroth:

Christ's being killed on the cross only became a sacrificial action because what was intended in a totally different sense by his executioners, was transformed into a sacrificial action in the heart of Jesus, which his words express.<sup>14</sup>

In the heart of Jesus, the intention of total self-giving perfectly coincided with the Father's will.

James Alison expresses this providential element very clearly as he asserts that in the death of Jesus we see 'a loving God who was planning a way to get us out of our violent and sinful life. Not a nonapplicable to Christ, also has the audacity to call the passion a sacrifice: 'the death of Jesus on a cross is a sacrifice *only* in its full expression as a feast of love.'<sup>17</sup> For Moore, the risen Christ who invites his disciples to share in the eucharist turns his passion into a feast of love'.

### **The Seriousness of Sin**

Secular thought tends to explain human aberrations by turning to explanations which are certainly partially valuable, but which do not reach the deepest level: poverty, social inequalities, ignorance, inattention, distrust of oneself and of others, false perceptions, fears, ambition, greed, rivalry and retaliation, etc.

In the Bible, on the contrary, one notes a profound recognition of sin and of its consequences. Our ancestors in the faith discovered that infidelity to the covenant with God damages the bond between the people of Israel and their Creator. They established a connection between this damaged bond and the harm done to others. Every distortion in interhuman relationships entails a distortion in the relationships with God.

John's gospel emphasizes the gravity of sin. It brings out its homicidal and mendacious character in a stark way. Jesus declares:

You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies (8:44).

John shows here that the enemies of Jesus entertain the diabolical wish to exterminate the person who proclaims and embodies the truth. The worst aspect of sin is its denial of the truth — including the fact of sinfulness — and its desire to take away the life of the prophet who keeps reminding

people of that truth.

A person who has not experienced genuine love cannot but have an inadequate apprehension of sin. The gravity of sin is unveiled at the same time as the seriousness of love. So long as one has not perceived the beauty of love, it is possible to ignore the negative effects of one's actions. It is not by chance that chapters 13 to 17 of St John present at once the reality of the love disclosed in Jesus and in the community, and the fact of hatred on the part of the world. The extraordinary overture of Jesus brings into full contrast the rigid closing-off of human hearts.

Meditating on the New Testament, the Christian tradition has equated sin with self-idolatry, namely a search for complete autonomy in regard to the conditions of life, other people and God. There is in sin a refusal of finitude and of mortality. In order to protect this artificial independence, individuals or groups are ready to affirm themselves *by any means*. The logic of this disposition consists in injuring human beings, by taking from them their goods, their health, their honour, their human relationships and sometimes their physical life. In this manner, one also does the greatest wrong to oneself and one accentuates a discontentment, even a disgust of oneself that reinforces the tendency to destruction. As Maury Schepers pertinently remarks, what is revelatory is 'how we deal with our own evil (violently or non-violently)'.<sup>18</sup>

### **The Divine Solution: Sacrifice**

Properly understood, the notion of sacrifice helps us to grasp how the death of Jesus proves to be the ultimate solution to the mystery of evil. We start from an analogy found in interpersonal relationships. When we have caused sorrow or done wrong to someone who is dear to us, we have the possibility of speaking to her or to him and expressing our sincere regret. But in addition to words, we feel the need to compensate the offense by making a gesture which goes beyond what we would ordinarily do. Such a gesture signifies our resolution to do better in the future. In this way, reconciliation can express itself in the offer of a gift or in an activity likely to please the person we love.

The biblical idea of sacrifice is not unlike this human reflex. At the temple of Jerusalem, people offered sacrifices of communion and of expiation in order to symbolize the continuation or the restoration of the covenant. As they immolated animals they would signify that all life — represented by the blood — belongs to the Creator. These sacrifices, which would eventually throw light on the gesture of Jesus, should be sharply distinguished from the rite of the scapegoat, which was burdened with the sins of the people and expelled into the desert. The New Testament never presents Christ as a scapegoat. Rather, it construes him as

the slain lamb.

On the one hand, the scapegoat should not be understood as representing Jesus, because there is a total separation between the scapegoat and the people. One substitutes the scapegoat for the people by heaping upon it the sins of all. Thus the high priest Caiaphas pronounced that 'it is better for you to have one man die for the people than to have the whole nation destroyed' (John 11:50). Only from that restricted political viewpoint could Jesus be selected as a scapegoat. It is lamentable that quite a few Christians view a scapegoat, since this image in no way reflects the collaboration between him and them in the work of salvation.

On the other hand, the metaphor of the slain lamb is also not without its problems. Still, what is important to retain from it is the fact that Jesus does not resist the evil that is done to him. If, at the Mount of Olives, he does not flee to avoid being arrested, it is because he is convinced that his Father will make sense of his passion by using this non-resistance. The religious intention of Jesus, his obedience to the Father, his consent to the divine plan, constitutes an interior action, a 'yes', an engagement. As a contemporary theologian sums it up, 'Handed over, he hands himself over.'<sup>19</sup> In the exterior passivity of Jesus, we discern an entirely voluntary commitment, an amazing activity.<sup>20</sup> This is the most perfect form of self-gift, in the complete loss of blood and water (John 19:34). He freely offers his life: 'No one takes my life from me, but I lay it down of my own accord' (John 10:18).

What saves the world is not the material sacrifice of Jesus, but rather the love with which he consents to give his life — his self-offering, the spiritual and yet embodied sacrifice. Neither the Father nor Jesus directly willed the passion. By stopping the hand of Abraham when he was about to sacrifice his son Isaac, God made known his rejection of human sacrifices. Nonetheless, given sin and its deadly character, the divine compassion did not will to shun the ultimate form of presence that involves total solidarity with the victims of evil. By undergoing the extreme consequence of sin, the inseparably victimized and forgiving Son of God could break the logic of hatred.

In this sense, Christ did not come on earth directly in order to die; but he accepted death as coming *from humans* (not from God) and as a means (used by God) for loosening hardened hearts. Christ's direct intention was to free humanity, and this goal entailed his non-resistance to evil. Confronted with the evil caused by humans, Jesus offered a loving and liberating response. What the Father and Jesus directly willed is not the sin culminating in the execution of Jesus, but the love-in-suffering which vanquishes sin.

The passion of Jesus calls us to recognize the consequences of sin.



Complicity with evil introduces a grave distortion in relationships among humans and with the Creator. Taking account of this fact, the divine mercy does not propose a superficial solution, which would consist in letting bygones be bygones, in cleaning the slate with a quick brush. Such a gesture of pardon would be artificial, because it would not enlist human beings in their own religious rehabilitation. On the contrary, the Saviour acts like a physician whose surgical action is followed by the prescription of exercises to be performed each day by the patient. The paschal mystery constitutes a divine-human operation in which all believers collaborate.

If it was 'necessary that the Messiah should suffer these things' (Luke 24:26; see also 9:22 and 17:25), this was not in order to appease the wrath of an irate Father. Its purpose consists in working out a solution to the mystery of evil, a solution that contains an inexhaustible wisdom. Jesus is not punished *in the place of* others. In fact, God does not punish: humans are those who, by sinning, punish one another. We routinely sacrifice one another. The Father permits that in the passion Jesus be punished and sacrificed *by and with* the others. The 'satisfaction' that he accomplishes derives from the love with which he reverses the sinful movement of punishment by making it a movement of blessing. 'Satisfaction' literally means 'to do sufficiently', that is, to exert the divine-human power that enables love to rise up even in the innermost depths of hatred. Such an achievement, on the part of Christ, has nothing to do with what one could call a 'satispassion', namely brute suffering that would have been unjustly inflicted upon Jesus — himself substituted for others — by a Father concerned to avenge his offended honour.<sup>21</sup>

### **Saved for What?**

It is important to take sin seriously in order to be able to answer the question: *from what* are we saved? However, the answer to this fundamental question depends on the answer given to a question still more fundamental: *for what* are we saved? In other words, Christian liberation can certainly be formulated in negative terms: we are saved *from* sin. Yet, more profoundly this experience is a positive reality: we are saved *for* God. Christ renders us capable of living fully, because he puts us in relation with each Person of the Trinity.

Reflection upon the passion of Jesus — the way of the cross — is an entry into the divine mystery. A step towards conversion is taken as soon as one discerns in the passion a love concerned to reach out to every human person. Jesus looked his death in the face; inside himself he knew the destiny which was imposed upon him from outside, and he saw in it the ultimate occasion to love in the deepest way. The friendship offered by Jesus who forgives is for us the sole absolutely indefectible friendship.

Confronted with betrayal, his faithfulness reaffirms solidarity and community. In the course of his last meal, the abiding covenant is symbolically renewed in two gestures expressing complete self-gift. His body broken, soon to be put to death, becomes the bread of life; his blood poured out, soon to exhaust his last strengths, becomes the wine which fills us with superhuman energies.

For Christians, this historic episode exhibits not only a human love, but also a divine love. St John avers:

We have seen and do testify that the Father has sent his Son as the Saviour of the world. God abides in those who confess that Jesus is the Son of God, and they abide in God. So we have known and believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and those who abide in love abide in God, and God abides in them (1 John 4:14-16).

More than a human being, it is the Son equal to the Father who undergoes the passion. In this way, Jesus' movement of love is identical to the movement of the eternal Son. He constantly gives back to the Father everything he receives from him. This offering is not only that of the man Jesus, but inseparably that of the eternal Son. And we are associated to this mutual donation: by participating in the paschal mystery, we obtain and hand over to the Father the life that he imparts to us. In the eucharist we follow the curve of the loop: with Jesus Christ we receive "every generous act of giving, with every perfect gift, ... from above, coming down from the Father of lights" (James 1:17) and as we lift up our hearts we offer it back to God in a loving exchange.

The Father is the source. He gives himself entirely to his Son and he gives us his incarnate Son as well as their mutual Spirit. The Son returns this gift without reserve. With Christ, we incessantly make this offering, inspired and animated by the Holy Spirit. As one can see, what Christian salvation makes accessible is participation in the Trinitarian life. In this context of love, everything that a person experiences, joyous or painful, can be gratefully received as grace. Believers are intimately associated in the exchanges that take place between the divine Persons. This sharing is incarnated in the life-death-resurrection of Jesus, in baptism and in eucharist, and in daily life modelled on Christ's Passover.

In conclusion, the disengagement from ego-centredness that salvation procures awakens a great desire, a loving fascination with the divine mystery. Such self-transcendence is impossible to mere human powers, given the tendency to self-idolatry and to violence, which vitiates even the religious level. As a counterweight, it is necessary that the Father himself intervene and reveal himself directly, that the incarnate Son personally call the sinner, and that the Holy Spirit, who works in hearts and minds, incite

them persistently to leave their narrow preoccupations and allow themselves to be conquered by a love stronger than death. In sum, the Trinitarian and yet also fully human character of God's solution to the mystery of evil guarantees its universality.<sup>22</sup>

- 1 Daniel A. Helminiak, *The Same Jesus: A Contemporary Christology* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1986), 259.
- 2 For this distinction between the causes and effects of Jesus' death I am indebted to Anthony Akinwale, OP, a former doctoral student at Boston College, now a professor of theology at Ibadan, Nigeria.
- 3 René Girard, *Things Hidden since the Foundation of the World* trans. Stephen Bann and Michael Metteer (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987), Book II, Ch. 2.
- 4 Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*, trans. James G. Williams (New York: Orbis, 2001), 155–156.
- 5 Several scholars have noted this weakness in Girard, notably Lucien Scubla, 'The Christianity of René Girard and the Nature of Religion', in *Violence and Truth: On the Work of René Girard*, ed. Paul Dumouchel (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988), 160–178 and 269–279.
- 6 Raymund Schwager, *Must There Be Scapegoats? Violence and Redemption in the Bible*, trans. Maria L. Assad (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987, reprint in New York: Crossroad, 2000), 82–91 and 200–204; *Jesus in the Drama of Salvation: Toward a Biblical Doctrine of Redemption*, trans. James G. Williams and Paul Haddon (New York: Crossroad, 1999), 177–186.
- 7 In *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, trans. William V. Dych (New York: Crossroad, 1978), 282–283, Karl Rahner, while maintaining the notion of sacrifice, raises relevant critical questions regarding its various senses and implications.
- 8 *Jesus in the Drama of Salvation*, 225–228.
- 9 I cannot list them here, for lack of space. See Rudolf Schnackenburg, 'Sacrifice', B. 'New Testament', in *Sacramentum Verbi: An Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*, ed. Johannes B. Bauer (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970), 803–807.
- 10 See Louis Roy, OP, *Self-Actualization and the Radical Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 53–56.
- 11 A text quoted by Joseph Moingt, *L'homme qui venait de Dieu* (Paris: Cerf, 1993), 412; see the whole of his chap. 6, where he highlights, with fine nuances, God's design and the sacrificial import of Jesus death.
- 12 See Schwager, *Must There Be Scapegoats?*, 188–189. Schwager draws attention to these two biblical texts in the German edition of 1978. Girard does the same later in *Je vois Satan tomber comme l'éclair* (Paris: Grasset, 1999), ch. 8; for title of English translation, see n. 4.
- 13 See Schwager, *Must There Be Scapegoats?*, 183–200; *Jesus in the Drama of Salvation*, 169–172.
- 14 Otto Semmelroth, 'Sacrifice', Ill. 'Sacrifice of Christ' in *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*, ed. Karl Rahner (New York:

- Seabury Press, 1975), 1492–1495, at 1493.
- 15 James Alison, *Raising Abel: The Recovery of the Eschatological Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1996), 46.
  - 16 Strictly speaking, one can sacrifice only to God, since this is an act of worship. Notwithstanding this traditional acceptance, we may say, with Alison, that the death of Jesus was God's sacrifice to us humans in the sense that the Father 'gave him up for all of us' (Romans 8:32).
  - 17 Sebastian Moore, 'The New Convivium', *The Downside Review* 111 (1996): 40–55, at 41.
  - 18 Maury Schepers, OP, 'An Integral Spirituality of the Paschal Mystery', *New Blackfriars* 82 (2001): 283–290, at 286.
  - 19 Jean-Noël Bezançon, *Dieu sauve* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, and Montreal: Bellarmin, 1985), 64.
  - 20 See Louis Roy, OP 'The Passion of Jesus A Test Case for Providence'. *New Blackfriars* 79 (1998) 512–523
  - 21 See Charles C. Hefling, Jr 'A Perhaps Permanently valid Achievement: Lonergan on Christ's Satisfaction', *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 1992: 51–76, esp. 60–61.
  - 22 I want to thank Harvey Egan SJ and Matthew Levering who helped me make this article clearer and more elegant.

## A Plea in Favour of a Vulnerable Peace

Andrew Lascaris OP

The fall of the Twin Towers in New York on September 11th last year shattered the confidence of many people in the security of modern society. Modern society was supposed to guarantee a safe and happy human existence. It promised solutions of difficult problems through its impressive technological developments, it protected the individual against arbitrary decisions of government through its democratic institutions and kept poverty away thanks to the benefits of the free market economic system. The western world looked like a rather peaceful world, apart from some small pockets of violence such as Northern Ireland, the Basque country and Cyprus, and, at the edge of the western world, Israel and Palestine. Democratic states do not make war against democratic countries. It is difficult to count wars for it depends how one defines a war, but since the Second World War almost all the wars in the world were civil wars.