

Chapter Four

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND THE QUEST FOR GLOBAL SOCIAL ORDER IN FRANCIS' LAUDATO SI

Philip Osarobu ISANBOR

Department of Philosophy

Seminary of All Saints, Uhie-Ekpoma

osarobuisanbor@gmail.com

Executive Summary

The anthropological imports of the environment as our common home are envisaging that human life and its existential relevance for any developmental creativity and innovation to be dependable on the valuation of the same environment that houses the human family, following the conviction of Francis' *Laudato Si*. This is the basis on which the understanding of the human person is inseparable from the demands for environmental sustainability, and as such, meaningful and integral development been dependent on the institution of the courses of global social order. As recognized in Francis' *Laudato Si*, the human family has been facing the effects of environmental pollutions and degradation as a result of imposing influences of scientific and technological culture associated with globalised socialization and civilization. Hence, adopting speculative and prescriptive methods of analysis, the essay concludes that the human society, irrespective of its global influences and values, cannot talk about the possibility of global social order without due references to the environmental sustainability that indispensably and existentially sustain the human family and guarantees safe and healthy future generations.

Keywords: Human Person, Global Social Order, Francis' *Laudato Si*, Environmental Sustainability, Human Family, Science and Technology, Integral Ecology.

Introduction

The political and economic projections for the possibilities of global social order have been challenged by some imperialistic, hedonistic and consumerist developmental cultures or policies. They are mainly hinged on the values of global conflicts and violence which have been generating the nefariousness of environmental pollution and degradation, and sustaining the fears of global warming and the rapidity of climate change (see, Isanbor and Obinyan 2018: 238; Isanbor 2018: 120; Isanbor and Bature 2018: 60). But, there have been some developmental longing for the peace and justice through the respect, protection and promotion of the human family. They become very dominant in the minds of many people as they civilize along the values of science and technology which impose more fears of environmental pollution and degradation rather than environmental continence and sustainability. This is a global concern breeding the culture of global disorderliness and disintegration as a result of some mismanagement of freedom and creativities. Recognizing that the contemporary world of production and labour been governed by consumerist and hedonist's vision of development, Pope Francis in his *Laudato Si* asserted that:

A consumerist vision of human beings, encouraged by the mechanisms of today's globalized economy, has a levelling effect on cultures, diminishing the immense variety which is the heritage of all humanity. Attempts to resolve all problems through uniform regulations or technical interventions can lead to overlooking the complexities of local problems which demand the active participation of all members of the community. New

processes taking shape cannot always fit into frameworks imported from outside; they need to be based in the local culture itself. As life and the world are dynamic realities, so our care for the world must also be flexible and dynamic. Merely technical solutions run the risk of addressing symptoms and not the more serious underlying problems. There is a need to respect the rights of peoples and cultures, and to appreciate that the development of a social group presupposes an historical process which takes place within a cultural context and demands the constant and active involvement of local people from within their proper culture. Nor can the notion of the quality of life be imposed from without, for quality of life must be understood within the world of symbols and customs proper to each human group (no. 144).

For Pope Francis in his social encyclical: *Laudato Si*, situating the environment as a common home as the basis of integral development and for the transcendental valuation of the human person, recognizes that the concern for “integral development includes efforts to bring about an integral improvement in the quality of human life, and this entails the settings in which people live their lives. These settings influence the way we think, feel and act. In our rooms, our homes, our workplaces and neighbourhoods, we use our environment as a way of expressing our identity” (Francis 2015: no. 147). The developmental concerns for environmental sustainability demand that the human persons, irrespective of their colour, religion and any other social, cultural economic and political convictions and beliefs, should think and act rightly and ethically in advancing the world around them for the purpose of common living, survival and salvation, especially with reference to the values of creation. He observed that, “we make every effort to adapt to our

environment, but when it is disorderly, chaotic or saturated with noise and ugliness, such overstimulation makes it difficult to find ourselves integrated and happy (Francis 2015: no. 147). That, creating orderliness in every possible disordered and chaotic situations should readily and responsibly show the level of respect the human persons are investing in themselves in order to sustain the environment that has been entrusted to themselves by the creator, God.

Such consciousness for integral development through the valuation of integral ecology is replicated in Pope Francis' recent social encyclical: *Fratelli Tutti*, issued in 2020. Through it, Pope Francis reiterates his concerns for the needs for environmental sustainability through social relationship and fraternity. He initially generated this concern in his earlier social encyclical: *Laudato Si*, and recognized therein that everything about the environmental sustainability are about the values of one's relationship with other persons, nature and God (see, Gaudalli 2017: 80). Pope Francis recognized the sociological conviction of development within the socio-psychological effects of economic operations of anthropological individualism, escapism, particularism and forced patriotism that are leading humankind to misguided separatism, undue collectivism and throwaway culture. With *Fratelli tutti*, he sustains the campaign for integral development on the valuation of social friendship that recognizes the warmth of ourselves as brothers and sisters rather than neighbours. He believes that through this consciousness, the environment can be sustained as our common home for common development and future, as a philosophy of *Otherness of Living*. According to Pope Francis:

When we speak of the "environment", what we really mean is a relationship existing between nature and the society which lives in it. Nature cannot be regarded as something separate from ourselves or as a mere setting in

which we live. We are part of nature, included in it and thus in constant interaction with it. Recognizing the reasons why a given area is polluted requires a study of the workings of society, its economy, its behaviour patterns, and the ways it grasps reality. Given the scale of change, it is no longer possible to find a specific, discrete answer for each part of the problem. It is essential to seek comprehensive solutions which consider the interactions within natural systems themselves and with social systems. We are faced not with two separate crises, one environmental and the other social, but rather with one complex crisis which is both social and environmental. Strategies for a solution demand an integrated approach to combating poverty, restoring dignity to the excluded, and at the same time protecting nature (2015, no. 139).

Pope Francis' concerns for the management of ecological crises project the elimination of the elements of monopolistic tendencies of development and the politics of diplomatic suppression and subjugation of weaker nations by the economic and military treaties. This is inherent in his issuance of the social encyclical: *Laudato Si*. With this encyclical, we understand that development comes with its challenges, and sometimes, they are inevitable (see, Gaudalli 2017: 80). But, the employment of human freedom demands its checkmating of human activities and values for the sake of global social order. This is about the existential and transcendental understanding of integral development in relation to the values of the environment as our common home, common heritage that should sustain our common future. This is about the model of development the global humanity is adopting through the innovative powers of creativities and intelligibility, and the effects of these aspects of development become a common threat to our sense of common good and survival.

Hence, the objective of this essay is hinged on the consideration of the values of the human person through the possibility of global social order. It recognizes that the possibility of global social order is based on the sustainability of the environment as a common home and heritage for the human family. Adopting the speculative and prescriptive method of analysis, the essay assesses Francis's *Laudato si* on the valuation of the environment as our common home, which indicates the global nature of the human person in realizing global social order. Therefore, the essay is directed to sustain the idea that overcoming the effects of socio-political individualism and the imposing misguided and greedy collectivism associated contemporary capitalistic industrialism, which have been occasioned by scientific and technological civilization, demands the needs to revalue our actions and choices for the sustainability of the human family through the protection, promotion and preservation of the environment.

Environment and the Quest for Global Social Order in *Laudato Si*

Francis' *Laudato si* which is issued on the 24th May, 2015, hinged on the sustainability of the environment as our common home. Having the environment as our common home is about the sustainability of the human family in the faces of the ecological challenges and problems associated on the nuclear bombing, false and unchecked industrializations, indiscriminating mining and bio-chemical researches and the likes. These concerns of integral ecological development are about the attainment of global social order, and Pope Francis' *Laudato si* is hinged on the philosophical tradition of the *Catholic Social Teachings*. With this active consciousness for the possibility of environmental sustainability and developmental peace, we simply remember and refer to the socio-ecclesiological philosophies of the 20th century Pontifical encyclicals of John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris*, Paul

VI's *Populorum Progressio*, and John Paul II's *Laborem Exercens*, *Sollicitudo rei Socialis* and *Centisimus Annus*. These were basically concerned with the values for global peace and justice in the age of scientific and technological revolution and advancement that were epistemologically against the values of human life, rights and dignity. According to Pope Francis' *Laudato Si*:

The urgent challenge to protect our common home includes a concern to bring the whole family together to seek a sustainable and integral development, for we know that things can change. The creator does not abandon us; he never forsakes his loving plan or repents of having created us. Humanity still has the ability to work together in building our common home (2015: no. 13).

This social concern for environmental sustainability is strongly and faithfully retained and substantiated by the current 21st century pontifical social encyclicals of Pope Benedict XVI's *Caritas in Veritate* and Francis' *Laudato si* and *Fratelli tutti*. From this tradition, Pope Benedict XVI asked the human persons with all sense of rationality to recognize the indispensable fact that the natural environment has been gravely damaged by our irresponsible actions and choices. Also, that our social environment has suffered damage dependent on our values for the sustainability of our natural environment. Both are ultimately due to the same evil associated with mismanaged and misdirected freedom, and that are no indispensable truths to guide our lives only when we recognize that our freedom is limited rather than limitless (see, Francis, 2015: no. 6). Such consciousness for authentic development should be simply based on the need for integral expression of human actions and choices in truth for the sustainability of human social friendship, fraternity and values.

Before now, socially theologising towards the reconstruction of society from the effects of capitalism, as a social philosophical teaching of the church, Leo XIII's issued *Rerum Novarum* in 1891. This was the first encyclical of the *Catholic Social Teachings*. With it, Pope Leo XIII championed the course of change of attitude of human labour towards the values of true and meaningful development. Hence, there are needs to revalue the productive relationship the employees and the employers in a capitalist-driven society. Pope Leo XIII reacted on the effect and nature of the capitalist society in the attainment of authentic development of his time. Over the times, this culture of alienation and subjugation associated with capitalist productive consciousness is still prevailing, and capable of sustaining increasing rate of membership of the lower class. Even before now, the church and other social institutions have been very concerned, and this is evident in the works of St Thomas Aquinas on the teleological valuation of the human person within the indispensability of faith and reason, and St Augustine of Hippo on the respect of human personhood through the operation of divine illumination. The fact is that it is the concern of everybody, and because, it is the nature of the human person to act and reasonably act responsibly, which is of necessity for him or her to express his or her essence. He or she has the right to have the full benefit of his or her labour, and it is the duty of the government to provide him or her a job to do, and in return, it is his or her duty to return adequate services that justify his or her earnings.

Seeing the global effects of environmental pollutions and degradations in the faces of climate change, global warming and the extinction of animal species, the contemporary Roman Pontiffs with their social teaching as an apparatus of social reformation, restructuring and re-engineering, have been calling for global responses to overcome the trending nature of

imperialistic, hedonistic and consumerist nature of development. Pope John XXIII calls for global ethics against global environmental deterioration. Pope Paul VI seeks for authentic social and moral progress for fighting against some ecological concerns, and he regards such effects as a tragic consequence of unchecked human activity through false and misguided industrialization and urbanization. Pope John Paul II on his part with a long history of *Catholic Social Teachings* constantly sues for moral continence against consumerist lifestyle of development and imposing social nature of throwaway culture. Pope Benedict XVI longs for the values of truth for the realization of integral ecology where the wholeness of nature becomes the avenue of integral development (See, Bals 2016: 11). Recently, with the issuance of *Laudato si*, Pope Francis substantiates the concerns of his predecessors by considering the sustainability of the environment on the valuation of human brotherliness rather than neighbourliness, and with it, the environment being our common home where the human existence and living can be integrally sustained.

Hinged on the understanding of the disintegrating nature of integral ecology of Francis' *Laudato Si*, humanity has entered a new era in which our technical prowess has brought us to a crossroad of development in our imperialistic and hedonistic World of values. This is mainly on the dilemma between the positivity and negativity of the employment of science and technology. For instance; we see the employment of science and technology for the cures of illnesses and diseases and for the inventions of new ones. There are increasing tendencies in the search for common good and solidarity, reinforcing the search for solutions to the effects of climate change and global warming (See, Bals 2016: 12). It demands that common good in its variety of manifestation remains a basis of integral human development,

and including the effects of common survival and sustainability of the planet earth, national interest of nation states, primary actors in international politics, promotion of democratic principles and good governance, maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights of every citizens of the planet (see, Oyeshola 2017: 187, Gaudalli 2017: 82). With the revolutionary advents of science and technology, humans' conceptions of peace and development have greatly changed and such conceptions revolved around the strengths and contents of human creativities and innovations (see, Isanbor and Obinyan 2018: 240; Isanbor 2018: 122; Isanbor and Bature 2018: 62). Even in education and morality, it is seen that what matters to secular humanity are what is pragmatic and realistic, and many times, away from what is idealistic and ethical for the realization of integral development.

The Challenges of Globalization and the Existentiality of Common Developmental Interests

Globalization has remained an imposing and inevitable system of contemporary socialization and civilization of human goods, services, values and interests. It is a system of the closeness of humankind in a miniature community of values and interest of development, technically and socially engineered by the employment of science and technology. It has been a concern by and for everyone that been lost in the values of no values outside the public values. According to Oyeshile, the problems have been that:

Apart from deaths and wanton destruction of life and property there has been stagnation in terms of human resources development as well as material development. The education of the children in particular has suffered. Scientific and technological advancement has also been truncated in most cases.... We then ask: what are the

causes of ethnic conflicts? Scholars of various shades of opinion have come up with different reasons for ethnic. Two major factors have been adduced for these conflicts. These are the control of political power and struggle over economic resources. The two are related in the sense that in a multi-ethnic state, the ethnic group that controls the political power invariably controls economic resources, whether or not the resources are found within the region of the dominating unit. These problems of control of political power and lopsided distribution of economic resources subsequently lead to marginalization of some groups or outright cheating of other groups in the authoritative allocation of resources (Oyeshile 2011: 11-12).

From the weighty nature of human lived experiences, we have been observing that the policies and politics of development have given many versions for the understanding of the human person as an agent of development. With these variation of interests, the global consciousness presents the indispensable interconnectedness of the human persons, and limiting the individuality of the person in the faces of public values, where science and technology have been praised as the saving grace of human true socialization and civilization, and sustaining the courses of defending human life, rights and dignity through vibrant and reliable solidarity. But, for contemporary relativistic and hedonistic cultures of development, human life and death of the human person have become the values of what science and technology can provide, and losing their existential-transcendental essences in each passing of socialization and civilization to the imposing and advancing robotic engineering, socialization and civilization.

Only value that matters to the globalised humanity is development of imperialistic, hedonistic and consumerist world of socialization and civilization. Such social, political and economic currencies of secularist model of development has been situating of thrust values of the human persons to be deceived by the imposing wave of technological science and advancement. This appeared to “have been liberating them from the authority of God, technological science promised them unending joy, peace, and immortality; but has failed to deliver any of these goods, leaving them more confused and disoriented” (Ehusani 1991: 241). The human persons as subjects of lived experiences and development seem to be at mercies of they have produced, And today, within the secularist development associated with the values of science and technology, “human persons are blinded by materialism, poisoned by consumerism, enslaved by greed and humiliated by aggression, and appear to have lost their sense of meaning and purposes” Ehusani 1991: 241). But, to redeem the human persons from the effects of what they have produced, it becomes highly imperative to readdress our values and interests based on the principles of common good, solidarity and universal destination of goods, and therefore to formulate a new vision of reality on the foundation of the “civilization of love”, and the hope of a new world directed by the values of the *Otherness of Living*, that should be holistically friendly, functionally transcendental, and godly humane, and ultimately saved by the presence of God.

As contemporarily put, the talk of globalization is that of science and technology, and they remain very imposing and influential in determining the fate of morality, development, politics, environment, economy, and even religion. For we recognize that “today’s young people, especially, know that the progress of science and technology can produce not only new material goods but also a wider sharing in knowledge” (John Paul II 1980: no.

10). With such trunks of knowledge, the globalization is becoming enslaving and demeaning, limiting the values of one's individuality, missing in the crowds of interests and values. Understandably, "globalization must not be a new version of colonization. It must respect the diversity of cultures which, within the universal harmony of peoples, are life's interpretative keys" (PCJP 2005: no. 366). It is creating superficial cultures of secluded groupings of persons bounded and blinded by fading crowded relevance of development without faith being created but evolved. It is a society where everyone is free but enslaved by the culture that determined their freedom. In particular, we should also have in mind that such globalized culture of development "must not deprive the poor of what remains most precious to them, including their religious belief and practices, since genuine religion convictions are the clearest manifestation of human freedom" (PCJP 2005: no. 366). According to Greg Nnamani (2005):

Largely through human activity, life on earth faces serious danger of extermination. Since the dawn of modernity, humans have sequentially polluted, degrade and destroyed the very environment which sustains their lives and those of other living organisms. Not only have they succeeded in making the environment hostile to life, they have also turned it into a breeding ground for usual and unusual diseases and sickness.

This is the fate of globalised humanism in the faces of the environmental pollution and degradation, where everyone suffers the effect of one's mismanagement of freedom and creativity. This globalised humanism recognized that the human persons cannot, therefore, realize their potentialities in a hostile and warring environment (See, Agbo 2010: 36; Ograh 2014: 111). For the human persons to become what they should be along the values of values and creativities, according to their essential

nature, it demands that they manage the conditions of development that do not differentiate peoples, but respect their values, rights and cultures according to the dictates of natural law (Cf Gaudalli 2017: 81; Nnamani 2013: 53). This demands that they understand their make-ups of being bounded together and seeking interdependence, and not involve in relationships of conflict or opposition but express and give practical and functional meaning to their fundamental unity

Hence, contemporary humanism recognized that the valuation of the human person is indispensable hinged on the valuation of the environment, and that the operational epistemology and ethics of human actions on the environment determine what to happen to human generations. Hence, it will not be at of place to say that, humanity recognized “the main developmental problems of our time seem to be the lack of integration and valuation of science and technology, where the same science and technology are expressively moving faster and industrially imposing than the human person are following it morally and spiritually, such consciousness thereby is making life tilt towards one direction, towards self-destruction, rather than promise. The faster technology moves, the more materialistic and consumerist we become, and the less spiritual and moral we become too. According to Francis’ *Laudato Si*:

We urgently need a humanism capable of bringing together the different fields of knowledge, including economics, in the service of a more integral and integrating vision. Today, the analysis of environmental problems cannot be separated from the analysis of human, family, work-related and urban contexts, nor from how individuals relate to themselves, which leads in turn to how they relate to others and to the environment. There is an interrelation between ecosystems and between the various spheres of social interaction, demonstrating yet

again that “the whole is greater than the part (2015, no. 141).

Naturally, the environment cannot be duly sustained by the employment of science and technology, despite its global influences and values in promoting urbanization, industrialization and communization. Rather, only by love and in love with which such employment of science and technology are adopted. One can only love when he or she acts and makes choices rightly and wisely within the operation of faith and reason that define one’s humanness. For Pope Francis, “human beings too are creatures of this world, enjoying a right to life, and happiness, and endowed with unique dignity. So we cannot fail to consider the effects on people’s lives of environmental deterioration, current models of development and the throwaway culture” (Francis 2015: no. 43). So, we must keep faith and reason working in safeguarding the environment in order for the environment to keep us, and to save us from self-alienation and self-destruction (from possible self-extinction). Only what will keep the environment safe and healthy are responsive and responsible persons who long for the institution for the courses of global social order. It is on the conviction to the save ourselves from our mismanaged employment of our freedom and intelligence, and longing to sustain the values of creation and protect the factors of future human generations.

This concern of Francis’ *Laudato Si* is extended in his social encyclical: *Fratelli tutti*, where he believes that the human environment can be sustained through healthy and integral human social fraternity and relationship. In *Fratelli tutti*, Pope Francis recalled the indispensable relevance of the courses of integral human development in the management and preservation of the natural recourses for the relationship of global social order, and therein, he asserts that; “to care for the

world in which we live means to care for ourselves. Yet we need to think of ourselves more and more as a single family dwelling in a common home (Francis, 2020, no. 17). To think of ourselves as humans is to think of the environment that can sustain such natural hope and conviction of being truly human. We can only be human when the human family is properly defined among other existents as rational and intelligent agents of development. As against this common consciousness of development, we remember that “such care does not interest those economic powers that demand quick profits. Often the voices raised in defense of the environment are silenced or ridiculed, using apparently reasonable arguments that are merely a screen for special interests” (Francis, 2020, no. 17). This is a culture of monopolistic consciousness of development that has been sustaining the politics of greed, wickedness and selfishness among nations, and working towards to the courses of global disorder, insecurities and ecological crises. “In this shallow, short-sighted culture that we have created, bereft of a shared vision, it is foreseeable that, once certain resources have been depleted, the scene will be set for new wars, albeit under the guise of noble claims” (Francis, 2020, no. 17). More still, the dilemmatic nature of industrialized development demands that the human persons act responsibly and ethically in investing their creative and innovative talents and knowledge in protecting, preserving and promoting the created World, through some responsive changes of lifestyles by promoting the values of human togetherness and brotherliness.

Environmental Sustainability for Global Social Order: On the Values of the Human Family

The reign of global social order is dependent on global response for the respect of human life, rights and dignity. This is peace in relation to the valuation of integral development. For this conviction of development, Johan Galtung has earlier before

Pope Francis' *Laudato Si* on the human roots of the ecological crisis through the fears of new biological and chemical technologies for the execution of wars, identifies three conceptual outlooks of peace for integral development. First is the conventional idea of peace and peaceful socialization to be as a synonymous with the operational conceptualization and relevance of social stability and equity. Second is the idea of peace as the absence of organized collective violence, be it racial, ethnic or international (negative peace). Third, is peace as a synonym for all other good things in the world community, particularly cooperation and integration between human groups, with less emphasis on the absence of violence (positive peace) (Galtung 1967: 12). With this classification, Galtung presents the view that peace is the absence of structural violence, and not just the absence of war (Galtung 1969: 167). Galtung's position on peace mandates a prior definition of violence; which he explains thus; "violence is everything which prevents the full realization of innate somatic and mental human potentials... violence is anything which produces a gap between the physical and mental potentials of human beings and their actual conditions" (Galtung 1969: 168). But, for Pope Francis, the attainment of global social order as the culture of peaceful development is hinged on the sustainability of the human family in regards to the environment as our common home. As a matter of fact, the whole issues of development and its enduring principles are centred on the promotion and protection of the human family. The family is the cradle of civil society and development. It is in great measure of the human family life that the destiny of any nation is fostered. But, in many ways, through the imposing effects of environmental pollution and development, this measure for the sustainability of human family has been hampered.

With such consciousness, Pope Francis' *Laudato Si* projects the common understanding that the values of life should be the determinant factors for all policies and principles of development through human labour and production. For Pope John Paul II, just before Pope Benedict XVI and Pope Francis, recognized many obstacles to the respect of families, and for example, today, the various forms of the erosion of marriage, such as free unions and "trial marriage", and even pseudo-marriages between people of the same sex, are instead an expression of anarchic freedom that are wrongly made to pass as true human liberation. This pseudo-freedom is based on a trivialization of the body, which inevitably entails the trivialization of the person. Its premise is that the human being can do to himself or herself whatever he or she likes. Thus, with such consciousness, the human body becomes a secondary thing that can be manipulated, from the human point of view, and used as one likes. Licentiousness, which passes for the discovery of the body and its value, is actually a dualism that makes the body despicable, placing it, so to speak, outside the person's authentic being and dignity (See, Bals 2016: 13). A society built on a family scale is the best guarantee against drifting off course into individualism or collectivism. This is because, within the family the individual as a person is always at the centre of attention, and remains as an end for any developmental policy, and never as a means (see, PCJP 2005: no. 213). Then, due attention must obviously be given to responsible procreation, which among other things has a positive contributions in realizing integral development. And in societal concern for human's authenticity, the quest for integral development urges the exercises of human actions in respecting human values through proper exercises of his or her sexuality and its responsive socialization.

What is needed then is for human societies and the families who live within them, often in a context of struggle between the

civilization of love and its opposites, to seek their solid foundation in a correct vision of the human person and of everything which determines the full “realization” of his or her humanness (PCJP 2005: no. 215). The human family has the growing tendency for developing its potentials and capacities, and this should be done adequately in accommodating environment, where peace, justice and unity are the bedrocks of meaningful and integral development. The theme of development can be identified with the inclusion-in-relation of all individuals and peoples within the one community of the human family, built in solidarity on the basis of the fundamental values of justice and peace (Benedict XVI 2009: no. 54). The human society works to eliminate the effects of individualism and materialism that do not promote cultural symbiosis needed. In the promotion of peace and justice, it is the duty of any State to protect the interest of the human family. The family is anterior to the State which is composed of families. The State, therefore, enjoys a subsidiarity function in relation with the family. It exists to help the family and enable its members to develop themselves and fulfill their obligations under natural law. Therefore, the State has no authority whatever so to act as to prove itself more of a hindrance than a help to the families who compose it. The State must respect and protect families against the assaults of sectional interests.

Hence, the question of global social order remained central on the kindness towards the weak, poor and needy in the society-owing that, the wealth of the earth belong to them- for the eyes of the divine, everyone is poor, weak and in need. We owe one another the truth of justice and equity considering the weak, poor and needy in willingness to pay due wages and salaries to labourers and having just terms of commerce, especially in terms of managing our surplus values, and not playing games with

common resources of the people in the names of political gimmicks. Global social order is possibly instituted on the values of the human person- possibly suggests the institutionalization of “I-Thou” relationship in a transcendental subjectivity of the human person. It is a culture of oneness in which the individual sees his or her very self beyond himself or herself, especially in the subjectivity of others- seeing “me in you” and “you in me” consciousness of warmth. This warmth does not lead the individual out of his or her very subjectivity and authenticity, but established the individual in the consciousness of keeping himself within the existential-ontological relevance of the others. For participation is possible when there are interactions with peoples whose needs have been duly taken care of, owing to the philosophy of “I-Thou” relationship, or better still, “We” relationship with a consciousness that enliven every human pains and joys, which transcends the individuality of the person to the social integration of interdependency of the persons.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, we realized that the quests for the environmental sustainability are hinged on the values of global social order. This will remain a global affair or concern for integral development as the ontological values of the human person are the same anywhere and anytime. Such commonness of importance shows the indispensable valuation of the human family in the faces of contemporary quests for scientific and technological development. It is for the sake of balancing environmental biodiversity, as greatly emphasized in Pope Francis’ *Laudato Si*, that there are indispensable and conscious needs to respect, promote and protect human life, rights and dignity with regards to what should be modified in the environment. This is owing to the increasing rate of societal conflicts and violence, demands of biotechnologies and advancement on nuclear weapons and technologies. Such

consciousness of development demands advanced responsible stewardship of the human family and the ecology.

Therefore, the opinions raised here in line with the conviction of Francis' *Laudato Si* on the indispensability of environmental sustainability in relation to the valuation of the human family suggest that the attainment of global social order is hinged on the values of human life, rights and dignity. This concern recognized that the value of life is absolute and of highest degree when compared with other human values; and this should guide the reasons and contents of our actions and choices. It demands that, amidst the plethora of value judgments associated with our current scientific and technological civilization, we should make sure, reasonably certain that human life, rights and dignity remain the most valuable factors of development we have. It is on this conviction for true and integral development that global social order is made possibly realizable sustainable when the environment is made our common home through our conscious actions and choices, and which values cannot be monopolized by any individual or group of persons.

References

- Agbo, J. N. (2010). Is globalisation a process or a product? In A. B. C. Chiegboka, T. C. Utoh-Ezeajugh, and G. I. Udechukwu (Eds.). *The humanities and globalization in the third millennium* (pp. 26-39). Nigeria: Rex Charles and Patrick.
- Bals, C. (2016). *A successful provocation for a pluralistic global society: The encyclical Laudato Si' – A Magna Carta of integral ecology as a reaction to humanity's self-destructive course*. Published in Politics and Society. Bonn: Germanwatch. As assessed via: www.germanwatch.org/en/12697, on the assessed on the 15th September, 2021.
- Benedict XVI, pope (2009). *Caritas in veritate*. Social encyclical on the realization of the authentic human development in charity in truth. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Cox, G. (1986). *A way of peace: the philosophy of peace as action*. Mumbai: Paulist Press.
- De Soras, A. (1963). *International morality*. New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Ehusani, G. O. (1991). *An afro-Christian vision "Ozovehe": toward a more humanized world*. New York: University Press of America.
- Francis, pope (2015). *Laudato si*. Social encyclical on the environment as our common home. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Francis, pope (2020). *Fratelli tutti*. Social encyclical on the fraternity and social friendship. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Galtung, J. V. (1967). *Theories of peace: a synthetic approach to peace thinking*. International Peace Research Institute, Oslo.
- Galtung, J. V. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 160-172.

- Gaudelli, W. (2017). People, pope and planet: a hermeneutic and spectacle analysis of *laudato si'* for global citizenship educators. *Journal of International Social Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 70-91.
- Isanbor, P. O. (2018). Morality against environmental degradation: a review for sustainable development. *SCIENTIA: Plasu Journal of General Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 119-126.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Bature, A. I. (2018). Morality, integral ecology and development in Francis' *laudato si*: A Review. *PHILECTICS: Benin Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 56-63.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Obinyan, V. E. (2018). "African meta-ethical appraisal of Echekwube's regeneration thesis for global peace development." In F. O. Ekhaize, et al (eds). *Book of Proceedings of 3rd University of Benin Annual Research Day Conference* (pp. 237-240) Benin City: University of Benin.
- Omoregbe, J. (2007). *Social-political philosophy and international relation*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers.
- Oyeshile, O. A. (2011). *Reconciling the self with the other: an existentialist perspective on the management of ethnic conflicts in Africa*. Ibadan: Hope Publications Limited.
- Oyeshola, D. (2017). International politics, common good and the challenges of climate change: In search of solutions. In J. T. Ekong (ed). *Politics and the common good*. (pp. 185-211). Ibadan, Dominican Institute: The Michael Dempsey Centre for Social and Religious Research.
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (PCJP) (2005). *Compendium of the social doctrine of the church*. Nairobi: Pauline Publication.