Ted Peters, "The Crisis of Technological Civilization," in *Created to be Creators: Human Becoming in an Age of Science, Technology, and Faith.* Eds., Mladen Turk and Jason Roberts. Lanham MD: Lexington Press, 2022; 199-210.

Chapter 11

The Crisis of Technological Civilization

Ted Peters

"I have some bad news and some good news," the pilot announced over the speaker system. Dozing passengers sat up straight while video gamers put down their screens. Everyone was listening.

"The bad news," continued the captain, "is that our instruments have temporarily ceased functioning. We do not know what direction we are flying. Now, here's the good news: we're making excellent time."

Technological civilization is facing a crisis because, although it is progressing at a high rate of speed, it is directionless. Or, perhaps more accurately, some ambitious segments of our society are taking us in one direction while others wish to go a different direction. And all are flying at jet speed.

Going in one direction is Demis Hassabis, founder of Deep Mind, an AI (Artificial Intelligence) start-up in the U.K. DeepMind's mission is to "solve intelligence" and then use intelligence "to solve everything else."[1] Going the other direction is Tesla and Space X *Wunderkind*, Elon Musk, who fears the birth of self-evolving AI. Musk warns that AI researchers could have perfectly good intentions but still "produce something evil by accident"—including, possibly, "a fleet of artificial intelligence-enhanced robots capable of destroying mankind."[2] In short, stop AI development before we are destroyed by a robocalypse.

Even before we engage artificial intelligence, today's human intelligence already connected globe-wide by electronic communication is divisive, factious, competitive, and outright rude. Traffic on the information highway is slowed by detours of disinformation and animus. Just at the moment when technology could unite the human race in Teilhard's noosphere, human integrity crumbles like a stale cake.

What does theological anthropology tell us about the present crisis? Try this: through evolutionary processes, God determined that created cocreators would be free, but God did not determine the directions these free cocreators would choose to follow. God may not have determined that direction, but God still has a preferred direction symbolized by biblical notions such as *new creation* accompanied by middle ethical axioms such as pursuit of the common good.

I. WHERE DID THE CREATED COCREATOR GO WRONG?

Our disposition toward technological innovation is in the human DNA. God put it there. With the help of natural selection, to be sure. Philip Hefner provides a succinct rendering of theological anthropology. "*The human being is created by God to be a co-creator in the creation that God has brought into being and for which God has purposes.* We state this briefly in the term *created co-creator*."[3] Hefner draws out implications.

> This term [*created cocreator*] does a number of things. Because we are *created*, we are reminded that we are dependent creatures. We depend for our very existence on our cosmic and biological prehistory; we depend on the creative grace of God. Yet, we are also *creators*, using our cultural freedom and power to alter the course of historical events and perhaps even evolutionary events. We participate with God in the ongoing creative process.[4]

Note how for Hefner God creates us as cocreators for God's "purposes." God's purposes derive from God. The problem is that we creatures take advantage of our freedom to construct and choose our own purposes, which may or may not coincide with God's purposes. And what we choose differs from person-to-person, culture-to-culture, and tyrant-to-tyrant. This freedom we have been given permits us to create purposes right along with the means to fulfill these purposes. With billions of created cocreators directed by rival purposes and competing with one another, it is no wonder that fast-moving technological innovation lacks a shared purpose or single direction.

Actually, the remedy is more complicated than merely persuading a majority of individuals to elect a common purpose and then share a single direction for innovation. To fulfill a purpose is to fulfill the individual, to attain self-fulfillment. Each one of us feels the deep need for an inner compass, for self-direction, for autonomy. If purpose or direction is superimposed on us by a tyrant, we experience heteronomy and the frustrations that accompany

it. At the deepest level, we yearn for theonomy, for the unity of our own autonomously chosen goals and God's appointed purposes.[5]

Neither technology nor the science that undergirds it is capable on its own of setting direction, purpose, or meaning. Purpose and direction are produced solely by subjectivity, either God's subjectivity or ours. And with a planet populated by billions of individual subjectivities, the statistical chance of electing a common purpose seems staggeringly low.

The crisis of technological civilization did not just drift in like a leaf falling from a tree. Rather, the crisis is more like a hurricane that has been blowing us off our feet for more than half a century. Victor Ferkiss, the political scientist at Georgetown University, forecasted the coming of *technological man* in 1969; he forecasted a human society that controls and directs innovation.[6] But, a half decade later in his book, *The Future of Technological Civilization*, Ferkiss became more pessimistic about the human capacity to govern its own creativity. He avers, "The essence of humanity's current crisis is that we have allowed our collective destiny to be determined by the political philosophy usually called 'liberalism,' which holds that the prime purpose of human society is to encourage individual self-aggrandizement."[7] With this term, *liberalism*, Ferkiss is not referring to America's Democratic Party. Rather, Ferkiss recalls the classic liberalism of the eighteenth century that took the turn toward individual freedom set over against the tyranny of the king or the state. In Ferkiss's case, *liberalism* connotes individualism, pluralism, and irreconcilable divisiveness. The crisis of technological civilization is not the product of technology. Rather, today's crisis is the product of an underlying culture of individualism that seems incapable of centering on a common good.

On the one hand, God has gifted *Homo sapiens* with freedom and with the opportunity for individual self-fulfillment. On the other hand, like a bag of marbles dropped on the floor and rolling uncontrollably in different directions, the human race is taking its technological innovations in ungovernably different directions.

Hefner's diagnosis is not quite isomorphic with mine. I concur with Hefner when he says this crisis is quintessentially a crisis of culture, and therefore quintessentially a crisis of the human creators. So far, so good. Hefner's next step is to spotlight the rift between human culture and the natural world within which culture resides. We ourselves are out of sync with other systems of nature, Hefner avers.

This is true, of course. The ecological crisis recognized more than a half-century ago[8] remains virtually unaddressed while our climate heats up. The worldwide scientific community is virtually unanimous: our planet is in grave trouble. Yes, we can say accurately that culture is out of sync with nature.

Even so, I press my diagnosis a step further. Why is culture out of sync? My diagnosis is exactly the one with which we have been working, namely, lack of a shared commitment to the common good. Only a culturally driven vision of the common good can rally the resources needed to put culture and nature back in sync.

Fifty years ago, the futurists and ecologists lifted up a vision for a planetary surge in disciplined changes at the intersection of culture with nature. Because the planet is one, the human impulse needs to be one. Futurist Ervin Laszlo represented a previous generation: "The values of the large majority of the human population need to be shifted from parochial and national orientation to the global perspective."[9] The values that could direct technological civilization toward resynchronizing culture with nature must be planetary in scope. In short, the diagnosis prescribes a specific cure: our values should embrace the common good.

Might the rising generation of created cocreators solve the crisis of technological civilization? Or, might the tantalizing lure of technological advance so mesmerize the visionaries among us that our human sync with nature will become buried even deeper? Might we cocreators create a Frankenstein monster?

II. WILL THE HUMAN BECOME POSTHUMAN?

Perhaps the accelerating pace of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Intelligence Amplification (IA), accompanied by the promise of an emerging posthuman superintelligence, best exemplifies the paradox of technological civilization.

"Current humanity need not be the endpoint of evolution," claims Nick Bostrom at Oxford University's Future of Humanity Institute.[10] What might a future posthuman scenario presuppose?

Rather than the term, *human being*, Hefner aptly takes a Hereclitean turn toward *human becoming*. Because we are perpetually creating and even self-creating, the human race is always on-the-way. Here we ask: are we on the way to a posthuman species? Will AI and IA lead to superintelligence, a superintelligence which will make today's human person obsolete? Will the present generation innovate itself into extinction?

The transhumanists in our neighborhood will answer affirmatively, even with applause. Transhumanism, also known as H+ or Humanity Plus, believes AI and IA progress provides the *trans* from the human to the enhanced human and eventually the posthuman.[11] Even if the present generation of *Homo sapiens* does nothing, our human species will evolve over time regardless. The question transhumanists raise is this: should we just let nature take its course or should we intervene and take technological control over this evolutionary

process? Could we design our descendants like we design Volkswagens and prostheses? Our transhumanist friends answer with a zealous, yes.

The designing of our evolutionary descendants will rely on GNR innovations: genetics, nanotechnology, and robotics. The task of GNR will be to raise both human and machine intelligence to such a high level that the resulting intelligence will take over and reproduce itself on its own. The threshold to be crossed is called the *Singularity*, at which point self-enhancing and self-evolving superintelligence will take control of the next stage of evolution. We will put directionless technology in the driver's seat.

"Humanity will be radically changed by technology in the future," declares the *Transhumanist Declaration*. "We foresee the feasibility of redesigning the human condition, including such parameters as the inevitability of aging, limitations on human and artificial intellects, unchosen psychology, suffering, and our confinement to the planet earth."[12] The enhanced human if not the posthuman will overcome survival threats and escape confinement to the planet of our birth.

The transhumanist envisions much more than merely inventing the next gadget. H+provides a philosophy, a worldview, and a compelling plan for transformation. At least according to Natasha Vita-More, Executive Director of Humanity+Inc.:

> As a philosophy transhumanism deals with the fundamental nature of reality, knowledge, and existence. As a worldview, it offers a cultural ecology for understanding the human integration with technology. As a scientific study, it provides the techniques for observing how technology is shaping society and the practice for investigating ethical outcomes. Its social narrative emerges from humans overcoming odds and the continued desire to build a world worth living in. These processes require critical thinking and visionary accounts to assess how technology is altering human nature and what it means to be human in an uncertain world.[13]

The "altering of human nature" here conflates two types of alteration: enhancement and replacement. On the one hand, IA accompanied by IA augmentation could enhance the human person's ability to negotiate the world we live in. On the other hand, the Singularity could simply replace the human person we know with a superintelligent posthuman.

Need this evolutionary transformation be restricted to individual enhancement? No. The very idea that propels today's transhumanism forward was anticipated by Julian Huxley seven decades ago. For Huxley the good for all of humanity belongs to the vision:

> Up till now human life has generally been, as Hobbes described it, "nasty, brutish and short"; the great majority of human beings (if they have not already

> died young) have been afflicted with misery [. . . W]e can justifiably hold the belief that these lands of possibility exist, and that the present limitations and miserable frustrations of our existence could be in large measure surmounted. [. . .] The human species can, if it wishes, transcend itself—not just sporadically, an individual here in one way, an individual there in another way, but in its entirety, as humanity.[14]

According to Huxley's vision, the technological self-makeover would benefit the "entirety of humanity." Nick Bostrom, in contrast, blesses the individual with the fruits of superintelligence.

The posthuman could be post-biological, that is, our descendants might locate their intelligent minds not in brains but in computers. What we have previously known as *Homo sapiens* will be replaced by *Homo cyberneticus*. The advent of the posthuman will establish a technological utopia, according to Nick Bostrom. He exhorts,

> Let us make a leap into an imaginary posthuman world, in which technology has reached its logical limits. The superintelligent inhabitants of this world are autopotent, meaning that they have complete power over and operational understanding of themselves, so that they are about to remold themselves at will and assume any internal state they choose.[15]

That the individual seeks fulfillment, we grant and affirm. What remains to be assessed is the impact of superintelligence on the entirety of humanity, on the whole of human existence in sync with our planet's biosphere.

The theologian's initial reaction to the H+plan is to flinch. Is the H+plan one more expression of human hubris? Celia Deane-Drummond thinks so. *Hyperhumanism* is the belief that humanity is in control of its own history and its own evolutionary future. "It would be a mark of intense hubris marked with political overtones of eugenics to expect that humans can control their own evolution."[16] These concerns are consonant with the analysis of writer and radio host Carmen LaBerge, who notes,

> From a Christian worldview, technology is not inherently good nor evil. Technology is morally benign but we are not. Human beings who develop and use technology are moral agents who stand responsible before God who defines the boundaries of good and evil. So, part of what Christians bring to the transhumanist conversation is the question of *should*.[17]

The person of faith must ask whether the technosapien ideology at work in AI and H+going to lead us to a repeat of the Promethean tragedy? Will the H+Frankenstein once again create a monster? "These extreme vistas represent a rerun of the science-as-saviour mentality," fears Gareth Jones.[18]

III. THE LEAKS IN THE BOTTOM OF THE TECHNOLOGICAL BOAT

Here is one leak at the bottom of the technological boat: technological innovation is amazingly successful at providing means to an end, but it is incapable of providing the end in itself. "Technical reason," Paul Tillich reminds us, "provides means for ends, but offers no guidance in the determination of ends."[19] This is clear.

Even so, it would be a cheap shot to say that the transhumanist lacks purpose, direction, or inspiration. The leak in the bottom of the transhumanist boat is that its purpose and direction are arbitrary, floating on the subjective preference for intelligence over other human qualities such as compassion, cooperation, and care.

Oh yes, the transhumanist believes that the movement is grounded in an evolutionary ethic, asserting that technological self-transformation is what evolution wants from the human race. But past attempts at guiding a society by an ethic drawn from survival-of-the-fittest or natural selection have led to eugenics and even genocide. This was dramatically the case in Nazi Germany. Evolutionary naturalism is not humanity's friend. To avoid endorsing such a violent ethic, the sensitive transhumanist selects for his or her natural selection one treasured human trait, namely, intelligence. Superintelligence becomes the H+ *summum bonum*.

The H+ *summum bonum* is intelligence, and the H+ techie wants to press superintelligence into the service of human betterment. Today's transhumanist is heir to the technological imperative: the tacit doctrine which holds that new technologies are inevitable and essential and that they must be developed and accepted for the good of society. For two centuries, believers in the technological imperative have sought human betterment right along with the ecstasy of yielding to technological destiny.

Pope Francis is impatient with the technological imperative because technological progress does not automatically translate into human progress:

> There is a growing awareness that scientific and technological progress cannot be equated with the progress of humanity and history, a growing sense that the way to a better future lies elsewhere. This is not to reject the possibilities which technology continues to offer us. But humanity has changed profoundly, and the accumulation of constant novelties exalts a superficiality which pulls us in one direction. It becomes difficult to pause and recover depth in life.[20]

In sum, technological progress lacks "depth in life."

Where do the transhumanists go for their depth? To evolution. Transhumanist ethics moves from what *is* in evolution to what we *ought* to do. Here is the *is*: our world is in "a process of evolutionary complexification toward ever more

structures." Further, we human beings have a "will to evolve." From here, we move to the *ought*: "We should seek to foster our innate will to evolve . . . by acting in harmony with the essential nature of the evolutionary process."[21] The technological imperative kicks in at this point, where Simon Young anticipates replacing "Darwinian Evolution with Designer Evolution—from slavery to the selfish genes to conscious self-rule by the human mind."[22]

On the one hand, we might congratulate the transhumanist movement for plugging up the hole in the bottom of the boat: H+ does not ask technological reason to provide its moral end. Instead, transhumanists ask evolution to provide the depth Pope Francis is looking for. But, alas, this only drills another hole in the same boat.

Why? Because evolution is no more equipped to provide a moral end than technology is. No such principle of complexity leading to intelligence drives evolution, at least if you ask the evolutionary biologists. "We are glorious accidents of an unpredictable process with no drive to complexity," trumpets Stephen Jay Gould.[23] To review our evolutionary history through scientific lenses precludes any warrant for value based on purpose or direction. Neither intelligence nor any other specific human trait is respected by evolution let alone obeyed as its guiding principle. "There are no long-range teleological trends or directions to evolutionary change; no goals of design, complexity, or intelligence are inherent in the evolutionary process."[24]

The appeal to evolution springs an additional leak. This leak is due to the theodicy problem. David Ziegler explains:

> 99 percent of the species that ever lived are extinct. [. . .] Also, across all species 95 percent or more of each new generation is eliminated early in life by lady luck or by selection's harsh hand. It would seem difficult to accept that a "higher power" would use such cruel and wasteful methods for bringing us (or any species for that matter) into being.[25]

By arbitrarily selecting intelligence for the H+ *summum bonum*, our transhumanist friends cannot but help perpetuate the suffering perpetrated by natural selection and its eugenics implication, namely, their superintelligent posthumans must discard us lesser achievers and allow us to go extinct. It is difficult to conceive of a coherent ethic based on evolution that does not result in cruelty.

The human race needs technological innovation for its own well-being if not betterment. The first leak in the bottom of the transhumanist boat is that technology cannot by itself set purpose, direction, or a measure for fulfillment. The second two leaks spring up from the reliance of H+ on evolution to fix the first leak. The first hole is drilled by the established scientific community, which denies that purpose or direction or value belongs inherently in the evolutionary process. The second hole is drilled by the theodicy problem:

even if purpose or direction can be conscripted from natural selection, the resulting ethic would be a cruel imitation of Darwin's struggle for existence.

Purpose, direction, and fulfillment can only be understood by subjectivity, divine or human subjectivity. Human culture dare not ask technology to govern itself, let alone govern us. Human culture dare not design itself to repeat in morality what takes place already in nature, bloodred in tooth and claw.[26]

Our emerging globalized culture needs to place a spirit of communal well-being into the driver's seat of technological innovation. That spirit of community is best articulated in the doctrine of the common good.

IV. THE PROLEPTIC COMMON GOOD

The New Testament vision of the future of creation was instituted by God when raising Jesus from the dead on the first Easter. As God raised Jesus from the dead, so also will God transform a creation otherwise destined for death into a new creation imbued with everlasting life. The biblical symbols are the *Kingdom of God*, *City of God*, *New Jerusalem*, and *new creation.* Interpreting these symbols provides confidence and hope that tomorrow will be better than today, that God's guarantee of redemption is authorized by the very God of creation. Jesus's resurrection is a microcosm of the eschatological transformation, the macrocosm. We live today between the times, between Easter and consummation.

In order to translate our vision of God's ultimate future into hortatory values for our own near- and medium-range futures, we need middle axioms. Christian ethics consists essentially of anticipating God's eschatological redemption through transformative actions in the present. *Prolepsis* is my term for actions today guided by middle axioms that incarnate ahead of time God's eschatological new creation. The ethical concept of the common good provides a fitting therapy for what we have diagnosed as the crisis of technological civilization.

Aspiring to the common good causes us to think in terms of wholes and parts. What is good for the whole is good for the part, and vice versa. Pope Paul VI defined the common good as "the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment."[27] If we think of the whole in terms of the well-being of planet Earth inclusive of both nature and human culture, this contributes definitively to the well-being of each individual person.[28] Herman Daly and John Cobb make this point forcefully: "The well-being of a community as a whole is constitutive of each person's welfare."[29]

For the public theologian, the common good provides what is needed for both prophetic discourse clarification as well as worldview construction. In discourse clarification, the common good becomes accusatory. "As an accusatory concept," writes Jesuit Jacquineau Azetsop, "the common good underlines the social impacts and human cost of individualism and highlights the moral significance of human interrelatedness."[30] In worldview construction, the Christian public theologian can announce that there is a new world coming that will be, among other things:

1. organized as a single worldwide, planetary society;
2. united in devotion to the will of God;
3. sustainable within the biological carrying capacity of the planet and harmonized with the principles of the ecosphere;
4. organized politically so as to preserve the just rights and voluntary contributions of all individuals;
5. organized economically so as to guarantee the basic survival needs of each person;
6. organized socially so that dignity and freedom are respected and protected in every quarter;
7. dedicated to advancing their quality of life in behalf of future generations.[31]

God's future emanates backward through time to our present crisis, glowing like an emerald of priceless value. Aspiring to the common good will lead our planetary society to this treasure.

Former Cardinal Ratzinger and now retired pontiff Benedict XVI understands our pursuit of the common good proleptically.

> In an increasingly globalized society, the common good and the effort to obtain it cannot fail to assume the dimensions of the whole human family, that is to say, the community of peoples and nations, in such a way as to shape the *earthly city* in unity and peace, rendering it to some degree an anticipation and a prefiguration of the undivided *City of God*.[32]

V. CONCLUSION

If technology itself is incapable of producing the very values it needs to drive itself in a purposeful direction, might a social commitment to the common good provide just the steering we need for the future well-being of both nature and culture?

Our only hope appears to be cocreating a future directed by the proleptic common good. The alternative is unthinkable.

NOTES

1. Demis Hassabis, "Deep Mind Homepage," https://deepmind.com/, 2021.
2. Maureen Dowd, "Elon Musk's Billion Dollar Crusade to Stop the AI Apocalypse," *Vanity Fair*, April 2017, https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/03/elon-musk-billion-dollar-crusade-to-stop-ai-space-x.
3. Philip Hefner, *The Human Factor: Evolution, Culture, and Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 35; emphasis in original.
4. Philip Hefner, "The Evolution of the Created Co-Creator," in *Cosmos as Creation: Theology and Science in Consonance*, ed. Ted Peters (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1989), 225–26.
5. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 83–85.
6. Victor Ferkiss, *Technological Man* (New York: Mentor, 1969).
7. Victor Ferkiss, *The Future of Technological Civilization* (New York: George Braziller, 1974), 6.
8. See Lynn White, Jr., "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," *Science*, 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203–207.
9. Ervin Laszlo, *A Strategy for the Future* (New York: George Braziller, 1974), 112.
10. Nick Bostrom, "Transhumanist Values," in *Ethical Issues for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Frederick Adams (Philosophical Documentation Center Press, 2005), 3–14.
11. Not everyone uses the term *posthuman* as H+ does. See Francesca Ferrando, "Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Antihumanism, Metahumanism, and New Materialisms," *Existenz* 8, no. 2 (Fall 2013): 32. For Ferrando posthumanism is understood in light of critical, cultural, and philosophical posthumanism in the geological time of the anthropocene. As the anthropocene marks the extent of the impact of human activities on a planetary level, the posthuman focuses on de-centering the human from the primary focus of the discourse. In tune with antihumanism, posthumanism stresses the urgency for humans to become aware of pertaining to an ecosystem which, when damaged, negatively affects the human condition as well. Hefner is more likely to embrace this brand of posthumanism than the H+ brand.
12. World Transhumanist Association, *Transhumanist Declaration*, accessed October 7, 2015, http://humanityplus.org/philosophy/transhumanist-declaration/.
13. Natasha Vita-More, "History of Transhumanism," in *The Transhumanism Handbook*, ed. Newton Lee (Switzerland: Springer, 2019), 49–62.
14. Julian Huxley, "Transhumanism," in *New Bottles for New Wine*, ed. Julian Huxley (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957), 13–17.
15. Bostrom, Nick. "Dignity and Enhancement," in *Human Dignity and Bioethics*, ed. US President's Council on Bioethics (Washington, DC, 2008), 202, https://www.academia.edu/38307610/Human_dignity_and_bioethics?email_work_card=thumbnail-desktop.
16. Celia Deane-Drummond, *Christ and Evolution: Wonder and Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 285.

17. Carmen Fowler LaBerge, "Christian? Transhumanist? A Christian Primer for Engaging Transhumanism," in *The Transhumanism Handbook*, 774.

18. Gareth D. Jones, "A Christian Perspective on Human Enhancement," *Science and Christian Belief* 22, no. 2 (2010): 14.

19. Paul Tillich, "The World Situation," in *Main Works / Haptwerke*, vol. 2, ed. Paul Tillich (Berlin: DeGruyter Evangelisches Verlagswerk GmbH, 1989). 168.

20. Francis, *Encyclical Letter* Laudato Si' *of the Holy Father Francis on Care for Our Common Home* (2015), par. 113, http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html.

21. Simon Young, *Designer Evolution: A Transhumanist Manifesto* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2006), 19, 202.

22. Ibid, 207.

23. Stephen Jay Gould, *Full House* (New York: Three Rivers, 1996), 3.

24. David Ziegler, "In What Version of Evolution Do You Believe?" *Skeptical Inquirer* 41, no. 1 (2018): 42.

25. Ibid, 43.

26. Alfred Lord Tennyson, "In Memoriam A. H. H.," Poem (London, 1850), canto 56.

27. Paul VI, *Pastoral Consitution on the Church in the Modern World: Gaudium et Spes*, 1965, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.

28. The common good might provide the healing of the rift between nature and culture as Hefner prescribes. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's social statement on *Genetics Faith and Responsibility* exhorts, "Today, the meaning of *common good* or *good of all* must include the community of all living creatures. The meaning also should extend beyond the present to include consideration for the future of the web of life. The sphere of moral consideration is no longer limited to human beings alone." *Genetics, Faith, and Responsibility*, ELCA, 2011, https://download.elca.org/ELCA%20Resource%20Repository/GeneticsSS.pdf?_ga=2.9400565.1750797784.1623970272-94204558.1623970272.

29. Herman E. Daly, and John Cobb, Jr., *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community* (Boston: Beacon, 1989), 164.

30. Jacquineau Azetsop, "The Return to the Common Good as a Challenge to the Eclipse of the Public: Five Uses of the Common Good," in *Public Theology and the Global Common Good: The Contribution of David Hollenbach*, eds. Kevin Ahern et al. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2016), 112.

31. Ted Peters, *God—The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a New Era*, 3rd edition (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 753–54.

32. Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate*, 2009, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.