

INTEGRATING THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS  
WITH A CATHOLIC UNDERSTANDING  
OF MAN AND SOCIETY

---

---

**G. Alexander Ross**  
**Institute for the Psychological Sciences and**  
**Indian River Community College**

*Like much of modern scholarship, the study of social problems today is usually conducted in isolation from the truths of faith. Yet Catholics understand that the truths of science and the truths of faith are not in opposition but in harmony. This paper uses the Catholic concept of transcendent human dignity to integrate the scientific analysis of social problems with the Church's understanding of man. This integral approach places the social scientist on a firm footing from which to identify the principal social problems of our day and to clarify the appropriate solutions, which would guard the dignity of the human person and facilitate his true flourishing.*

One of the central concerns of the Church in modern times is the isolation of the Gospel from human life. In recent years, powerful groups within our political, economic, and educational institutions have sought to force the practice of faith into more limited and private spheres, banishing faith-based moral concerns and arguments from the public realm.<sup>1</sup> These recent attempts are part of an effort over the past two centuries to portray matters of faith as being appropriate only to an earlier, more superstitious age and unsuited to a society based on reason and science.

The division between faith and reason is the topic of the 1998 Encyclical of John Paul II entitled *Fides et Ratio*. In this important work, the Holy Father describes the increasing dominance of a flawed perspective in philosophy and the sciences that ignores or rejects the integral relationship between faith and reason. The Church's perennial teaching, as articulated especially by St. Thomas Aquinas, is that faith and reason, although different forms of knowledge, are in harmony with one another. "Both the light of reason and the light of faith come from God, he argued; hence, there can be no contradiction between them."<sup>2</sup>

Especially in fields that have achieved impressive scientific and technical progress, attempts to supply some moral guidance to that progress frequently give rise to complaints of inappropriate meddling in

the affairs of science. His Holiness explains, “In the field of scientific research, a positivistic mentality took hold which not only abandoned the Christian vision of the world, but more especially rejected every appeal to a metaphysical or moral vision. It follows that certain scientists, lacking any ethical point of reference, are in danger of putting at the center of their concerns something other than the human person and the entirety of the person’s life.”<sup>3</sup> Catholic social scientists are well aware that the Holy Father’s comments are as applicable to the social as to the natural sciences.

In a recent article, Lisa Lickona outlines the application of this encyclical to Catholic social science, emphasizing the advantage that the social scientist whose faith serves as a foundation for his work has over those who deny the applicability of the truths of the Gospel to scientific efforts. “These challenges for the social scientist must be met with a scientific rigor that is infused with the wisdom that the world does not know; a sensibility that comes from a knowledge of who man is, what he is made for and what it is that really makes him happy.”<sup>4</sup>

Lickona’s suggestion can be seen as a Catholic solution to the problem addressed in the work of Pitirim Sorokin. Sorokin believed that because of its positivistic orientation, modern social science had lost its connection to the important contributions that faith makes to an accurate understanding of the social world. His response was to develop an orientation he called “integralism,” a term that has been adopted today by those who wish to integrate the empirical methods of social science with the truths of faith and sound philosophical reasoning.<sup>5</sup>

### ***Ambiguity in the Definition of Social Problems***

Nowhere in sociology is the challenge to integrate the truths of faith with rigorous scientific inquiry more necessary than in the analysis of social problems. The field of social problems is devoted to the application of sociological knowledge to the significant problems that plague modern society. Yet, depending on the values espoused and philosophical orientation adopted, the results of the analysis of social problems can vary dramatically.

Much of this variance is due to what would appear to be a simple problem: the definition of social problems. At a minimum, a social problem refers to some failure in the social fabric or social practice. Yet to speak meaningfully of failure requires one to specify some standard or ideal that has not been met. Many of the ideals of a society may appear to be shared by all. But, although generalized expressions of social standards may elicit approval from many quarters,

closer examination often uncovers considerable disagreement about their precise meaning. A surface appearance of value consensus hides what Fr. Thomas Berg describes as “incommensurable conceptions of the good.”<sup>6</sup>

For example, many people will mention compassion as a valuable human trait. Yet, when questioned in more depth, people will quarrel over what constitutes this trait. Does compassion for the other require that we accept whatever behavior the other chooses? Or does it oblige us to discourage behavior that we judge to be harmful to the other? More specifically, some would say that to show compassion to homosexuals requires that we be indifferent to the morality of homosexual relationships, shunning the belief that heterosexuality is the more natural pattern even if it is statistically the more common. Others will reason that to be silent about the wrong of homosexuality merely encourages those who practice it to continue in behavior that is a grave danger to themselves and others. Does it show compassion to remain silent when a friend is engaged in self-destructive behavior?<sup>7</sup>

With such differences in values and social goals, which (or whose) values will be specified to define the social problems of a given society? Moral relativism, dominating modern thought, denies ultimate authority to any particular voice, making the selection of one group above another arbitrary. With no ultimate standard to judge social practices, one group’s claim is no more valid than another.<sup>8</sup> Social policy is therefore guided not by unchanging moral principles but by evolving preferences expressed by parliamentary majorities or the courts.<sup>9</sup>

Immersed in this relativism, sociologists usually opt to define social problems subjectively. That is, a social problem is a social condition which people perceive to be a social problem. For example, Coleman and Cressey state that a social problem requires that “a significant number of people believe that a certain condition is in fact a problem.”<sup>10</sup> Henslin defines a social problem as “an aspect of society that a significant number of people are concerned about and would like changed.”<sup>11</sup> Mooney, Knox, and Schacht suggest that a social problem is “a social condition that a segment of society views as harmful to members of society and in need of remedy.”<sup>12</sup>

The emphasis we sociologists place on the process by which social groups construct meaning can dispose us to philosophical relativism and subjectivism. We can succumb to the fallacy that because man can create meaning, the only meaning is that which is created by man. Yet when we do this we give up much of our credibility as social critics. For, if the reliance on any particular group’s standard is

arbitrary because there is no transcendent or extra-social authority, on what grounds can we evaluate the social practices of others? We may confront what to us is a particularly heinous social practice. But if the society fails to recognize the injustice of the practice, what basis have we for criticism? Sociologists frequently assert the right to offer counter-cultural critiques of society. If they espouse relativism, they lose their claim to be authoritative critics.

### ***Toward a Catholic Definition of Social Problems***

An approach that integrates the truths of the Catholic faith with a scientific perspective on social problems does not suffer from the weaknesses of relativism and arbitrary standards. The Church holds that there exists an objective moral order to guide human behavior.<sup>13</sup> We need not, in other words, be at the mercy of the competing value claims of a relativistic society. The truths of the faith, as articulated in Church doctrine, are a source of knowledge about the nature of man and society which, by transcending the changeable fashions of secular society, furnish an objective basis for the identification of social problems.

The concept that appears most suited as an integralist basis for the identification of social problems is human dignity as understood especially in the Church's social doctrine. The transcendent dignity of man is a theme of many important documents of the Church. The term is mentioned some fifty times in *Gaudium et Spes*,<sup>14</sup> the Vatican II constitution on the Church in the modern world. It is also one of the most frequent themes in the many writings of John Paul II.<sup>15</sup>

Yet the term "dignity" carries for some a meaning wholly at odds with Catholic thought.<sup>16</sup> It has, for instance, been appropriated into the names of organizations committed to assisted suicide or the endorsement of homosexuality. This notion of dignity is confused with radical individual autonomy and antinomianism. "Dignity" in this non-Catholic sense views man as his own author and creator, subject to no law above himself and his own desires. In contrast, Catholic thought has always understood human dignity as the unmerited gift of God to man. It is radically opposed to the autonomous individualism that is conspicuous as a value in modern society.

Human dignity within Catholic teaching is based on the fact that, although all of creation was formed by God and is good, only man was created in His image and likeness.<sup>17</sup> God reserved this special status for man alone. And in the Incarnation of His Divine Son, God raised man's dignity to even more sublime heights. As St. Peter Chrysologus wrote so eloquently: "The hand that assumed clay to make

our flesh deigned to assume a body for our salvation. That the Creator is in His creature and God is in the flesh brings dignity to man without dishonor to Him who made him.”<sup>18</sup>

That the source of human dignity is God also clarifies the purpose and end of man. As John Paul II has described it, the fulfillment of the human person is the “gift of self,” an act which reflects the very nature of God.<sup>19</sup> The acknowledgment that man finds his fulfillment and greatest flourishing only in giving himself to others is in stark contrast to the radical individualism so jealously guarded by the modern secularist who sees dignity only as a demand for absolute autonomy.

The Catholic concept of transcendent human dignity provides us with the core around which to build a new definition of social problems, one not subject to the relativistic and subjectivist tendencies so prevalent in our culture. Specifically, let me suggest the following definition: *A social problem is a widespread social condition that threatens or obscures the transcendent dignity of the human person.*

The typical subjectivist definition of social problems states that a social condition is a social problem when society defines it as such. Such a circular, inward-focused conception allows no room for the truths of faith, for it is bound only to changing personal or social preferences. In contrast, our definition embeds us firmly in the metaphysical realities revealed in Catholic tradition and doctrine. By referencing the God-given dignity of the human person in our definition, we establish as an integral basis for our analysis a Catholic understanding of the nature and purpose of man.

### ***A Comparison to Current Approaches***

Redefining social problems within an integral Catholic perspective gives results that differ markedly from much of the current literature in the field. This difference can be illustrated by examining how current textbooks in social problems approach a few of the most significant social problems faced in modern society. Such an examination should clarify the value of integrating the truths of faith with a scientific analysis of society’s most serious problems.<sup>20</sup>

### ***Issues of Human Sexuality***

One major focus in social problems courses today is human sexuality. An integral Catholic approach, of course, would find nothing wrong with a focus on this important aspect of human life. Indeed, many of the most serious social problems that threaten the transcendent dignity of the human person (e.g., pornography, prostitution, abortion,

sexual infidelity and promiscuity) are sexual in nature. However, an orientation adopted frequently in today's social problems texts is to treat virtually any sexual activity, provided it is consensual, as a morally neutral act.

This stance has some important consequences for the presentation of social problems related to sexuality. For instance, the treatment of prostitution in some textbooks concentrates on the rights of so-called "sex workers" rather than on the degradation and exploitation of women caught in lives of prostitution. The sole mention of pornography in the text by Mooney, Knox, and Schacht is in a brief presentation of "victimless" crimes such as gambling and illegal prostitution.<sup>21</sup> The discussion of pornography in Diane Kendall's text on social problems debates in considerable length whether the research literature demonstrates that pornography leads people to commit sexual violence, but fails to note the inherently exploitative nature of a business which is built on the degradation of the human person.<sup>22</sup> In contrast to these writers, positing the transcendent dignity of the human person as the central component of the definition of social problems immediately clarifies the seriousness of both prostitution and pornography as social problems.

Treating all sexual behavior as morally neutral also has important consequences for discussions of homosexuality. A common approach to homosexual behavior found in many textbooks is to assume that it is a mere sexual preference that is opposed by most of society not "from rational consideration of the evidence, but from a perceived threat to a lifestyle based on deeply held cultural norms and values."<sup>23</sup> Opposition to homosexuality, typically labeled "homophobia," is analyzed with the same concepts and theoretical approaches that sociologists use to explain patterns of discrimination and prejudice aimed at racial and ethnic groups. Such an approach is fundamentally at odds with the Catholic understanding that homosexuality is "intrinsically disordered" and damaging to those who practice it.<sup>24</sup> The Church explicitly condemns discrimination against homosexuals, calling us to treat them with respect and compassion. But she does not pretend that their behavior is benign.

Another social problem related to human sexuality is abortion. From a Catholic perspective, this is one of the gravest social problems in American society, for by its nature it is a great offense against the transcendent dignity of mother, child, and the human family. It is estimated that each year in the United States alone, 1.3 million unborn children are intentionally killed through abortion.<sup>25</sup> The loss of these innocent children is difficult to fathom, but the devastation wrought by

legalized abortion has many other victims as well. The serious physical and psychological consequences for the aborting mother are well documented in the growing literature on post-abortive women.<sup>26</sup> Even macrosociological issues such as population structure and cohort size are significantly disturbed by the frequency of abortion.<sup>27</sup> Yet, abortion receives only light treatment in most social problems textbooks. Even in these brief accounts, the choice of language and the focus adopted betray a strong bias in favor of upholding the legality of abortion. The most common phrases used to characterize the social issue of abortion in the textbooks that I have examined are “reproductive freedom” and “reproductive rights,” favorite phrases of the pro-abortion lobby because they place the issue in a context of personal autonomy and choice rather than moral responsibility. Absent from any of the presentations is an appreciation of the impact of abortion on the human dignity of the mother and her child.

Efforts to restrict abortion are nearly always viewed by the textbook authors as threats to individual freedom. Some authors even view the limited attempts to curtail abortion through legislation as inherently sexist. In their social problems text, Feagin and Feagin claim that “most anti-abortion laws and regulations...reveal a type of institutionalized sexism. In general, recent anti-abortion legislation reinforces the subordinate position of women in U.S. society, a subordination that means that women do not have full control over their own bodies.”<sup>28</sup>

The battle over abortion is a conflict that should be of great interest to social scientists. Like the civil rights movement, the pro-life movement is comprised of persons who appeal to timeless principles in order to call us back from a great wrong we are doing to our fellow man. Yet in documenting this conflict, most texts concentrate on reports of violence against abortionists and fail even to mention the many occasions in which police and government authorities have brutally treated pro-lifers. How these sociologists would complain if they were to read a history of the civil rights struggle that omitted the acts by legal authorities in support of racist policies! They are so enthralled with the abortion industry’s demand for complete individual autonomy that they are blinded to a great social drama in their midst.

### ***Gender Roles***

What today are commonly called “gender issues” also represent a key element of the social problems course. Considered under the label of gender are problems of violence and oppression directed against women, topics that are important within a Catholic as

well as a secular perspective on social problems. But a common assumption in the sociological literature on gender is that most of the observed dissimilarity between men and women is due to the culturally imposed differences in the socialization of individuals of the two sexes. The implication in the literature is that the goal of equality requires the reduction or elimination of these differences.

Sociology tends to stress the socially constructed nature of reality, but this emphasis can lead one to deny the natural differences between the sexes. For example, many sociologists will interpret virtually any difference in representation of the sexes in occupational or vocational groups as evidence of sexual discrimination. If one offers the alternative suggestion that women may be less likely to pursue certain careers because their natural preferences lie elsewhere, the response is that the preferences themselves are socially constructed and determined by institutionalized patterns of discrimination.<sup>29</sup>

Current textbooks sometimes cite research that documents the natural differences between men and women, but the findings tend to be discounted or minimized by the textbook authors. Neubeck and Neubeck, for example, dismiss as “ideology” the belief that “basic biological and psychological differences exist between the sexes.”<sup>30</sup> Other authors are more balanced in their discussion of natural sex differences, but they take great pains to de-emphasize their importance.<sup>31</sup> The orientation of these textbooks may be motivated by a desire to discourage the domination of one sex by another; however, such intentions do not justify the neglect of valid scientific findings.<sup>32</sup>

The Church teaches that sexuality is a fundamental component of the human person, “a reality deeply inscribed in man and woman,” which characterizes the human person “not only on the physical level, but also on the psychological and spiritual, making its mark on each of their expressions.”<sup>33</sup> It is not a mere biological fact that can be rectified by socialization in androgyny. The natural differences between man and woman may be exploited for domination or other selfish and sinful motives. But they are not in themselves a threat to the dignity of the human person. For they are the basis for the realization of the “physical, psychological, and ontological complementarity” present in marital relationships of the greatest harmony and fruitfulness.

### ***The Modern Family***

One final topic that can be examined to clarify the consequence of adopting a Catholic approach to social problems is the modern family. An integral Catholic perspective sees the family as the central social institution, “the foundation of society.”<sup>34</sup> Yet most social

problems textbooks treat the family as merely one among many social institutions. Furthermore, its breakdown is generally analyzed as merely a change in form. That is, the great increase in single-parent families, cohabitation, and alternative living arrangements (such as same-sex couples) is presented in many textbooks as a mere expansion of the concept of family rather than an indication of a serious threat to its well-being. Coleman and Cressey, for example, maintain that the changes experienced by the family suggest that we redefine it to mean “any group of people that defines itself as a family.”<sup>35</sup>

This mutable notion of family is a handicap to efforts to analyze accurately the problems that plague modern societies. Much of the research on the family over the past decade has addressed the consequences of family breakdown for numerous other social problems, including crime, suicide, poverty, and mental and physical health.<sup>36</sup> To treat family breakdown as a mere change in form tempts us to overlook the serious social consequences of these changes to the family. A Catholic integralist perspective, on the other hand, understands the importance of stable family structure for the health of society. Church teaching clearly identifies the family institution as the bulwark of society.<sup>37</sup> This understanding gives to Catholic integralism a special sensitivity to the many social problems that arise from the deterioration of the modern family. As such, it is a more useful tool to the social scientist who is interested in using research to improve the lives of his fellow man.

### ***A Challenge to the Field of Sociology***

A Catholic integralist perspective is a challenge to the sorts of analysis encountered in secular social problems courses and textbooks. The values espoused by most sociologists tend to conform to those of their mostly liberal academic colleagues. They are, for example, overwhelmingly in favor of abortion and unrestricted consensual sexual expression. They are uncomfortable with the traditional family and embarrassed at the natural differences between men and women. Many of these values they hold in common with other members of America’s contemporary intellectual and media elite.<sup>38</sup>

Sociologists often pride themselves on offering a critical view of society.<sup>39</sup> The irony, however, is that the value assumptions espoused by modern sociologists often hide from them some of the most critical wrongs in society. Their reflexive support of “reproductive rights” blinds them to the evidence of great harm to both mother and child from abortion. Their discomfort with the traditional family obscures from them the impact its breakdown has had on the poor and most vulnerable

in our society. Their embrace of radical individualism fails to acknowledge that the human person finds his greatest happiness in relationship with others.

In contrast, an integral Catholic approach to social problems is founded upon revealed truths which transcend our social and historical context. Not subject to the variety of subjective value claims common in current social thought, an integral approach to social problems can offer a more authoritative, consistent portrayal of the social conditions that threaten human dignity. And because it is based on the Church's clear understanding of the nature and purpose of man, it can speak more effectively for the true good of man in society, guarding the dignity of the human person and facilitating his true flourishing.

### Notes

1. Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America*. 2nd Edition. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans, 1986).

2. Summa contra Gentiles, I, 7, cited in John Paul II, *Fides et Ratio*, September 14, 1998, para. 43.

3. *Fides et Ratio*, para. 46, 88.

4. Lisa Lickona, "The Christocentrism of Pope John Paul II: Foundation for a `Catholic Integralism.'" *The Catholic Social Science Review* VIII (2003): 35.

5. See, for example, the symposium on "Integralism, Catholicism, and Social Science." *The Catholic Social Science Review* (VIII) 2003: 9 - 88.

6. Thomas Berg, LC, "The Value-Language Phenomenon and the Imminent Tasks of Catholic Moral Philosophy." Paper presented to the 11th Annual Society of *Catholic Social Scientists* National Meeting, October 25, 2003, Steubenville, Ohio.

7. In addition to compassion, Fr. Berg mentions a variety of "family values" which would gain only superficial agreement among Americans: mutual acceptance, marital commitment, self-esteem, maturity, responsibility. *Ibid*.

8. Joel Best argues that our increasingly fragmented media of communication have produced a proliferation of social-problem claims, many of which are addressed to isolated, homogeneous audiences who seldom speak with one another. Joel Best, "Social progress and social problems: Toward a sociology of gloom." *The Sociological Quarterly* 42(1: 2001): 6-7.

9. *Fides et Ratio*, para. 89.

10. James William Coleman and Donald R. Cressey, *Social Problems*. 7th Edition. (New York: Longman, 1999), 3.

11. James M. Henslin, 2000. *Social Problems*. 5th Edition. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000), 3

12. Linda A. Mooney, David Knox, and Caroline Schacht, *Understanding Social Problems*, 2nd Edition. (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 2000), 3.

13. John Paul II, *Veritatis Splendor*, August 6, 1993, para. 53.

14. Vatican Council II. *Gaudium et Spes: Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*. Promulgated by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI on December 7, 1965.

15. A computer search of "dignity" in the writings of John Paul II contained on the Vatican web site amassed many hundreds of hits.

16. William P. Cheshire, "Toward a Common Language on Human Dignity." *Ethics and Medicine* 18:2 (Summer 2002).

17. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2nd Edition (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997), paragraph 1700.

18. *The Liturgy of the Hours according to the Roman Rite*, vol. III, (New York: The Catholic Book Publishing Company, 1975), p. 1563. The original citation provided in the *Liturgy of the Hours* is "Sermo 148: PL 52, 596-598."

19. See, for example, John Paul II, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, 15 August 1988, para. 7; *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, 25 March 1992, para. 23; *Evangelium vitae*, 25 March 1995, para. 19; *Centesimus annus*, 1 May

1991, para. 4. In these writings, the Holy Father refers often to paragraph 24 of *Gaudium et Spes*; specifically, the following passage: “This likeness reveals that man, who is the only creature on earth which God willed for itself, cannot fully find himself except through a sincere gift of himself.”

20. Much of the material below is based on a content analysis of the ten highest-selling social problems textbooks reported more fully in G. Alexander Ross, “*Gaudium et Spes* as a Foundation for Teaching the Social Problems Course,” presented to the 2001 Annual National Meeting-Conference of the *Society of Catholic Social Scientists*, Ave Maria School of Law, Ann Arbor, Michigan, October 26, 2001.

21. Mooney, Knox, and Schacht, *Understanding Social Problems*, 96.

22. Diana Kendall, *Social Problems in a Diverse Society*. 2nd edition. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2001). In opposition to this common secular perspective, see *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2354.

23. Thomas Sullivan, *Introduction to Social Problems*. 6th edition. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2003), 277.

24. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, para. 2357.

25. Randall K. O’Bannon, “Abortion Totals, Rates, Ratios Drop to Lowest Levels in Decades,” *National Right to Life News*, February, 2003. <http://www.nrlc.org/news/2003/NRL02/randy.html>

26. Elizabeth Ring-Cassidy and Ian Gentles, *Women’s Health after Abortion* (Toronto, Ontario: deVeber Institute for Bioethics and Social Research, 2002).

27. The loss of such a significant portion of its youngest members robs a society of many of its future leaders and innovators. In some societies, abortion is practiced as a means to select the sex of the child. In societies with a cultural preference for males, sex-selective abortion leads eventually to large cohorts of males who, having little prospect of finding a spouse, are a source of much societal unrest.

28. Joe R. Feagin and Clairece Booher Feagin, *Social Problems: A Critical Power-Conflict Perspective*, 5th edition. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1997), p. 255.

29. Daniel J. Curran and Claire M. Renzetti, *Social Problems: Society in Crisis*, 5th Edition. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000), 206.
30. Kenneth J. Neubeck and Mary Alice Neubeck, *Social Problems: A Critical Approach*. 4th Edition. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1997), 307.
31. D. Stanley Eitzen and Maxine Baca Zinn, *Social Problems*. 8th Edition. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000), 247; Vincent N. Parrillo, John Stimson, and Ardyth Stimson, *Contemporary Social Problems*. 4th Edition. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999), 225-227.
32. See, for example, Steven E. Rhoads, *Taking Sex Differences Seriously* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004); and Paul McHugh, "Surgical Sex," *First Things*, No. 147 (November 2004): 34-38.
33. *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, "Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Collaboration of Men and Women in the Church and in the World." May 31, 2004, para. 8.
34. *Gaudium et Spes*, para. 52.
35. Coleman and Cressey, *Social Problems*, 32.
36. See, for example, Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage* (NY: Doubleday, 2000); Steven Nock, *Marriage in Men's Lives* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1998); and David Popenoe, *Life Without Father: Compelling New Evidence That Fatherhood and Marriage Are Indispensable for the Good of Children and Society* (NY: The Free Press, 1996). A brief summary of the research is provided in *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-One Conclusions from the Social Sciences* (New York, NY: Institute for American Values, 2002).
37. See, for example, *Gaudium et Spes*, *Lumen Gentium*, and *Familiaris Consortio*.
38. Robert Lichter, Stanley Rothman, and Linda Lichter. *The Media Elite*. (New York: Hastings House, 1990).
39. For example, Neubeck and Neubeck make this claim an explicit element of their approach to social problems. Neubeck and Neubeck, *Social Problems*, 9-11.

