FINDING WISDOM FOR THE CRISIS WE FACE

St. Paul’s letter to Philemon is the shortest epistle and the only truly personal letter in the Christian scriptures addressed from one individual to another. Yet its 335 words offer us insight into the gospel and food for thought regarding the troubling and complex issues we face as individuals, as Church and society. It’s worth our attention and reflection. While the details of the situation and characters involved in Paul’s letter to Philemon are sketchy, there are some things we can ascertain. Philemon was obviously a person of means since he had slaves and since his home was large enough to provide a place where the Christians could meet for prayer and fellowship. Paul mentions the “Church that meets at your home.” Onesimus, whose name means “useful” – an appropriately common name for slaves in that time – ran away from his master, perhaps having stolen something from him, since Paul offers to pay for any losses Philemon incurred because of the slave.

Paul meets this runaway slave; they may have been cellmates in prison and Onesimus helped Paul in some way. Paul calls him “my child” which could indicate that Paul baptized the slave. Suddenly a new relationship is established with this slave; now he is a brother in Christ, infused with the Holy Spirit, no longer just a piece of property, but a child of God in the full stature of Christ. So now Paul is in a moral quandary. What does he do? Legally, Onesimus had no rights according to Roman law. His whole existence depended upon his owner. The Roman Empire at the time had some 60 million slaves and the laws concerning them were very strict. Had he been caught, Onesimus may have lived the rest of his days with an “F” branded on his forehead, for fugitivus – fugitive.

Locked in prison, Paul can hardly take on the entire institution of slavery which was an accepted practice and norm in the first century, and he had to recognize Philemon’s legal rights as a slave owner. Paul didn’t have the authority to command the man to take the slave back and forgive him. Paul’s dilemma forced him to operate in a different manner; he had to change the heart of one person since he couldn’t change the laws governing all people. He urges his fellow Christian to change his heart and his attitude. Paul sought to transform their relationship from one of ownership to partnership, from legality to love.

The tone of Paul’s letter is a tender invitation to compassion and understanding. There is nothing heavy-handed in his use of authority. He is fully respectful of Philemon’s rights and responsibilities. He appeals to him on a different level – from the mind and heart of Christ, using gentle persuasion rather than the heavy hand of one who throws his weight and power around. Receive him back, Paul urges his fellow Christian, as more than a slave, but as a brother in the flesh, and now, a brother in the Lord.
As I reflect on Paul’s dilemma, I can’t help but think about the moral quandaries facing us in our world today – the struggle to understand the many nuances of human sexual development and the issue of transgender rights; the corroding of race relationships in our cities, as far away as Baltimore, and as close as Oakland. The tensions between police and black citizens seem only to increase with each new shooting. There are a socially catastrophic number of black men behind bars in the United States and the reform of our prison system is slow in offering hope for a change. As a nation we seem impervious to the fact that more than ten thousand die by gun violence each year. In neighboring Canada that number is less than two hundred, and in Japan, less than fifty. How do we balance a two hundred year-old Bill of Rights amendment to “keep and bear arms” with a modern-day free-for-all of easy access to semi-automatic weapons, a reality never envisioned by the founding fathers?
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has the duty to receive so many immigrants that its social and economic life are jeopardized. The third principle of Catholic social teaching on immigration is where the scriptures and our faith are brought to bear: **A country must regulate its borders with justice and mercy.** A country’s regulation of borders and control of immigration must be governed by concern for all people and by mercy and justice. A nation may not simply decide that it wants to provide for its own people and no others. A sincere commitment to the needs of all must prevail. In our modern world where communication and travel are much easier, the burden of emergencies can’t be placed solely on nations immediately adjacent to the crises. Justice dictates that the world community contribute resources toward shelter, food, medical services, and basic welfare. These three Catholic social principles don’t resolve the present debate in our country, but they give us guidance in forming our own conscience as we assess current turmoil and political rhetoric.

Paul’s short letter to his fellow Christian offers us – as a society and as individuals – a different way to respond. One author proposed a distinction that I find helpful. He speaks about the “Dominant Narrative,” that is, the standard way of doing things, versus an “Alternative Narrative,” or a new way of interacting and being. In Paul and Philemon’s moral dilemma, the “dominant narrative” or standard way of operating would have seen compassionate treatment of a slave as unthinkable. There could only have been harsh repercussions for the runaway slave. But the fact that a slave might be converted to the Lord Jesus really posed a great challenge to early Christianity. What should be done with such a slave, if he transgressed? Can he still be punished severely, cursed and discriminated against? This is the way that needed to be challenged.

Using an “alternative narrative,” Paul took the initiative by proposing a more equal society, where slave and master were now brothers in the Lord. Paul wanted Philemon to make that change freely, not out of obligation, but from his heart, knowing it was the right thing to do. The grace lies in the fact that the chains of bondage from an unjust system had to be shaken off and a new, more lenient response created.

As Catholic Christians, no matter what our political persuasion, we follow the path marked out for us by Jesus. It has never been an easy path. The challenge of today’s gospel tells us to make our priorities that of Jesus who resisted the “dominant narrative” of his time and culture, even though it led to the Cross -- the cross which he invites us to pick up and carry.

We don’t know how Philemon responded to Paul and the moral crisis he faced over the slave who became his friend; we can only hope that things turned out well for them both. We know from our own history that it took centuries before slavery was recognized as immoral. The “dominant narrative” was difficult to topple. Moral development and social consciousness doesn’t happen at once, but only by changing one heart at a time. In our church and in our world, in our homes and in our communities, it’s a temptation to take the easy way out, avoiding dialogue when it comes to difficult issues, but Paul’s manner -- as we witness in this brief but poignant epistle -- his care, and the love he showed for all people, regardless of their status, continues to recommend his example to our leaders and to all of us. May the wisdom of God break upon us, giving us discernment and God’s Holy Spirit from on high, making our path straight and showing us road to peace.
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