

Solidarity with the Poor

Gregory Baum

A ROMAN CATHOLIC IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT

The idea of development that emerged in the 1950s envisaged the rescue of poor people from their misery through the industrialization of their societies. The hope was that the economic system that produced the wealth of Western nations could be exported to the developing countries and eventually make them wealthy too. W.W. Rostow (1960) elaborated this idea in detail in his celebrated work, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. This book offered a vision and a plan for overcoming poverty in the world, as an alternative superior to the Marxist enterprise. Rostow, director of Policy and Planning in the US State Department during the Kennedy administration, is said to have inspired President J.F. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. The intention of this program was to promote the modernization of Latin America by supporting industrial development and fostering an entrepreneurial culture of self-reliance and competitiveness.

To render a full account of how the Christian churches have viewed the idea of development would demand an entire book. Both the Roman Catholic Church and the Geneva-based World Council of Churches have produced significant, critical literature on the topic of development. What I wish to do in this paper is much more modest. In this section, I draw on a number of papal documents to provide a summary of a Roman Catholic idea of development; in the second section, I show that in recent years the World Bank has come to regard religion as a possible

factor in the promotion of economic development; and in the final section, I argue that the social and economic sciences are never entirely value free and that the researcher's political vision and attitude toward religion are likely to influence her or his conclusions.

CRITICS OF THE IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT

At first, the Christian churches were ill at ease with the new idea of development. They had heard the protests of Christian and non-Christian groups in the poorer parts of the world, denouncing the aggressive modernization of their regions. I will mention but two of their objections. One is from Latin American liberation theology. The theologians of this school, in dialogue with political economists, recognized that the industrialization of the South by Northern capital created patterns of dependency that prevented the countries of the South from creating their own future in accordance with their own culture. If industrialization was supported by Northern capital, they argued, it would be guided by the North; it would produce goods for export to sell at high prices on the world market, not goods needed by the local population; it would use sophisticated technologies, not those appropriate to the skills of the people; it would exploit the simple workers, paying them in accordance with the law of supply and demand. More than that, these Christians opposed the globalization of Western culture, with its competitive spirit, ideals of personal autonomy, unrelenting work ethic, and impatience with celebration and contemplation. Liberation theologians replaced the notion of "development" (*desarrollismo*) with the concept of "liberation" (Gutierrez 1973). They advocated the creation of a regional, low-scale economy, based to a large extent on local resources, relying mainly on local skills, and serving, for the most part, the needs of the local population. Is there still room in today's world, they asked, for alternatives to Western industrial culture?

Liberation theology made use of dependency theory to interpret the situation of the continents at the periphery of the global capitalist system. To many observers this appeared to be an infiltration of Catholic theology by Marxist ideas. Not so to Canadian observers. By the 1930s, the Canadian liberal economist Harold Innis had already analyzed the evolution of Canadian society in terms of the exploitative dynamics between the "metropolis" and the "hinterland" (Drache 1995).

The arguments of liberation theology against Western-style development are mainly economic and cultural. Yet, some communities have also had specifically religious reasons to protest the globalization of capitalist culture. In Canada, we are keenly aware of this as First Nations defend themselves against private developers and government-sponsored development projects by affirming the sacredness of their understanding of the land and their relationship to it. They claim that, in the first place, natural resources are not commodities, means of

creating wealth, or even objects of barter to enrich First Nation communities; natural resources, they insist, sustain a specific lifestyle, support a local community, and form part of a living entity. For these people, land is not real estate to be bought and sold: it is something sacred. They venerate it as something that has given them life and continues to support and protect them. The land claims of First Nations are not based on a Western liberal idea of property: they demand the power to protect their land from the invasion of developers and preserve it to ensure the continuance of their lifestyle. Yet, they are quite willing to share this land with people from the dominant population, as long as these people have the same reverence for the natural environment.

First Nation peoples, whether they are Christians or practice their traditional cosmic religion, regard with great suspicion the secular approach to life taken for granted in business, government, economics, and other social sciences. As all these endeavours systematically exclude the spiritual dimension of life, native peoples often regard them as a form of brainwashing designed to undermine their cultural identity.

This theme is developed at length by the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians, which was founded in Tanzania in 1976 and has been meeting since then at regular intervals. Here, Christian theologians from Africa and Asia offer critical reflections on the secularism of the industrialized world (Fabella 1997). They argue that political science, economics, and other social sciences and development projects based on the dominant model presuppose an anthropology — a vision of humankind — that severs the human being from the realm of the Spirit and contradicts the understanding of human life in African and Asian cultures. Some of these theologians are even critical of Latin American liberation theology: they feel that in relying primarily on an economic critique of the oppressive conditions of their continent, liberation theology has become excessively influenced by the secularism of the oppressors. The position of these theologians is that the Western economic empire makes people in Africa and Asia suffer “anthropological oppression,” that is, the people find themselves caught in institutions and overwhelmed by a set of symbols that rob them of their cultural identity and produce religious anguish. If this analysis is correct, it may not be surprising that in many parts of the world people turn to religious fundamentalism to protect themselves from the invasion of the Western empire and mind-set.

It is not surprising that after listening to these and other voices of protest, the Christian churches, especially the World Council of Churches, made “development” an important issue, calling for a response of faith. The major churches, Protestant and Roman Catholic, have denounced the purely economic understanding of development and the aggressive globalization of the free-market economy. In the present world, marked by soul-destroying and often death-dealing inequality, the Christian churches have expressed in public statements their

solidarity with the poor and their commitment to analyzing their own societies and the world system from the perspective of the marginalized and excluded. This expression of solidarity has produced a new understanding of the church's mission to serve God's reign in the world, to bear, in other words, the burden with the victims of society and promote love, justice, and peace.

The literature on the churches and development is extensive.¹ As I indicated above, I confine myself in this paper to a résumé of the Roman Catholic idea of development proposed in two papal encyclicals — Pope Paul VI's (1967) "Populorum Progressio" and Pope John Paul II's (1987) "Sollicitudo Rei Socialis" (see excerpts of both in Annex 1).

PAUL VI'S "POPULORUM PROGRESSIO"

In the "Populorum Progressio," Paul VI showed himself keenly aware of the protest against development mounted by Christian and non-Christian groups in the poorer parts of the world. As we shall see, he pays attention to their economic and religious arguments. As John Paul II (1987, p. 12) later noted, the "Populorum Progressio" emphasized "the ethical and cultural character of the problems connected with development" and the legitimacy of the Church's intervention in the field.

Paul VI supported the idea that the wealthy nations of the North must help the poorer nations of the South overcome the conditions that produce misery and suffering. International solidarity is an obligation of love and justice. Love of God and neighbour, which is the heart of biblical faith, implies a commitment to universal solidarity, beginning with the poor and oppressed. But even strict justice, required of Christians and non-Christians alike, demands that rich people and nations do their utmost to help poor people and nations gain access to the wealth of the Earth. Because God intended the goods of the Earth for the whole of humanity, the current scandalous maldistribution of wealth is an offence against justice and a grave sin. Paul VI praised the efforts of international organizations, particularly the United Nations, to try to restructure the economic order, support development projects in the poor countries, and demand the reduction of their public debt.

Paul VI supported the modern idea of development, but in an alternative mode. He appreciated, in particular, the humanistic development theory of Father Louis Lebreton (1959). The Pope took with utmost seriousness the economic and religious arguments against the dominant form of development. He gave an extended critique of liberal capitalism and its impacts on the poorer continents. He recognized that the plight of many Southern nations is, at least in part, the result of the precarious economic conditions created by the colonial powers, such as

¹ For a useful summary of this literature, see the *Dictionary of Mission* (Orbis Books 1997).

the concentration of agricultural production on a single crop, which left these nations vulnerable when they became independent (Paul VI 1967, s. 7). He also recognized the fear that “under the cloak of financial aid or technical assistance, there lurk certain manifestations of what has come to be called neo-colonialism, in the form of political pressures and economic suzerainty aimed at maintaining or acquiring complete dominance” (Paul VI 1967, s. 52). In more general terms, the Pope lamented the emergence of neoliberalism, that is, the globalization, in theory and in practice, of the self-regulating market system.

It is unfortunate that ... a system has been constructed which considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right that has no limits and carries no corresponding social obligations. This unchecked liberalism leads to dictatorship rightly denounced by Pius XI as producing “the international imperialism of money.”² One cannot condemn such abuses too strongly by solemnly recalling once again that the economy is at the service of man.

Paul VI (1967, s. 26)

Paul VI argued that “if certain landed estates impede the general prosperity because they are extensive, unused or poorly used, or because they bring hardship to peoples or are detrimental to the interests of the country, the common good sometimes demands their expropriation” (Paul VI 1967, s. 24). The Pope also considered it “unacceptable that citizens with abundant incomes from the resources and activity of their country should transfer a considerable part of this income abroad purely for their own advantage, without care for the manifest wrong they inflict on their country by doing this” (Paul VI 1967, s. 24). In certain situations, the Pope continued, injustice cries to heaven:

When whole populations destitute of necessities live in a state of dependence barring them from all initiative and responsibility, and all opportunity to advance culturally and share in social and political life, recourse to violence, as a means to right these wrongs to human dignity, is a grave temptation. ... We know, however, that a revolutionary uprising — save where there is manifest, long-standing tyranny which would do great damage to fundamental personal rights and dangerous harm to the common good of the country — produces new injustices, throws more elements out of balance and brings on new disasters.

Paul VI (1967, ss. 30 and 31)

² The reference is to paragraph 109 of Pope Pius XI’s “*Quadragesimo anno*” (O’Brien and Shannon 1992).

The Pope also asked us to question even the sacred cow of technology, in a passage particularly prescient of today's issues in development:

It is not sufficient to promote technology to render the world a more humane place in which to live. The mistakes of their predecessors should warn those on the road to development of the dangers to be avoided in this field. Tomorrow's technocracy can beget evils no less redoubtable than those due to the liberalism of yesterday. Economics and technology have no meaning except from man whom they should serve.

Paul VI (1967, s. 34)

The Pope favoured the reform of these circumstances and dynamics, calling for "bold transformations, innovations that go deep" (Paul VI 1967, s. 32) and encouraging individual involvement in the necessary reforms, each according to his or her resources and capacity for action.

Yet, after reflecting on the nature of the human vocation and the current condition of the world, he came to the conclusion that the industrialization of society had become a necessity. According to the Christian understanding of the human being, the Pope argued, the quest for self-fulfillment is not optional. People must work, and work hard, to humanize the conditions of their lives. One sentence of the encyclical has a particularly "Western" ring:

By persistent work and use of his intelligence man gradually wrests nature's secrets from her and finds better application of her riches. As his self-mastery increases, he develops a taste for research and discovery, an ability to take a calculated risk, boldness in enterprises, generosity in what he does and a sense of responsibility.

Paul VI (1967, s. 25)

In this passage, the Pope endorsed modernization. In an earlier passage, he supported industrialization. The evils of neoliberal capitalism, according to Paul VI, must not be attributed to industrialization as such. Industrialization can take place in a mixed economy in which market forces — regulated by government, contained by the labour movement, and tamed by a culture of solidarity — are made to serve the common good of society.

Paul VI also took seriously the religious arguments against development. He repudiated the generally accepted and purely materialistic idea of development current at the time and suggested, instead, what he called "integral" development, that is to say, a development that improves people's material conditions in the context of the fuller realization of humanity in social, political, cultural, and religious terms. Economic development must go hand in hand with the intensification of social solidarity, political freedom and responsibility, access to education, cultural continuity, and the search for greater religious depth:

If further development calls for work of more and more technicians, even more necessary is the deep thought and reflection of wise men

[and women] in search of a new humanism which will enable modern [persons] to find [themselves] anew by embracing the higher values of love and friendship, of prayer and contemplation.

Paul VI (1967, s. 20)

A purely secular culture has no access to this new humanism. According to Paul VI, it is only by calling on the hidden divine powers, graciously and undeservedly made available to us, that humans can make progress on the road of love, justice, and peace in today's complex global society. Christian faith, hope, and love are not meant as an entry into personal piety; rather, they constitute a world-transforming power that dwells in people's hearts and summons forth a transpersonal piety of solidarity³ and concern for others.

The "Populorum Progressio," it seems to me, is a document that supports development, but from a particular perspective. First, it affirms the need for worldwide industrialization; second, it endorses the idea that the North must assist the development of the South, albeit in an alternative fashion; and third, it understands the presence of God in human life as a means to rescue us from personal and social sin and to empower us for the sanctification of human history.

The passage of time has shown us that many questions remain. First, can the resources of the Earth afford industrialization on a global scale? Are all subsistence economies destined to disappear? Second, should the somewhat paternalistic idea that the rich North must help the poor South be replaced by a more cooperative model that recognizes the distinct contributions of both partners to mutually beneficial interaction? The 1971 World Synod of Bishops moved beyond Paul VI's analysis when it insisted that Southern nations receiving help from the North should remain the principal architects of their development and the guardians of their culture (SBSGA 1971). And third, is the humanistic theology of Paul VI, which I fully and joyfully endorse, shared by all people who believe in God? Members of other religions may have different ideas. Many Christians may interpret God as other than the redeemer and transformer of human history — that is, acting in the here and now — but look on God as the saviour rescuing them from history and offering them a refuge in the sacred temple (in the afterlife).

³ Pope John Paul II explained the term *solidarity* in "Sollicitudo Rei Socialis": "political leaders, and citizens of rich countries considered as individuals, especially if they are Christians, have the moral obligation, according to the degree of each one's responsibility, to *take into consideration*, in personal decisions and decisions of government, this relationship of universality, this interdependence which exists between their conduct and the poverty and underdevelopment of so many millions of people" (John Paul II 1987, s. 9, emphasis in the original).

JOHN PAUL II'S "SOLLICITUDO REI SOCIALIS"

To commemorate the 20th anniversary of the "Populorum Progressio," Pope John Paul II (1987) composed the encyclical "Sollicitudo Rei Socialis." He reexamined the question of development in the light of more recent events and, through theological reflections on present-day culture, demonstrated the need for a more nuanced concept of development. John Paul II agreed with the positions adopted by his predecessor in the "Populorum Progressio," namely, the need for industrialization, the deleterious material and cultural consequences of neoliberalism, and the need for international solidarity to promote the integral development of developing countries. John Paul II grieved with his predecessor over the misery, oppression, and marginalization imposed on masses of people in the South. He lamented that despite major political and economic efforts made in the North and the South, several indicators of basic needs revealed that the global situation was getting worse and that the social and economic inequalities between rich and poor countries and between rich and poor people in each country were increasing.

In this paper, I mention only one issue introduced by John Paul II's encyclical, namely, the cultural causes that, in conjunction with economic and political ones, are responsible for the increasing misery in the world. John Paul II mentioned in particular the economic understanding of human beings; and the belief, sustained and guided by science, in humanity's orientation toward limitless progress. The Pope reminded his readers that both liberals and Marxists share these two convictions, even if they interpret them differently. He pointed an accusing finger at contemporary Western culture and suggested that to account for the "underdevelopment" of the South, we have to examine the "superdevelopment" of the North; in other words, to understand the troubling situation of the poor, we must examine the trouble-creating situation of the rich:

A disconcerting conclusion about the most recent period should serve to enlighten us: side-by-side with the miseries of underdevelopment, themselves unacceptable, we find ourselves up against a form of *superdevelopment*, equally inadmissible, because like the former it is contrary to what is good and to true happiness. This superdevelopment, which consists in an excessive availability of every kind of material goods for the benefit of certain social groups, easily makes people slaves of "possession" and of immediate gratification, with no other horizon than the multiplication or continual replacement of the things already owned with others still better. This is the so-called civilization of "consumption" or "consumerism" . . .

John Paul II (1987, s. 28, emphasis in the original)

John Paul II analyzed "consumerism" from an ethical and theological perspective. He argued that the urgent task of helping developing countries overcome the conditions of hunger and misery demands a

moral conversion of wealthy countries and people everywhere. British sociologist John Hargreaves, in his book *Sport, Power and Culture*, offered a detailed analysis of consumerist, capitalist culture:

It is the way discourses and practices are articulated around features of a consumer culture, and the way this whole complex is orchestrated by certain key themes, that gives [contemporary capitalism] its coherence and power. The orchestrating themes of this culture are directed at selling a specifically modern, secular version of the good life. The dominant discourse/practice is of youth, beauty, romance, sexual attraction, energy, fitness, health, movement, excitement, adventure, freedom, exotica, luxury, enjoyment, entertainment, fun. Above all, it is a culture that esteems “self-expression.” A truly astonishing variety of goods and services — from washing powder, cars and foreign holidays, to cosmetics, fashion-wear, eating and aerobics — circulate on this basis: and concomitantly, major segments of social life are organized around this consumer culture.

Hargreaves (1975, p. 131)

According to John Paul II, the North needs to transform its culture, reject the consumerist mentality, and reenter the spiritual life.

The new idea that John Paul II added to Paul VI’s idea of development was that the goal of a world of justice and peace that meets the basic needs of all people is wholly unrealistic unless rich nations are willing to undergo a spiritual conversion. This is a bold assertion. Most of the development literature, including reports by the United Nations and the World Bank,⁴ deal with the situation of the poor. If the Pope was correct, then what we need is research on the rich: their power, ideals, culture, and worldview and the impact of their institutions on the world at large.⁵

A PERSONAL SPIRITUALITY

Before turning to the other questions I want to address, I will make a few remarks on where I stand as a Catholic theologian and what inspires me in my work of exploring the meaning and power of the Gospel in today’s world. One important influence on my life has been the concept of an “option for the poor,” first articulated in Latin American liberation theology and then endorsed in papal and episcopal documents. This option involves two commitments: to look at society from the

⁴ Most recently, the “World Development Report 2000/01: Poverty and Development” (to be published by the World Bank in September 2000).

⁵ Susan George, Associate Director of the Transnational Institute in Amsterdam and a well-known critic of economic globalization, said, “Let the poor study themselves. They already know what is wrong with their lives and if you truly want to help them, the best you can do is give them an idea of how the oppressors are working now and can be expected to work in the future” (George 1976, p. 289).

perspective of its victims; and to publicly manifest solidarity with their struggle for justice. Whereas the implications of this option are secular, its inner spirit is religious and grounded in the Bible. Its roots are particularly evident in the Exodus story (the rescue of the people of Israel from pharaonic oppression), the divine demand of social justice announced by the Hebrew prophets, and the provocative preaching of Jesus Christ that led to his condemnation as a troublemaker and to his death on the Roman cross.

The option for the poor has released a new inwardness in the Christian churches, marked by a certain spiritual anguish; that is, (1) we are deeply troubled by the suffering of others, especially those who are oppressed (the majority of humankind); (2) we grieve over the Church's past and present complicity with empire, colonialism, and other forms of domination; and (3) we willingly expose ourselves to the painful and unanswerable question of how we can reconcile our faith in a loving and omnipotent God with the evil we see in the world. This new spirituality, which has its own "dark night of the soul," is not devoid of hope and the energy to act. In situations of grave injustice, Christian love transforms itself into a yearning for justice and an impulse to act to lift the heavy burdens from the shoulders of the oppressed.

What amazes many Christians, like me, is that in our association with secular men and women committed to justice we often discover that they also have a "spirituality." By this I mean an inwardness of compassion, urgency, and hope that inspires them and guides their lives, even though they never talk about it. Perhaps they never talk about this motivation because traditional spiritual language appears otherworldly to them and they do not possess an alternative discourse to describe such feelings. I often feel closer to such inwardly blessed secular people than I do to those members of my own church who are insensitive to the divine summons for justice. I do not speak of God to these secular associates of mine. It does not occur to me to desire their "conversion"; on the contrary, I marvel at their spiritual experience of standing aloof from the dominant culture, feeling compassion for the unjustly treated, and being empowered to act on their behalf. I detect there a moment of transcendence. As a Catholic in the theological tradition of St Augustine (354–430 AD), I am greatly impressed — as he was — by the sinful dimension of society's dominant structures and, at the same time, the gratuity or "grace" of people's capacity to love, do justice, and make peace. Just as I respect their "secular spirituality" and have no intention to "convert" my friends, I hope that they also respect — in their social-scientific research and their support for public policies — the "otherness" in the mind-set of religious people.

THE WORLD BANK'S NEW INTEREST IN RELIGION

STRUCTURAL-ADJUSTMENT POLICIES IMPOSED BY THE WORLD BANK

After World War II, the Bretton Woods Agreement created the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to monitor the world economy, loan money to poor countries in urgent need, and prevent financial collapse on a universal scale. At the time, the British participants were unhappy that (on the insistence of the Americans) the Bretton Woods institutions would be guided by a liberal economic philosophy that conceived the free market as the engine moving history forward toward universal well-being. When, in the early 1980s, Prime Minister Thatcher of the United Kingdom and President Reagan of the United States implemented neoliberal economic policies in their countries, the Bretton Woods institutions were confirmed in their neoliberalism and pursued it with even greater vigour.

The neoliberal policies had devastating effects on many of the developing countries of the South. To promote free trade and the free reign of market forces, the World Bank and the IMF imposed the so-called structural-adjustment policies (SAPs) on these countries. These countries were to get no further loans unless they

- ☞ Opened their borders to free trade and the entry of foreign corporations;
- ☞ Deregulated their national economies;
- ☞ Privatized publicly owned enterprises;
- ☞ Reduced government spending by cutting social programs and laying off government employees; and
- ☞ Shifted production from the local market to the export market.

The SAPs increased hunger and misery in many countries. Instead of growing their own food and producing the goods they needed, people were obliged to produce for export and thus increase their dependency on the centre of world power. In the eyes of the World Bank and the IMF, this bitter medicine was needed to contain what they judged to be irresponsible governments, discipline what they thought to be lazy populations, and convince people that in the long run the self-regulating market system would be the wealth-creating engine of world development.

Neoliberalism has become the new orthodoxy. In response to critics, the World Bank and the IMF claim that they have no alternative. Yet, others have offered alternatives. A well-known example is the 1989 report of the Economic Commission for Africa entitled *African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-Economic Recovery and Transformation* (ECA 1989). Pressure from the World Bank

seems to have been a strong contributing factor in the stagnation of this report (Mihevc n.d.).

The industrialized countries of the North, I note, have increasingly applied the SAPs to their own economies, and this has brought about a major shift in the distribution of power and wealth. There are signs that we are entering a new phase of human history. Central controlling power has moved to international financial institutions and transnational corporations (TNCs), which are accountable to neither the public nor any supervisory agency. National governments have lost the capacity to promote the well-being of their people and protect them from the TNCs that enter their countries, destabilize their local economies, and invest local profits in other countries (Martin and Schumann 1997). As a policy and ideology, neoliberalism has widened the gap between rich and poor in the industrialized countries; it has produced a growing sector of chronically unemployed people and promoted a culture of competitive individualism devoid of both social solidarity and self-restraint. Only minority movements of spirited people resist this culture. One such movement among the churches is the world-wide ecumenical Jubilee 2000 Initiative,⁶ which addresses itself to the Northern nations, the World Bank, and the IMF. Based on the Jubilee texts of Leviticus (25:13–24), in which God commands the Israelites to redistribute wealth, release slaves, and cancel debts at regular intervals, this initiative demands the cancelation of the heavy debt load that currently burdens developing countries. Accompanying this ecumenical initiative is a major educational effort to raise the awareness of church-going Christians.

MOUNTING CRITICISM OF THE WORLD BANK

We saw in the first part of this paper that the major Christian churches on all continents have condemned neoliberal philosophy and demanded political and economic policies based on international solidarity and a desire for social justice. A growing number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) active in the South have also formulated criticisms of the World Bank and the SAPs. This wave of complaints climaxed in 1994, the 50th anniversary of the Bank's foundation, when, under the slogan "50 Years Is Enough," the NGOs succeeded in organizing a major campaign critical of the Bank. This campaign informed the public of the destructive, undemocratic, and unaccountable policies adopted by the

⁶ The Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative published a 30-page brochure, entitled "A New Beginning: A Call for Jubilee," about this initiative. It is available from the Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative, PO Box 772, Station F, Toronto, ON, Canada M4Y 2N6. More information on the Jubilee 2000 Debt Campaign can also be found on the Canadian Ecumenical Jubilee Initiative homepage (www.web.net/~jubilee/debt.htm).

Bank and called for fundamental reforms of this institution. The campaign received massive support. In fact, the leaders of the G7 countries put reform of the World Bank on the agenda of their 1995 meeting in Halifax.

In 1994, under its new president, James Wolfensohn, the World Bank decided to listen to these complaints, enter into dialogue with the NGOs, and modify some of its policies. The Bank canceled its involvement in a controversial project in India — the Narmada Dam. It admitted that in many countries foreign debt was a serious problem and prepared measures to alleviate it; it strengthened its commitment to reduce poverty in the world; and, most significantly, it began to hold meetings with the NGOs. The World Bank admitted NGOs to the 1995 assembly of the Bank and IMF and created a joint World Bank–NGO committee to review the SAPs.

Great controversy roars around the significance of the changes introduced by the World Bank. Some commentators think that the Bank has adopted a new orientation more beneficial to developing countries, whereas others argue that these changes are largely window dressing and do not weaken the Bank's commitment to the SAPs or the neoliberal logic behind them. Today, the World Bank is deeply committed to "world governance." Good governance has also become a concern of the United Nations (1995). *Governance*, I note, is not the equivalent of *government*. *Governance* refers, rather, to the interaction of several factors — including government and markets — in creating and sustaining order and peace in society, especially given the social and cultural consequences of globalization. Apart from governments and markets, the concept of civil society encompasses other governance-producing factors. Civil society includes professional associations, labour unions, religious institutions, schools and universities, nonprofit organizations, citizens' movements, cultural centres, and — especially in the South — foreign NGOs.

The protest movement leading up to the World Bank's 50th birthday may not have been the only reason for the Bank's new concern for global governance. The Bank shares the fear of all well-informed citizens that the globalization of the economy and the breakdown of subsistence economies, cultural cohesion, and social integration in many developing countries are producing conditions of grinding misery and social chaos that may easily explode in violence. An explosion of violence in developing countries would cause great human suffering, threaten investment and private property, inhibit production and delivery of goods, and thus impede the expansion of the free-market economy. For all of these reasons (humanitarian and economic), the World Bank has decided to encourage and support good governance, that is, the ordering and pacifying of society under conditions of poverty and dislocation.

In the name of good governance, the World Bank now actively intervenes in the affairs of developing countries on several levels:

- ☞ It puts new emphasis on role of the state;
- ☞ It seeks cooperation with, and offers financial support for, NGOs and other organizations of civil society; and
- ☞ It recognizes and encourages a role for religion, ethics, and spirituality.

THE WORLD BANK'S DIALOGUE WITH RELIGION

Good governance includes support for an ethical culture that promotes social well-being. Inwardness or spirituality has social consequences. The world religions form patterned communities that sustain people in difficult times, strengthen them in their communal efforts, and create close bonds of friendship, cooperation, and mutual aid. For these reasons, religious communities, as part of civil society, play an important role in ensuring good governance. It is not surprising that the World Bank, faithful to its new, post-1994 image, has begun to show concern for spirituality and religion. It has sponsored several international conferences on these issues in the hope that a better understanding of the Bank's aims will allow religious leaders and teachers of spirituality to make a more focused contribution to humanity's well-being. At the same time, the World Bank is willing to learn from the wisdom of the world religions.

I wish to comment on two such international conferences: the first, the 1995 Conference on Ethics and Spiritual Values, held in Washington, DC, focused on sustainable development; the second, the 1998 Conference on World Faiths and Development, held at Lambeth Palace in London, United Kingdom, focused on cooperation between religions and the World Bank.

At the opening of the 1995 Conference on Ethics and Spiritual Values, James Wolfensohn gave the keynote address, "New Partnerships," in which he made the following statement:

Development is not just a matter of looking at increases in gross domestic product (GDP) per capita. In Africa I saw successful development in villages where people were pulling themselves out of deep poverty. Development is visible in people who, within the structure of their familial or tribal system, possess a sense of grandeur, a sense of optimism, a sense of hope; who talk with excitement in their eyes about their children's future. These people, living on next to nothing, feel a sense of progress that is more than economic. It encompasses recognition of roots and their spiritual and cultural values, which we [the World Bank] need to nurture and encourage. These values are what we should be developing

The [World Bank's] central mission is to meld economic assistance with spiritual, ethical and moral development.

It is not easy to explain to most people why I would leave a successful business practice to come and try to make the world a better place. ... I came [here] because of a background that had, I believe, within my own Jewish religion some sense of ethical, spiritual and moral values that I have attempted to live by and that guide me.

Wolfensohn (1996, p. 1)

The conference proceedings, published by the World Bank, gave the names of the 34 men and women it had invited to address the topic. All the speakers agreed that ethics and spiritual values must be taken into account in formulating economic policy, especially that related to sustainable development. Most of them lamented the indifference of economics to ethical considerations, but, with one exception, all failed to articulate a critique of the World Bank's economic policies. Only Denis Goulet, a well-known, critical development economist, said in plain language that economic globalization (as promoted by the World Bank) undermined local economies and dissolved traditional values and that environmentally sustainable development was therefore impossible under the conditions created by these neoliberal policies (Serageldin and Barrett 1996).

The Conference on World Faiths and Development, 18–19 February 1998, was hosted by George Carey, Archbishop of Canterbury, and James Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank, and held at Lambeth Palace, London. Participants were leaders from nine world religions (Baha'i Faith, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Jainism, Judaism, Sikhism, and Taoism) and included the main traditions within these religions.

The conference at Lambeth Palace was preceded by a roundtable conference, *A Christian Response to the International Debt Crisis*, on 16–17 May 1996, organized by the Anglican Community Office at the United Nations. This earlier conference set forth the biblical and Christian foundations for ethical norms relevant to the economy. It assigned special significance to the Jubilee year. As stated in the conference documents, the immediate purpose of the roundtable conference was “to express uncompromising concern with the human impact of IMF and World Bank policies” and to explore with the participants “possible lines of practical action which might help alleviate negative effects of [IMF and World Bank] policy on the poor and vulnerable.”⁷ The conference participants produced a series of policy measures that they urged the Bretton Woods institutions to take into account.⁸

⁷ See www.aco.org/united-nations/debtconf.html.

⁸ A 13-page statement of these recommendations (ACOUN 1996), plus the conference program, can be obtained from the Rt Rev. James Ottley, Anglican Observer at the United Nations, 815 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA (e-mail: anglican_un_office@ecunet.org).

In response to the roundtable conference, James Wolfensohn agreed to cohost, with the Archbishop of Canterbury, the 1998 Conference on World Faiths and Development. Here leaders of the world religions were engaged in sustained conversation with staff members of the World Bank. At the end of the conference, the two co-chairs made a joint statement summing up in 11 points the agreements that had been reached. I offer a brief summary:⁹

1. The religious leaders and the leading staff of the World Bank are at one in their deep moral concern for the future of human well-being and dignity.
2. Human development must have regard for spiritual, ethical, environmental, cultural, and social considerations.
3. Human well-being includes spiritual and cultural expansion and rescue from suffering that is due to poverty.
4. It is important to listen to all the actors involved in development, including especially the local community.
5. The World Bank and the major religious communities agree on the need to continue the dialogue.
6. The religious communities will be allowed to influence the thinking of the World Bank.
7. Several joint working groups will be established.
8. The World Bank staff want more education regarding the world's religions, and the religious communities want more education regarding international development.
9. The religious communities have already contributed much to development projects: they will continue to do so, with the backing of the World Bank.
10. A light and flexible steering group will monitor progress in this area.
11. Governments and international agencies will be exhorted to join the search for better understanding between religion and development.

It is difficult to know how to interpret this joint statement. It is unlikely that the churches have modified the position they have adopted and defended over the years. Nor has the World Bank moved away from its policy of imposing SAPs on developing countries or from its neoliberal approach. Critics claim that by engaging in this dialogue, the Bank

⁹ The documentation can be obtained from the Press Office, Lambeth Palace, London, UK, SE1 7JU. It is also available on the Internet (www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/faithsdialogue).

wants to persuade the world religions to contribute to the cause of good governance and help stabilize society under the conditions of disintegration produced by the SAPs. These critics think the World Bank wants religion to save society for the globalization of the free market. In my opinion, it is too early to judge the significance of this dialogue.

THE SUBJECTIVE DIMENSION OF SOCIAL-SCIENCE RESEARCH

In this section, I touch on a topic that has been an interest of mine ever since I studied sociology. I have always been impressed by the social theorists who challenged the claim to objectivity, or value neutrality, made by the social sciences. These critical theorists had great respect for the objective methodology of these sciences, that is, the so-called scientific method: relying on empirical research, testing hypotheses, and producing a set of arguments that can be verified by other researchers. Yet, the critical theorists insisted that in social-science research there is inevitably a subjective dimension that depends on the social location, talents, and options of the researcher. I note that this claim is quite different from certain postmodern trends in sociology that deconstruct the objective methodology altogether. As the social sciences are never fully objective, or value free, the critical theorists argue that it would be more scientific if the social scientists articulated the implicit values operative in their research and offered a rational critique of them, not, indeed, “to prove” them but to defend their coherence and clarify their social implications.

In the following pages, I comment on two issues in relation to social-scientific research: its implicit sociopolitical perspectives and its dominant secularism. These are issues of concern to the Christian churches because Christianity — as well as all other religions — is linked to a particular ethic and the churches must respond to the current situation and its irrationalities in terms of this ethic. To do this, they must enter into dialogue with political scientists, economists, and other social scientists. Which of the many diverse currents in these sciences should the churches trust? To give a brief answer to this question, I say that the churches find social, political, and economic analyses trustworthy if the evaluative presuppositions operative within these analyses have an affinity with their own sets of values (Baum 1998).

THE SOCIOPOLITICAL PERSPECTIVE

That the social location of social scientists and their political options affect their analyses of society was an insight that was first articulated by Marx and then explored and developed in the sociology of

knowledge. I became acquainted with the sociology of knowledge through two German authors of the 1920s: Max Scheler (1980 [1924]), a conservative social thinker, and Karl Mannheim (1936 [1928]), a liberal sociologist. Today's students of sociology are introduced to this critical approach — admittedly a minority trend in sociology — through the work of Jürgen Habermas (1971 [1968]), who has systematically explored the relations between knowledge and social interest.

This paper is not the place to develop this critical theory in any detail. Simply put, we bring to our scientific study of social phenomena a perspective that expresses the relationship we have with our own society. This is part of the subjective dimension operative in social-science research. The critical approach is also very persuasive to the ordinary citizen because it explains why research institutes and think tanks — which all apply the scientific method faithfully — arrive at such diverse conclusions. Critical theory explains why a simple appeal to the social sciences cannot resolve the important social debates. Let me give a concrete example of this dilemma, drawn from an ecclesiastical document.

When the American Catholic bishops were preparing the 1986 pastoral letter, “Economic Justice for All,” they sought an answer to the question of why unemployment and poverty were growing, why the gap between rich and poor was widening, and why ever larger sectors of the population were being marginalized and excluded from participation. In their first draft of the pastoral letter (ACB 1986), the bishops told us that the social and economic scientists they consulted were divided on these issues. Some of these scientists argued that major changes had taken place in the structure of capital and the orientation of the economy; for this reason, repairing the damage and overcoming present injustices would demand major structural changes. Other scientists disagreed with this. They argued, instead, that the current economic decline was not dramatic, that it indicated no significant break with the past, and that it was simply the result of unwise policies adopted by governments and certain industries. Adopting appropriate measures could therefore incrementally overcome these issues.

In this first draft, the bishops mentioned another question that remained unresolved by the scientists they had consulted. The bishops wanted to know whether the economic collapse and the widespread misery in the South were produced by developments in these countries (to which American society was simply an onlooker) or whether these conditions were in some way related to the growing wealth and power of American society. Here, again, the scientists were unable to resolve the question, even though they all followed an objective method and provided demonstrations based on empirical research.¹⁰

¹⁰ For the two passages in the first draft of the pastoral letter, see ACB (1984, pp. 342 and 370).

Because the scientists failed to arrive at an agreement, the American bishops decided not to raise critical questions regarding liberal or neoliberal capitalism in the final version of their pastoral letter. However, not all national bishops' conferences have been as reticent. The Latin American bishops who met at Medellín in 1968 were keenly aware that economists and other social scientists are guided by a social perspective: they may operate out of an implicit identification with the established order or they may read the social reality from the perspective of society's victims, that is, the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized. The Latin American bishops were not surprised that scientists disagreed in their analyses of society, and the bishops decided, for theological reasons, to trust those scientists who opted for the perspective of the poor (LAB 1968).

The Latin American bishops called this perspective the option for the poor. They believed that, in fidelity to Jesus, Christians want to commit themselves to this perspective. Thanks to liberation theology and the leadership of the Latin American bishops, the option for the poor has become an important principle of interpretation guiding spirituality and social ethics in both Catholic and Protestant churches. The Canadian Catholic bishops, in particular, have produced a series of pastoral statements on social and economic ethics, based on the perspective of society's victims. This has created a certain affinity between Christian thought and critical theory.

I conclude from these reflections that because all social-scientific research operates with a conscious or unconscious value-based orientation, "engaged research" — that is, research guided by a social-justice commitment — is not only perfectly scientific but also more transparent, because it willingly articulates its implicit presuppositions.

QUESTIONING THE DOMINANT SECULARISM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Another implicit presupposition of the social sciences, closely related to the topic of this paper, concerns their relation to the spiritual order. The majority of social scientists recognize that, in the past, religion played an important role in society, either as a principle of order (creating "a sacred canopy") or as a source of motivation (generating a common ethos). But most social scientists have reduced religion to its social function: the study of religion does not provide them with empirical arguments for a transcendent spiritual order. Most sociologists, moreover, are convinced that in modern society, which is marked by industrialization, scientific rationality, and cultural pluralism, religion no longer fulfills any important social function. Religion no longer unites the social order or provides a universally accepted set of values. As the existence of a divine order cannot be scientifically demonstrated, many sociologists argue that religion is becoming increasingly unbelievable. Religion,

they think, survives only as the purely personal conviction of certain groups of people, as a sentiment and a commitment to an imaginary universe. Religion remains wholly extrinsic to the constitution of society. The only true reality, “the really real,” is here in the visible universe and human history, without any relationship to an invisible order. The traditional notion of transcendence has lost its meaning. Spirituality is at best the private interest of the few.

This secular outlook has been adopted by vast numbers of people in present-day society, and this secularism is predominant in the guild of political scientists, economists, and other social scientists. These scientists, we note, do not regard this secular outlook as the creation of a particular culture, that is to say, modern, Western, industrial culture: rather, they see this outlook as revealing the truth about the world and hence as a perspective applicable to the understanding of all other cultures. Secularism here makes its own culture-transcending claim.

The early literature on development, starting with *The Stages of Economic Growth*, by W.W. Rostow (1960), regarded the religions of peoples in the South as an obstacle to economic development, because these religions often trusted the rhythm of nature, fostered social identification with family and community, and failed to promote a culture oriented toward personal achievement and social mobility. Seen from this perspective, development had to be accompanied by a secularization of culture, that is to say, by an exclusion of religious values from public policies and the organization of production and distribution.

On a previous page, I mentioned that critical voices in Asia and Africa, as well as among native peoples of the Americas, have decried the secular presupposition implicit in economic and other social sciences and in the development projects sponsored by the industrialized West. They regard secularization as a construct of Western empire, aimed at undermining the identity of non-Western peoples. This outlook finds a parallel in work such as *Orientalism*, by Edward Said (1978), which demonstrated how the West’s claim to cultural superiority has shaped the Western perception of Islamic–Arab civilization. Other authors have shown that the same is true of the Western perception of India and other Asian civilizations (see Lopez 1995). The contemporary Christian theology of African theologians is critical of the secular attitude of Western missionaries who looked on African belief in the presence of spirits as a superstition to be discarded, even though the Near Eastern world — in which Jesus himself lived — fully shared this belief.

According to Peter Berger (1966), sociologists who study religious phenomena must adopt what he called “methodological atheism.” The sociologist must examine these phenomena with the presupposition that they have material and cultural causes within history. For Berger (who presents himself as a believing Christian), science must adopt the perspective of Western secularism. In response, Robert Bellah, one of

Berger's colleagues, argued instead that to appreciate religious phenomena and avoid their systematic distortion, sociologists must opt for "symbolic realism" (Bellah 1970, pp. 220–221). What does Bellah mean by this? The sociologist, he argued, must be open to the possibility that the religious symbols that define the identity of a human community have a transcendent referent; and that the sociologist's own secular presupposition is a Western cultural product rather than a universal truth. Bellah argued that without such an openness to, and empathy with, religious phenomena, sociologists are unable to appreciate the creativity of religion, its resourcefulness in helping people cope with their hardship, and its self-transforming power in new historical situations.

The question I cannot avoid asking is whether the attitude of the social-science researcher toward the existence of a transcendent order influences his or her analysis and conclusion. It seems to me that a social scientist committed to a secular outlook would be insensitive to the creative powers of religion, unless he or she reached out for a special openness. By this I do not mean, of course, that social scientists should all be theists or believers of some sort. Not belief, but empathy, is required. Max Weber insisted that sociologists stretch their imagination and learn to think themselves into the mind-set of religious people. He wanted students of sociology to read the great novels of world literature to discover that their own symbolic understanding of the universe was just one among many others. Weber also recognized that science, or formal rationality as he called it, does not reply to the riddle of the universe. Science was not a philosophy that replied to the great human questions: What is the meaning of it all? Where do we come from and where do we go? Weber regarded himself as a nonbeliever, but he was modest about it. He did not erect his unbelief into a metaphysics. He was not committed to secularism as a definitive interpretation of the universe. In his study of religion, he was open to the new and unexpected; he recognized the historical weight of religious convictions. If there is any truth in the above reflections, then development research should acquire a special sensitivity to the spiritual dimension of people's self-constitution and to the ways the secular presuppositions of contemporary Western culture threaten their identity.

Appreciating the creativity of religion has been a characteristic of the alternative development theories produced by researchers and social thinkers since the 1950s. The paradigms proposed by Louis-Joseph Lebret (1959) (and see Malley 1968) in France and Denis Goulet (1971) in the United States, based on practical experience and theoretical considerations, have always demanded that a certain cultural and religious continuity be a dimension of integral development. This is why they insisted that the local community must be recognized as a partner in any development project, be listened to by the so-called technical experts, and be allowed to exercise co-responsibility fully. Although

Western science plays an important role in such a project, the symbolic meaning and creative energy to make the project work must come from the culture and the religion of the local community. Any new attitudes or practices must find roots in the dynamic elements of the community's own tradition. As much as people are changed by participating in a development project, they want to retain their identity or, more precisely, they want to remain faithful to the past while reconstituting their identity under new conditions.

When we examined the concept of development proposed by the popes, we found that they recognized several dimensions of this process, including a religious one. Yet, they did not sufficiently emphasize, I then suggested, that to assure such an integral development, the local community must be recognized as a partner in the full sense. Development is not a process devised by Western scientists and executed by Western-trained men and women of the South. Co-responsibility means that both parties — the Western specialists and the local community — make an original contribution. This point, as we saw, was made by the 1971 World Synod of Bishops. A truly creative aspect of integral development is the summoning forth of meaning and wisdom derived from the cultural and religious tradition.

ANNEX 1: EXCERPTS FROM PAPAL ENCYCLICALS AND STATEMENTS BY THE WORLD SYNOD OF BISHOPS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT

EXCERPTS FROM “POPULORUM PROGRESSIO”¹¹

Encyclical letter of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, promulgated on 26 March 1967

7. ... It must certainly be recognized that colonizing powers have often furthered their own interests, power or glory, and that their departure has sometimes left a precarious economy, bound up for instance with the production of one kind of crop whose market prices are subject to sudden and considerable variation. Yet while recognizing the damage done by a certain type of colonialism and its consequences, one must at the same time acknowledge the qualities and achievement of colonizers who brought their science and technical knowledge and left beneficial results of their presence in so many underprivileged regions. The structures established by them persist, however incomplete they may be; they diminished

¹¹ Original footnotes omitted. Emphasis added by the author (bold).

ignorance and sickness, brought the benefits of communications and improved living conditions.

8. Yet once this is admitted, it remains only too true that the resultant situation is manifestly inadequate for facing the hard reality of modern economics. Left to itself it works rather to widen the differences in the world's levels of life, not to diminish them: rich peoples enjoy rapid growth whereas the poor develop slowly. The imbalance is on the increase: some produce a surplus of foodstuffs, others cruelly lack them and see their exports made uncertain.

...

14. **Development cannot be limited to mere economic growth. In order to be authentic, it must be complete: integral, that is, it has to promote the good of every man and of the whole man.** As an eminent specialist has very rightly and emphatically declared: "We do not believe in separating the economic from the human, nor development from the civilizations in which it exists. What we hold important is man, each man and each group of men, and we even include the whole of humanity."

15. In the design of God, every man is called upon to develop and fulfill himself, for every life is a vocation. At birth, everyone is granted, in germ, a set of aptitudes and qualities for him to bring to fruition. Their coming to maturity, which will be the result of education received from the environment and personal efforts, will allow each man to direct himself toward the destiny intended for him by his Creator. Endowed with intelligence and freedom, he is responsible for his fulfillment as he is for his salvation. He is aided, or sometimes impeded, by those who educate him and those with whom he lives, but each one remains, whatever be these influences affecting him, the principal agent of his own success or failure. By the unaided effort of his own intelligence and his will, each man can grow in humanity, can enhance his personal worth, can become more a person.

16. However, this self-fulfillment is not something optional. Just as the whole of creation is ordained to its Creator, so spiritual beings should of their own accord orientate their lives to God, the first truth and the supreme good. Thus it is that human fulfillment constitutes, as it were, a summary of our duties. But there is much more: this harmonious enrichment of nature by personal and responsible effort is ordered to a further perfection. By reason of his union with Christ, the source of life, man attains to new fulfillment of himself, to a transcendent humanism which gives him his greatest possible perfection: this is the highest goal of personal development.

17. But each man is a member of society. He is part of the whole of mankind. It is not just certain individuals, but all men who are called to this fullness of development. Civilizations are born, develop and die. But humanity is advancing along the path of history like the waves of a rising tide encroaching gradually on the

shore. We have inherited from past generations, and we have benefited from the work of our contemporaries: for this reason we have obligations towards all, and we cannot refuse to interest ourselves in those who will come after us to enlarge the human family. The reality of human solidarity, which is a benefit for us, also imposes a duty.

18. This personal and communal development would be threatened if the true scale of values were undermined. The desire for necessities is legitimate, and work undertaken to obtain them is a duty: "If any man will not work, neither let him eat." But the acquiring of temporal goods can lead to greed, to the insatiable desire for more, and can make increased power a tempting objective. Individuals, families and nations can be overcome by avarice, be they poor or rich, and all can fall victim to a stifling materialism.

19. **Increased possession is not the ultimate goal of nations nor of individuals. All growth is ambivalent. It is essential if man is to develop as a man, but in a way it imprisons man if he considers it the supreme good, and it restricts his vision.** Then we see hearts harden and minds close, and men no longer gather together in friendship but out of self-interest, which soon leads to oppositions and disunity. The exclusive pursuit of possessions thus become an obstacle to individual fulfillment and to man's true greatness. Both for nations and for individual men, avarice is the most evident form of moral underdevelopment.

20. If further development calls for the work of more and more technicians, even more necessary is the deep thought and reflection of wise men in search of a new humanism which will enable modern man to find himself anew by embracing the higher values of love and friendship, of prayer and contemplation. This is what will permit the fullness of authentic development, a development which is for each and all the transition from less human conditions to those which are more human.

21. **Less human conditions:** the lack of material necessities for those who are without the minimum essential for life, the moral deficiencies of those who are mutilated by selfishness. **Less human conditions:** oppressive social structures, whether due to the abuses of ownership or to the abuses of power, to the exploitation of workers or to unjust transactions. **Conditions that are more human:** the passage from misery towards the possession of necessities, victory over social scourges, the growth of knowledge, the acquisition of culture. **Additional conditions that are more human:** increased esteem for the dignity of others, the turning toward the spirit of poverty, cooperation for the common good, the will and desire for peace. **Conditions that are still more human:** the acknowledgment by man of supreme values, and of God their source and their finality. **Conditions that, finally and above all, are more human:** faith, a gift of God accepted by the good will of man, and unity in the

charity of Christ, Who calls us all to share as sons in the life of the living God, the Father of all men.

...

24. If certain landed estates impede the general prosperity because they are extensive, unused or poorly used, or because they bring hardship to peoples or are detrimental to the interests of the country, the common good sometimes demands their expropriation. While giving a clear statement on this, the Council recalled no less clearly that the available revenue is not to be used in accordance with mere whim, and that no place must be given to selfish speculation. Consequently it is unacceptable that citizens with abundant incomes from the resources and activity of their country should transfer a considerable part of this income abroad purely for their own advantage, without care for the manifest wrong they inflict on their country by doing this.

25. The introduction of industry is a necessity for economic growth and human progress; it is also a sign of development and contributes to it. By persistent work and use of his intelligence man gradually wrests nature's secrets from her and finds a better application for her riches. As his self-mastery increases, he develops a taste for research and discovery, an ability to take a calculated risk, boldness in enterprises, generosity in what he does and a sense of responsibility.

26. **But it is unfortunate that on these new conditions of society a system has been constructed which considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right that has no limits and carries no corresponding social obligation.** This unchecked liberalism leads to dictatorship rightly denounced by Pius XI as producing "the international imperialism of money." One cannot condemn such abuses too strongly by solemnly recalling once again that the economy is at the service of man. But if it is true that a type of capitalism has been the source of excessive suffering, injustices and fratricidal conflicts whose effects still persist, it would also be wrong to attribute to industrialization itself evils that belong to the woeful system which accompanied it. On the contrary one must recognize in all justice the irreplaceable contribution made by the organization of labor and of industry to what development has accomplished.

...

30. There are certainly situations whose injustice cries to heaven. When whole populations destitute of necessities live in a state of dependence barring them from all initiative and responsibility, and all opportunity to advance culturally and share in social and

political life, recourse to violence, as a means to right these wrongs to human dignity, is a grave temptation.

31. We know, however, that a revolutionary uprising — save where there is manifest, long-standing tyranny which would do great damage to fundamental personal rights and dangerous harm to the common good of the country — produces new injustices, throws more elements out of balance and brings on new disasters. A real evil should not be fought against at the cost of greater misery.

32. We want to be clearly understood: the present situation must be faced with courage and the injustices linked with it must be fought against and overcome. Development demands bold transformations, innovations that go deep. Urgent reforms should be undertaken without delay. It is for each one to take his share in them with generosity, particularly those whose education, position and opportunities afford them wide scope for action. May they show an example, and give of their own possessions as several of Our brothers in the episcopacy have done. In so doing they will live up to men's expectations and be faithful to the Spirit of God, since it is "the ferment of the Gospel which has aroused and continues to arouse in man's heart the irresistible requirements of his dignity."

33. **Individual initiative alone and the mere free play of competition could never assure successful development.** One must avoid the risk of increasing still more the wealth of the rich and the dominion of the strong, whilst leaving the poor in their misery and adding to the servitude of the oppressed. Hence programs are necessary in order "to encourage, stimulate, coordinate, supplement and integrate" the activity of individuals and of intermediary bodies. It pertains to the public authorities to choose, even to lay down the objectives to be pursued, the ends to be achieved, and the means for attaining these, and it is for them to stimulate all the forces engaged in this common activity. But let them take care to associate private initiative and intermediary bodies with this work. They will thus avoid the danger of complete collectivization or of arbitrary planning, which, by denying liberty, would prevent the exercise of the fundamental rights of the human person.

34. This is true since every program, made to increase production, has, in the last analysis, no other *raison d'être* than the service of man. Such programs should reduce inequalities, fight discriminations, free man from various types of servitude and enable him to be the instrument of his own material betterment, of his moral progress and of his spiritual growth. **To speak of development, is in effect to show as much concern for social progress as for economic growth. It is not sufficient to increase overall wealth for it to be distributed equitably. It is not sufficient to promote technology to render the world a more humane place in which to live.** The mistakes of their predecessors should warn those on the road to development of the dangers to be avoided in this field. **Tomorrow's technocracy can beget evils no less**

redoubtable than those due to the liberalism of yesterday. Economics and technology have no meaning except from man whom they should serve. And man is only truly man in as far as, master of his own acts and judge of their worth, he is author of his own advancement, in keeping with the nature which was given to him by his Creator and whose possibilities and exigencies he himself freely assumes.

...

40. In addition to professional organizations, there are also institutions which are at work. Their role is no less important for the success of development. "The future of the world stands in peril," the Council gravely affirms, "unless wiser men are forthcoming." And it adds: "many nations, poorer in economic goods, are quite rich in wisdom and able to offer noteworthy advantages to others." Rich or poor, each country possesses a civilization handed down by their ancestors: institutions called for by life in this world, and higher manifestations of the life of the spirit, manifestations of an artistic, intellectual and religious character. When the latter possess true human values, it would be grave error to sacrifice them to the former. A people that would act in this way would thereby lose the best of its patrimony; in order to live, it would be sacrificing its reasons for living. Christ's teaching also applies to people: "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world if he suffers the loss of his soul."

41. **Less well-off peoples can never be sufficiently on their guard against this temptation which comes to them from wealthy nations. For these nations all too often set an example of success in a highly technical and culturally developed civilization; they also provide the model for a way of acting that is principally aimed at the conquest of material prosperity.** Not that material prosperity of itself precludes the activity of the human spirit. On the contrary, the human spirit, "increasingly free of its bondage to creatures, can be more easily drawn to the worship and contemplation of the Creator." However, "modern civilization itself often complicates the approach to God, not for any essential reason, but because it is excessively engrossed in earthly affairs." Developing nations must know how to discriminate among those things that are held out to them; they must be able to assess critically, and eliminate those deceptive goods which would only bring about a lowering of the human ideal, and to accept those values that are sound and beneficial, in order to develop them alongside their own, in accordance with their own genius.

42. What must be aimed at is complete humanism. And what is that if not the fully-rounded development of the whole man and of all men? A humanism closed in on itself, and not open to the values of the spirit and to God Who is their source, could achieve apparent success. **True, man can organize the world apart from God, but "without God man can organize it in the end only to**

man's detriment. An isolated humanism is an inhuman humanism." There is no true humanism but that which is open to the Absolute and is conscious of a vocation which gives human life its true meaning. Far from being the ultimate measure of all things, man can only realize himself by reaching beyond himself. As Pascal has said so well: "Man infinitely surpasses man."

...

47. But neither all this nor the private and public funds that have been invested, nor the gifts and loans that have been made, can suffice. It is not just a matter of eliminating hunger, nor even of reducing poverty. The struggle against destitution, though urgent and necessary, is not enough. It is a question, rather, of building a world where every man, no matter what his race, religion or nationality, can live a fully human life, freed from servitude imposed on him by other men or by natural forces over which he has not sufficient control; a world where freedom is not an empty word and where the poor man Lazarus can sit down at the same table with the rich man. This demands great generosity, much sacrifice and unceasing effort on the part of the rich man. Let each one examine his conscience, a conscience that conveys a new message for our times. Is he prepared to support out of his own pocket works and undertakings organized in favor of the most destitute? Is he ready to pay higher taxes so that the public authorities can intensify their efforts in favor of development? Is he ready to pay a higher price for imported goods so that the producer may be more justly rewarded? Or to leave his country, if necessary and if he is young, in order to assist in this development of the young nations?

48. **The same duty of solidarity that rests on individuals exists also for nations:** "Advanced nations have a very heavy obligation to help the developing peoples." It is necessary to put this teaching of the Council into effect. Although it is normal that a nation should be the first to benefit from the gifts that Providence has bestowed on it as the fruit of the labors of its people, still no country can claim on that account to keep its wealth for itself alone. Every nation must produce more and better quality goods to give to all its inhabitants a truly human standard of living, and also to contribute to the common development of the human race. Given the increasing needs of the under-developed countries, it should be considered quite normal for an advanced country to devote a part of its production to meet their needs, and to train teachers, engineers, technicians and scholars prepared to put their knowledge and their skill at the disposal of less fortunate peoples.

...

52. There is certainly no need to do away with bilateral and multi-lateral agreements: they allow ties of dependence and feelings of bitterness, left over from the era of colonialism, to yield place to the happier relationship of friendship, based on a footing of constitutional and political equality. However, if they were to be fitted into

the framework of worldwide collaboration, they would be beyond all suspicion, and as a result there would be less distrust on the part of the receiving nations. These would have less cause for fearing that, under the cloak of financial aid or technical assistance, there lurk certain manifestations of what has come to be called neo-colonialism, in the form of political pressures and economic suzerainty aimed at maintaining or acquiring complete dominance.

...

57. Of course, highly industrialized nations export for the most part manufactured goods, while countries with less developed economies have only food, fibers and other raw materials to sell. As a result of technical progress the value of manufactured goods is rapidly increasing and they can always find an adequate market. On the other hand, raw materials produced by under-developed countries are subject to wide and sudden fluctuations in price, a state of affairs far removed from the progressively increasing value of industrial products. As a result, nations whose industrialization is limited are faced with serious difficulties when they have to rely on their exports to balance their economy and to carry out their plans for development. The poor nations remain ever poor while the rich ones become still richer.

58. **In other words, the rule of free trade, taken by itself, is no longer able to govern international relations.** Its advantages are certainly evident when the parties involved are not affected by any excessive inequalities of economic power: it is an incentive to progress and a reward for effort. That is why industrially developed countries see in it a law of justice. But the situation is no longer the same when economic conditions differ too widely from country to country: prices which are “freely” set in the market can produce unfair results. One must recognize that it is the fundamental principle of liberalism, as the rule for commercial exchange, which is questioned here.

59. The teaching of Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* is always valid: if the positions of the contracting parties are too unequal, the consent of the parties does not suffice to guarantee the justice of their contract, and the rule of free agreement remains subservient to the demands of the natural law. What was true of the just wage for the individual is also true of international contracts: **an economy of exchange can no longer be based solely on the law of free competition, a law which, in its turn, too often creates an economic dictatorship.** Freedom of trade is fair only if it is subject to the demands of social justice.

...

71. We are happy that experts are being sent in larger and larger numbers on development missions by institutions, whether international or bilateral, or by private organizations: **“they ought not conduct themselves in a lordly fashion, but as helpers and**

co-workers.” A people quickly perceives whether those who come to help them do so with or without affection, whether they come merely to apply their techniques or to recognize in man his full value.

Their message is in danger of being rejected if it is not presented in the context of brotherly love.

72. Hence, necessary technical competence must be accompanied by authentic signs of disinterested love. Freed of all nationalistic pride and of every appearance of racism, experts should learn how to work in close collaboration with all. **They realize that their competence does not confer on them a superiority in every field. The civilization which formed them contains, without doubt, elements of universal humanism, but it is not the only civilization nor does it enjoy a monopoly of valuable elements. Moreover it cannot be imported without undergoing adaptations.** The men on these missions will be intent on discovering, along with its history, the component elements of the cultural riches of the country receiving them. Mutual understanding will be established which will enrich both cultures.

...

76. Excessive economic, social and cultural inequalities among peoples arouse tensions and conflicts, and are a danger to peace. As We said to the Fathers of the Council when We returned from Our journey of peace to the United Nations: “The condition of the peoples in process of development ought to be the object of our consideration; or better: our charity for the poor in the world — and there are multitudes of them — must become more considerate, more active, more generous.” To wage war on misery and to struggle against injustice is to promote, along with improved conditions, the human and spiritual progress of all men, and therefore the common good of humanity. **Peace cannot be limited to a mere absence of war, the result of an ever precarious balance of forces. No, peace is something that is built up day after day, in the pursuit of an order intended by God, which implies a more perfect form of justice among men.**

EXCERPTS FROM “**SOLLICITUDO REI SOCIALIS**”¹²

Encyclical letter of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II, promulgated in 1987 on the 20th anniversary of “*Populorum Progressio*”

9. ... Unfortunately, from the economic point of view, the developing countries are much more numerous than the developed ones; the multitudes of human beings who lack the goods and services

¹² Original footnotes omitted. Emphasis in the original (*italics*) and added by the author (**bold**).

offered by development are *much more numerous* than those who possess them.

We are therefore faced with a serious problem of *unequal distribution* of the means of subsistence originally meant for everybody, and thus also an unequal distribution of the benefits deriving from them. And this happens not through the *fault* of the needy people, and even less through a sort of *inevitability* dependent on natural conditions or circumstances as a whole.

The Encyclical of Paul VI, in declaring that the social question has acquired worldwide dimensions, first of all points out a *moral fact*, one which has its foundation in an objective analysis of reality. In the words of the Encyclical itself, “each one must be conscious” of this fact, precisely because it directly concerns the conscience, which is the source of moral decisions.

In this framework, the *originality* of the Encyclical consists not so much in the affirmation, historical in character, of the universality of the social question, but rather in the *moral evaluation* of this reality. **Therefore political leaders, and citizens of rich countries considered as individuals, especially if they are Christians, have the moral obligation, according to the degree of each one’s responsibility, to *take into consideration*, in personal decisions and decisions of government, this relationship of universality, this interdependence which exists between their conduct and the poverty and underdevelopment of so many millions of people.** Pope Paul’s Encyclical translates more succinctly the moral obligation as the “duty of solidarity”; and this affirmation, even though many situations have changed in the world, has the same force and validity today as when it was written.

On the other hand, without departing from the lines of this moral vision, the *originality* of the Encyclical also consists in the basic insight that the *very concept* of development, if considered in the perspective of universal interdependence, changes notably. **True development *cannot* consist in the simple accumulation of wealth and in the greater availability of goods and services, if this is gained at the expense of the development of the masses, and without due consideration for the social, cultural and spiritual dimensions of the human being.**

...

15. ... We should add here that in today’s world there are many other *forms of poverty*. For are there not certain privations or deprivations which deserve this name? The denial or the limitation of human rights as for example the right to religious freedom, the right to share in the building of society, the freedom to organize and to form unions, or to take initiatives in economic matters — do these not impoverish the human person as much as, if not more than, the deprivation of material goods? And is development which

does not take into account the full affirmation of these rights really development on the human level?

In brief, modern underdevelopment is not only economic but also cultural, political and simply human, as was indicated twenty years ago by the Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*. **Hence at this point we have to ask ourselves if the sad reality of today might not be, at least in part, the result of a *too narrow idea* of development, that is, a mainly economic one.**

16. It should be noted that in spite of the praiseworthy efforts made in the last two decades by the more developed or developing nations and the International Organizations to find a way out of the situation, or at least to remedy some of its symptoms, **the conditions have become *notably worse*.**

Responsibility for this deterioration is due to various causes. Notable among them are undoubtedly grave instances of omissions on the part of the developing nations themselves, and especially on the part of those holding economic and political power. Nor can we pretend not to see the responsibility of the developed nations, which have not always, at least in due measure, felt the duty to help countries separated from the affluent world to which they themselves belong.

Moreover, one must denounce the existence of economic, financial and social *mechanisms* which, although they are manipulated by people, often function almost automatically, thus accentuating the situation of wealth for some and poverty for the rest. These mechanisms, which are manoeuvred directly or indirectly by the more developed countries, by their very functioning favor the interests of the people manipulating them. But in the end they suffocate or condition the economies of the less developed countries. Later on these mechanisms will have to be subjected to a careful analysis under the ethical-moral aspect.

Populorum Progressio already foresaw the possibility that under such systems the wealth of the rich would increase and the poverty of the poor would remain. A proof of this forecast has been the appearance of the so-called Fourth World.

...

28. At the same time, however, the "*economic*" concept itself, linked to the word development, has entered into crisis. In fact there is a better understanding today that the *mere accumulation* of goods and services, even for the benefit of the majority, is not enough for the realization of human happiness. Nor, in consequence, does the availability of the many *real benefits* provided in recent times by science and technology, including the computer sciences, bring freedom from every form of slavery. **On the contrary, the experience of recent years shows that unless all the considerable body of resources and potential at man's disposal is guided by a *moral***

understanding and by an orientation towards the true good of the human race, it easily turns against man to oppress him.

A *disconcerting conclusion* about the most recent period should serve to enlighten us: side-by-side with the miseries of underdevelopment, themselves unacceptable, we find ourselves up against a form of *superdevelopment*, equally inadmissible, because like the former it is contrary to what is good and to true happiness. This superdevelopment, which consists in an excessive availability of every kind of material goods for the benefit of certain social groups, easily makes people slaves of “possession” and of immediate gratification, with no other horizon than the multiplication or continual replacement of the things already owned with others still better. This is the so-called civilization of “consumption” or “consumerism,” which involves so much “throwing-away” and “waste.” An object already owned but now superseded by something better is discarded, with no thought of its possible lasting value in itself, nor of some other human being who is poorer.

All of us experience firsthand the sad effects of this blind submission to pure consumerism: in the first place a crass materialism, and at the same time a *radical dissatisfaction*, because one quickly learns unless one is shielded from the flood of publicity and the ceaseless and tempting offers of products that the more one possesses the more one wants, while deeper aspirations remain unsatisfied and perhaps even stifled.

The Encyclical of Pope Paul VI pointed out the difference, so often emphasized today, between “having” and “being,” which had been expressed earlier in precise words by the Second Vatican Council. To “have” objects and goods does not in itself perfect the human subject, unless it contributes to the maturing and enrichment of that subject’s “being,” that is to say unless it contributes to the realization of the human vocation as such.

Of course, the difference between “being” and “having,” the danger inherent in a mere multiplication or replacement of things possessed compared to the value of “being,” need not turn into a *contradiction*. One of the greatest injustices in the contemporary world consists precisely in this: that the ones who possess much are relatively *few* and those who possess almost nothing are *many*. It is the injustice of the poor distribution of the goods and services originally intended for all.

This then is the picture: there are some people — the few who possess much — who do not really succeed in “being” because, through a reversal of the hierarchy of values, they are hindered by the cult of “having”; and there are others — the many who have little or nothing — who do not succeed in realizing their basic human vocation because they are deprived of essential goods.

The evil does not consist in “having” as such, but in possessing without regard for the *quality* and the *ordered hierarchy* of the goods one has. *Quality and hierarchy* arise from the

subordination of goods and their availability to man's "being" and his true vocation.

This shows that although *development* has a *necessary economic dimension*, since it must supply the greatest possible number of the world's inhabitants with an availability of goods essential for them "to be," it is not limited to that dimension. If it is limited to this, then it turns against those whom it is meant to benefit.

The characteristics of full development, one which is "more human" and able to sustain itself at the level of the true vocation of men and women without denying economic requirements, were described by Paul VI.

29. Development which is not only economic must be measured and oriented according to the reality and vocation of man seen in his totality, namely, according to his *interior dimension*. There is no doubt that he needs created goods and the products of industry, which is constantly being enriched by scientific and technological progress. And the ever greater availability of material goods not only meets needs but also opens new horizons. The danger of the misuse of material goods and the appearance of artificial needs should in no way hinder the regard we have for the new goods and resources placed at our disposal and the use we make of them. On the contrary, we must see them as a gift from God and as a response to the human vocation, which is fully realized in Christ.

...

32. ... Collaboration in the development of the whole person and of every human being is in fact a duty of all towards all, and must be shared by the four parts of the world: East and West, North and South; or, as we say today, by the different "worlds." If, on the contrary, people try to achieve it in only one part, or in only one world, they do so at the expense of the others; and, precisely because the others are ignored, their own development becomes exaggerated and misdirected.

Peoples or nations too have a right to their own full development, which while including as already said the economic and social aspects should also include individual cultural identity and openness to the transcendent. Not even the need for development can be used as an excuse for imposing on others one's own way of life or own religious belief.

33. Nor would a type of development which did not respect and promote *human rights* — personal and social, economic and political, including the *rights of nations and of peoples* — be really *worthy of man*.

Today, perhaps more than in the past, the *intrinsic contradiction* of a development limited *only* to its economic element is seen more clearly. Such development easily subjects the human person and his

deepest needs to the demands of economic planning and selfish profit.

The *intrinsic connection* between authentic development and respect for human rights once again reveals the **moral character of development**: the true elevation of man, in conformity with the natural and historical vocation of each individual, is not attained *only* by exploiting the abundance of goods and services, or by having available perfect infrastructures.

When individuals and communities do not see a rigorous respect for the moral, cultural and spiritual requirements, based on the dignity of the person and on the proper identity of each community, beginning with the family and religious societies, then all the rest — availability of goods, abundance of technical resources applied to daily life, a certain level of material well-being — will prove unsatisfying and in the end contemptible. The Lord clearly says this in the Gospel, when he calls the attention of all to the true hierarchy of values: “For what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life?” (Mt 16:26).

True development, in keeping with the *specific* needs of the human being man or woman, child, adult or old person implies, especially for those who actively share in this process and are responsible for it, a lively *awareness* of the *value* of the rights of all and of each person. It likewise implies a lively awareness of the need to respect the right of every individual to the full use of the benefits offered by science and technology.

On the *internal level* of every nation, respect for all rights takes on great importance, especially: the right to life at every stage of its existence; the rights of the family, as the basic social community, or “cell of society”; justice in employment relationships; the rights inherent in the life of the political community as such; the rights based on the *transcendent vocation* of the human being, beginning with the right of freedom to profess and practice one’s own religious belief.

...

In order to be genuine, development must be achieved within the framework of *solidarity* and *freedom*, without ever sacrificing either of them under whatever pretext. The moral character of development and its necessary promotion are emphasized when the most rigorous respect is given to all the demands deriving from the order of *truth* and *good* proper to the human person. Furthermore the Christian who is taught to see that man is the image of God, called to share in the truth and the good which is *God himself*, does not understand a commitment to development and its application which excludes regard and respect for the unique dignity of this “image.” In other words, true development must be based on the *love of God and neighbor*, and must help to promote the relationships between individuals

and society. This is the “civilization of love” of which Paul VI often spoke.

34. Nor can the moral character of development exclude respect *for the beings which constitute* the natural world, which the ancient Greeks — alluding precisely to the order which distinguishes it — called the “cosmos.” Such realities also demand respect, by virtue of a threefold consideration which it is useful to reflect upon carefully.

The first consideration is the appropriateness of acquiring a growing awareness of the fact that one cannot use with impunity the different categories of beings, whether living or inanimate — animals, plants, the natural elements — simply as one wishes, according to one’s own economic needs. On the contrary, one must take into account *the nature of each being* and of its *mutual connection* in an ordered system, which is precisely the “cosmos.”

The *second consideration* is based on the realization which is perhaps more urgent that *natural resources* are limited; some are not, as it is said, *renewable*. Using them as if they were inexhaustible, with *absolute dominion*, seriously endangers their availability not only for the present generation but above all for generations to come.

The *third consideration* refers directly to the consequences of a certain type of development on the *quality of life* in the industrialized zones. We all know that the direct or indirect result of industrialization is, ever more frequently, the pollution of the environment, with serious consequences for the health of the population.

Once again it is evident that development, the planning which governs it, and the way in which resources are used must include respect for moral demands. One of the latter undoubtedly imposes limits on the use of the natural world. The dominion granted to man by the Creator is not an absolute power, nor can one speak of a freedom to “use and misuse,” or to dispose of things as one pleases. The limitation imposed from the beginning by the Creator himself and expressed symbolically by the prohibition not to “eat of the fruit of the tree” (cf. Gen 2:16–17) shows clearly enough that, when it comes to the natural world, we are subject not only to biological laws but also to moral ones, which cannot be violated with impunity.

...

37. This *general analysis*, which is religious in nature, can be supplemented by a *number of particular considerations* to demonstrate that among the actions and attitudes opposed to the will of God, the good of neighbor and the “structures” created by them, two are very typical: on the one hand, the *all-consuming desire for profit*, and on the other, the *thirst for power*, with the intention of imposing one’s will upon others. In order to characterize better each of these attitudes, one can add the expression: “at any price.” In other words, we are faced with the *absolutizing* of human attitudes with all its

possible consequences. Since these attitudes can exist independently of each other, they can be separated; however in today's world both are *indissolubly united*, with one or the other predominating.

Obviously, not only individuals fall victim to this double attitude of sin; nations and blocs can do so too. And this favors even more the introduction of the "structures of sin" of which I have spoken. If certain forms of modern "imperialism" were considered in the light of these moral criteria, we would see that hidden behind certain decisions, apparently inspired only by economics or politics, are real forms of idolatry: of money, ideology, class, technology.

I have wished to introduce this type of analysis above all in order to point out the true *nature* of the evil which faces us with respect to the development of peoples: it is a question of a *moral evil*, the fruit of *many sins* which lead to "structures of sin." To diagnose the evil in this way is to identify precisely, on the level of human conduct, *the path to be followed in order to overcome it*.

38. ... In the context of these reflections the decision to set out or to continue the journey involves, above all, a *moral value* which men and women of faith recognize as a demand of God's will, the only true foundation of an absolutely binding ethic.

One would hope that also men and women without an explicit faith would be convinced that the obstacles to integral development are not only economic but rest on *more profound attitudes* which human beings can make into absolute values. Thus one would hope that all those who, to some degree or other, are responsible for ensuring a "more human life" for their fellow human beings, whether or not they are inspired by a religious faith, will become fully aware of the urgent need to change the *spiritual attitudes* which define each individual's relationship with self, with neighbor, with even the remotest human communities, and with nature itself; and all of this in view of higher values such as the *common good* or, to quote the felicitous expression of the Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, the full development "of the whole individual and of all people."

...

It is above all a question of *interdependence*, sensed as a *system determining* relationships in the contemporary world, in its economic, cultural, political and religious elements, and accepted as a *moral category*. When interdependence becomes recognized in this way, the correlative response as a moral and social attitude, as a "virtue," is *solidarity*. This then is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary, it is a *firm and persevering determination* to commit oneself to the *common good*; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are *all* really responsible for *all*. This determination is based on the solid conviction that what is hindering full development is that desire for profit and that thirst for power already mentioned. These attitudes and "structures of sin" are only

conquered — presupposing the help of divine grace — by a *diametrically opposed attitude*: a commitment to the good of one's neighbor with the readiness, in the Gospel sense, to "lose oneself" for the sake of the other instead of exploiting him, and to "serve him" instead of oppressing him for one's own advantage (cf. Mt 10:40–42; 20:25; Mk 10:42–45; Lk 22:25–27).

39. The exercise of solidarity *within each society* is valid when its members recognize one another as persons. Those who are more influential, because they have a greater share of goods and common services, should feel *responsible* for the weaker and be ready to share with them all they possess. Those who are weaker, for their part, in the same spirit of *solidarity*, should not adopt a purely *passive* attitude or one that is *destructive* of the social fabric, but, while claiming their legitimate rights, should do what they can for the good of all. The intermediate groups, in their turn, should not selfishly insist on their particular interests, but respect the interests of others.

Positive signs in the contemporary world are the *growing awareness* of the solidarity of the poor among themselves, their *efforts to support one another*, and their *public demonstrations* on the social scene which, without recourse to violence, present their own needs and rights in the face of the inefficiency or corruption of the public authorities. By virtue of her own evangelical duty the Church feels called to take her stand beside the poor, to discern the justice of their requests, and to help satisfy them, without losing sight of the good of groups in the context of the common good.

The same criterion is applied by analogy in international relationships. **Interdependence must be transformed into solidarity**, based upon the principle that the goods of creation are *meant for all*. That which human industry produces through the processing of raw materials, with the contribution of work, must serve equally for the good of all.

Surmounting every type of *imperialism* and determination to preserve their *own hegemony*, the stronger and richer nations must have a sense of moral *responsibility* for the other nations, so that a *real international system* may be established which will rest on the foundation of the *equality* of all peoples and on the necessary respect for their legitimate differences. The economically weaker countries, or those still at subsistence level, must be enabled, with the assistance of other peoples and of the international community, to make a contribution of their own to the common good with their treasures of *humanity* and *culture*, which otherwise would be lost for ever.

Solidarity helps us to see the "other" — whether a *person, people or nation* — not just as some kind of instrument, with a work capacity and physical strength to be exploited at low cost and then discarded when no longer useful, but as our "neighbor," a "helper" (cf. Gen 2:18–20), to be made a sharer, on a par with ourselves, in the banquet of life to which all are equally invited by God. Hence the

importance of reawakening the *religious awareness* of individuals and peoples.

Thus the exploitation, oppression and annihilation of others are excluded. These facts, in the present division of the world into opposing blocs, combine to produce the *danger of war* and an excessive preoccupation with personal security, often to the detriment of the autonomy, freedom of decision, and even the territorial integrity of the weaker nations situated within the so-called "areas of influence" or "safety belts."

...

In this way, the solidarity which we propose is the *path to peace and at the same time to development*. For world peace is inconceivable unless the world's leaders come to recognize that *interdependence* in itself demands the abandonment of the politics of blocs, the sacrifice of all forms of economic, military or political imperialism, and the transformation of mutual distrust into *collaboration*. This is precisely the *act proper* to solidarity among individuals and nations.

The motto of the pontificate of my esteemed predecessor Pius XII was *Opus iustitiae pax*, peace as the fruit of justice. Today one could say, with the same exactness and the same power of biblical inspiration (cf. Is 32:17; Jas 3:18): *Opus solidaritatis pax*, peace as the fruit of solidarity.

The goal of peace, so desired by everyone, will certainly be achieved through the putting into effect of social and international justice, but also through the practice of the virtues which favor togetherness, and which teach us to live in unity, so as to build in unity, by giving and receiving, a new society and a better world.

...

42. Today more than in the past, the Church's social doctrine must be open to an *international outlook*, in line with the Second Vatican Council, the most recent Encyclicals, and particularly in line with the Encyclical which we are commemorating. It will not be superfluous therefore to reexamine and further clarify in this light the characteristic themes and guidelines dealt with by the Magisterium in recent years.

Here I would like to indicate one of them: **the *option or love of preference for the poor***. This is an option, or a *special form* of primacy in the exercise of Christian charity, to which the whole tradition of the Church bears witness. It affects the life of each Christian inasmuch as he or she seeks to imitate the life of Christ, but it applies equally to our *social responsibilities* and hence to our manner of living, and to the logical decisions to be made concerning the ownership and use of goods.

Today, furthermore, given the worldwide dimension which the social question has assumed, this love of the preference for the poor, and the decisions which it inspires in us, cannot but embrace the immense multitudes of the hungry, the needy, the homeless, those

without medical care and, above all, those without hope of a better future. It is impossible not to take account of the existence of these realities. To ignore them would mean becoming like the "rich man" who pretended not to know the beggar Lazarus lying at his gate (cf. Lk 16:19-31). ...

43. The motivating concern for the poor — who are, in the very meaningful term, "the Lord's poor" — must be translated at all levels into concrete actions, until it decisively attains a series of necessary reforms. Each local situation will show what reforms are most urgent and how they can be achieved. But those demanded by the situation of international imbalance, as already described, must not be forgotten.

In this respect I wish to mention specifically: *the reform of the international trade system, which is mortgaged to protectionism and increasing bilateralism; the reform of the world monetary and financial system, today recognized as inadequate; the question of technological exchanges and their proper use; the need for a review of the structure of the existing International Organizations, in the framework of an international juridical order.*

The *international trade system* today frequently discriminates against the products of the young industries of the developing countries and discourages the producers of raw materials. There exists, too, a kind of *international division of labor*, whereby the low-cost products of certain countries which lack effective labor laws or which are too weak to apply them are sold in other parts of the world at considerable profit for the companies engaged in this form of production, which knows no frontiers.

The *world monetary and financial system* is marked by an excessive fluctuation of exchange rates and interest rates, to the detriment of the balance of payments and the debt situation of the poorer countries.

Forms of technology and their transfer constitute today one of the major problems of international exchange and of the grave damage deriving therefrom. There are quite frequent cases of developing countries being denied needed forms of technology or sent useless ones.

In the opinion of many, the *International Organizations* seem to be at a stage of their existence when their operating methods, operating costs and effectiveness need careful review and possible correction. Obviously, such a delicate process cannot be put into effect without the collaboration of all. This presupposes the overcoming of political rivalries and the renouncing of all desire to manipulate these Organizations, which exist solely for the *common good*.

...

44. **Development demands above all a spirit of initiative on the part of the countries which need it.** Each of them must act in accordance with its own responsibilities, *not expecting everything* from the more favored countries, and acting in collaboration with

others in the same situation. Each must discover and use to the best advantage its *own area of freedom*. Each must make itself capable of initiatives responding to its own needs as a society. Each must likewise realize its true needs as well as the rights and duties which oblige it to respond to them. The development of peoples begins and is most appropriately accomplished in the dedication of each people to its own development, in collaboration with others.

...

In order to take this path, *the nations themselves* will have to identify their own *priorities* and clearly recognize their own needs, according to the particular conditions of their people, their geographical setting and their cultural traditions.

...

45. ... An essential condition for global *solidarity* is autonomy and free self-determination, also within associations such as those indicated. But at the same time solidarity demands a readiness to accept the sacrifices necessary for the good of the whole world community.

46. Peoples and individuals aspire to be free: their search for full development signals their desire to overcome the many obstacles preventing them from enjoying a "more human life."

Recently, in the period following the publication of the Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, a new way of confronting the problems of poverty and underdevelopment has spread in some areas of the world, especially in Latin America. This approach makes *liberation* the fundamental category and the first principle of action. The positive values, as well as the deviations and risks of deviation, which are damaging to the faith and are connected with this form of theological reflection and method, have been appropriately pointed out by the Church's Magisterium.

It is fitting to add that the aspiration to freedom from all forms of slavery affecting the individual and society is something *noble* and *legitimate*. This in fact is the purpose of development, or rather liberation and development, taking into account the intimate connection between the two.

Development which is merely economic is incapable of setting man free; on the contrary, it will end by enslaving him further. Development that does not include the *cultural, transcendent and religious dimensions* of man and society, to the extent that it does not recognize the existence of such dimensions and does not endeavor to direct its goals and priorities towards the same, is *even less* conducive to authentic liberation. Human beings are totally free only when they are completely *themselves*, in the fullness of their rights and duties. The same can be said about society as a whole.



EXCERPT FROM “JUSTITIA IN MUNDO”

World Synod of Bishops, Second General Assembly, 30 November 1971

71. (8) In order that the right to development may be fulfilled by action:

(a) people should not be hindered from attaining development in accordance with their own culture;

(b) through mutual cooperation, all peoples should be able to become the principal architects of their own economic and social development;

(c) every people, as active and responsible members of human society, should be able to cooperate for the attainment of the common good on an equal footing with other peoples.

REFERENCES

- ACB (American Catholic Bishops). 1984. Pastoral letter: economic justice for all. Origins: National Catholic Documentary Service, 14(1884), 338–383.
- ACOUN (Anglican Community Office at the United Nations). 1996. A Christian response to the international debt crisis. Conference programme and recommendations of the Round Table Conference, May 16–17, 1996. ACOUN, New York, NY, USA. 13 pp.
- Baum, G. 1998. Sciences sociales et option pour les pauvres. *Relations*, Mar, pp. 46–49.
- Bellah, R. 1970. *Beyond belief*. Harper and Row, New York, NY, USA. 298 pp.
- Berger, P. 1966. *The sacred canopy: elements of a sociological theory of religion*. Doubleday, Garden City, NY, USA. 230 pp.
- Drache, D. 1995. Celebrating Innis: the man, the legacy, our future. *In* D. Drache, ed., *Harold Innis: staples, markets and cultural change*. McGill–Queen’s University Press, Montréal, PQ, Canada. pp. xiii–liii.
- ECA (Economic Commission for Africa). 1989. African alternative framework to structural adjustment programmes for socio-economic recovery and transformation. ECA, Addis Ababa. UN Ref. No. E/ECA/CM.15/6/Rev.3.
- Fabella, V. 1997. Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT). *In* *Dictionary of mission*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. pp. 117–120.
- George, S. 1976. *How the other half dies: the real reasons for world hunger*. Penguin Books, New York, NY, USA. 352 pp.
- Goulet, D. 1971. *The cruel choice: a new concept in the theory of development*. Athenaeum, New York, NY, USA. 362 pp.
- Gutierrez, G. 1973. *A theology of liberation*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. 323 pp.
- Habermas, J. 1971 [1968]. *Knowledge and human interest*. Beacon Press, Boston, MA, USA. 256 pp.
- Hargreaves, J. 1975. *Sport, power and culture*. St Martin’s Press, New York, NY, USA. 258 pp.
- John Paul II. 1987. *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City, Italy. 102 pp.

- LAB (Latin American Bishops). 1968. Medellín documents: justice, peace, family and demography, poverty of the Church. *In* Gremillion, J., presenter, *The gospel of peace and justice*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. pp. 445–476.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1959. *Pour une civilisation solidaire*. Les Éditions Ouvrières, Paris, France. 141 pp.
- Lopez, D. 1995. *Curators of Buddha: the study of Buddhisms under colonialism*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA. 298 pp.
- Malley, F. 1968. *Le Père Lebret : l'économie au service des hommes*. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, France. 254 pp.
- Mannheim, K. 1936 [1928]. *Ideology and utopia*. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, NY, USA. 319 pp.
- Martin, H.-P.; Schumann, H. 1997. *The global trap: globalization and the assault on democracy and prosperity*. Black Rose, Montréal, PQ, Canada. 269 pp.
- Mihevci, J. n.d. *The market tells them so: the World Bank and economic fundamentalism in Africa*. Zed Books, London, UK. 320 pp.
- O'Brien, D.; Shannon, T., ed. 1992. *Catholic social thought: the documentary heritage*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. 668 pp.
- Orbis Books. 1997. *Dictionary of mission*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. 518 pp.
- Paul VI. 1967. *Populorum progressio: on the development of peoples*. *In* Gremillion, J., presenter, *The gospel of peace and justice*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. pp. 387–415. Internet: listserv.american.edu/catholic/church/papal/paul.vi/p6popp.txt
- Rostow, W.W. 1960. *The stages of economic growth: a non-communist manifesto*. University Press, Cambridge, UK. 178 pp.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, New York, NY, USA. 368 pp.
- SBSGA (Synod of Bishops, Second General Assembly). 1971. *Justitia in mundo: justice in the world*. *In* Gremillion, J., presenter, *The gospel of peace and justice*. Orbis Books, Maryknoll, NY, USA. pp. 513–529.
- Scheler, M. 1980 [1924]. *Problems of the sociology of knowledge*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, UK. 239 pp.
- Serageldin, I.; Barrett, R., ed. 1996. *Ethics and spiritual values: promoting environmentally sustainable development*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank, Washington, DC, USA. *Environmentally Sustainable Development Proceedings Series*, No. 12. 54 pp.
- United Nations. 1995. *Our global neighborhood*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA. 410 pp.
- Wolfensohn, J. 1996. *New partnerships*. *In* Serageldin, I.; Barrett, R., ed., *Ethics and spiritual values: promoting environmentally sustainable development*. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank, Washington, DC, USA. *Environmentally Sustainable Development Proceedings Series*, No. 12. p. 1.

Contributing Authors

Farzam Arbab

Farzam Arbab's doctorate in theoretical particle physics led him to Colombia to work with the University Development Program of the Rockefeller Foundation to strengthen the Department of Physics at the Universidad del Valle. While there he began to study the relationship between science, technology, and educational policy and their effects on development, which led him and a group of colleagues to form the Fundación para la Aplicación y Enseñanza de las Ciencias (Foundation for the Application and Teaching of Science). This organization still functions as a successful development program in Colombia and has earned an international reputation for its application of spiritual principles in education and development. In 1993, Dr Arbab was elected to the international governing body of the Bahá'í Faith, on which he currently serves.

Azizan Baharuddin

Dr Baharuddin's degrees in biology and the history and philosophy of science allowed her to pursue her interest in the relationship between Islam and science. Her research interests and teaching areas include the history and philosophy of science; science and religion; ethics, environmental ethics, and bioethics; gender studies and human development; and futures studies. She has written various publications on the issues of science and faith and ethics and the environment. Dr Baharuddin is an associate professor in the Department of Science and Technology Studies at the University of Malaya.

Gregory Baum

With degrees in mathematics, sociology, and Catholic theology, Dr Baum has for 40 years been a professor of theology and religious studies. He currently teaches religious studies at McGill University in Montréal, Quebec. He has written more than 20 books on ethics and economics, solidarity, and various approaches to social justice within the Christian churches. He is a member of the Karl Polanyi Institute at Concordia University and was a member of a research team on environmental ethics at Université du Québec à Montréal. He is also an officer of the Order of Canada.

Pierre Beemans

Pierre Beemans has degrees in education and philosophy and has worked in the field of international development for more than 30 years, including living and working for extensive periods in Latin America and Africa. He has held both field and management positions with CUSO and the Canadian International Development Agency and was for 3 years a policy adviser in the Privy Council Office of the Government of Canada. Since 1992, he has been Vice-President, Corporate Services Branch, of the International Development Research Centre.

Sharon Harper

Her degrees in journalism, law, and theology led Sharon Harper to seek a position that would allow her to explore the scriptures and practice of the world's religions and their manifestations, roles, and effects in the public sphere. After graduating from Harvard Divinity School, she became the project officer for the International Development Research Centre's Science, Religion, and Development project. She is a lawyer and legal researcher with experience in human-rights and discrimination issues, both domestic and international; an experienced writer and editor; and a program manager who is knowledgeable about mediation and arbitration techniques, issues of gender and research for development, and feminist ethics and epistemologies.

Promilla Kapur

With degrees in psychology and sociology, Dr Kapur has worked as a researcher, teacher of sociology, and counselor–therapist for more than 30 years. She specializes in the sociology of women, family, and marriage and has done extensive empirical research on women, adolescents and girl children, working women, family violence, and sex workers. She has published extensively in these areas, with books in English, Hindi, and Japanese. She has been a student of Indian culture, Hinduism, interfaith dialogue, and integrated human development. Since 1984 she has been the director of the Integrated Human Development Services Foundation, a charitable organization providing counseling and crisis intervention based on the principle of whole health, which includes human and spiritual values. She has been honoured by the British

International Biographical Centre, the American Biographical Institute, and the All India Conference of Intellectuals.

William Ryan, S.J.

Dr Ryan entered the Jesuit Order in 1944 and was ordained into the priesthood in 1957. He has an MA in labour relations and a PhD in economics from Harvard University and has been very active in Canada and the United States thinking, writing, and organizing around social-justice, ethics, and economic issues. He was the founding director of the Center of Concern (Washington, DC) and has been a senior research fellow at the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security and held the chair in Social Faith and Justice at St Paul University in Ottawa. He is the director of the Jesuit Project on Ethics in Politics in Ottawa and was recently appointed coordinator of the Jesuit Centre for Social Faith and Justice. Dr Ryan is the author of many articles and lectures on multinational corporations and the new international economic order, the poor, the relationships between faith and social justice and between faith and culture, and the role of religious people in socio-economic change. He has been working with the Science, Religion, and Development project since its inception in 1993.

APPENDIX 2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CSWR	Center for the Study of World Religions
DAV	Dayanand Anglo Vedic
FUNDAEC	Fundación para la Aplicación y Enseñanza de las Ciencias (Foundation for the Application and Teaching of the Sciences) [Colombia]
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IIT	International Institute of Islamic Thought
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MAIS	Malaysian Academy of Islamic Science
MINDS	Malaysian Institute for Development Studies
NGO	nongovernmental organization
S&T	science and technology
SAP	structural-adjustment policy
SRD	science, religion, and development
TNC	transnational corporation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme