

## **Development and Anthropology (an essay)**



*by Jean-Loup Dherse, Formerly Vice-President (Energy and Industry), World Bank, Washington, D.C.*

### **Man and the economy : friend or foe ?**

Many “down to earth” people would say: “Let us be practical. Let us speak of ‘Man and the economy’ rather than of ‘development and anthropology’ ”. Are they right? It is so comforting to be practical. Both homo economicus and the economy are interacting, but homo *economicus* is only a small part, a caricature of man. Development means more than just economic development and man more than homo *economicus*.

Man struggles to make a living, to build and re-build its homesteads, after natural and also man-made disasters. The economy struggles to understand and serve man and its needs, individually and in community. Does it really succeed? Governments play positive and negative roles, in variable proportions. Opinions as to what governments should and should not do differ considerably, Governments set rules, more or less ethical, and these rules are not always applied, also by governments themselves. .

The unbearable vision of poverty puts everyone who accepts looking at it on the spot. Three main temptations then arise.

- One is to on the whole ignore poverty and concentrate efforts on what works in order to make it work better. This is necessary, but not enough.
- 
- Another is to concentrate on injustice and hardship and try to obliterate it, without looking at th consequences on the way the whole machine performs. This is well intended, but detrimental on the whole.
- 
- Another is to simplify both man and development in looking only at the basic human needs and in trying to satisfy them independently of man’s other

requirements. This tends to cut man in slices and address its development slice by slice.

Economic development may then become an end in itself, and will try to make man its servant. Man loses sight of his own internal unity, starts behaving like an oversimplified puppet (which he is not) and believes that he is a pawn in a complex, de-humanized, system where some have a chance and others do not.. Man is then engaged into a self-destructive process. The economy is then on its way to becoming an absolute, an end rather than a mean, moving from being a servant to becoming the master of an enslaved man.

Economic systems have been developed and tried. This has been the case particularly in the XXth century. Each of them has its own anthropology at the heart of its economic thinking.

Starting from the recent failures, we will look into the present ambiguities, and we shall then try to show what is the minimal mutual consideration that men should have vis-à-vis each other in order to slow down or even stop the destructive processes. We shall then find what is the core engine of human development, so that we may in increasing numbers develop an understanding of our personal and collective challenges and at the end be filled with the hope that such dynamics are possible.

The sections below will be:

- » The two recent failures in development policies,
- » The market : an ambiguous liberation,
- » Denying man's mystery or not
- » Ethics : a strategy of respect
- » Love in action

### ***The two recent failures in development policies***

In the academia as well as in literature and in the media there were for years two main roads toward economic development and they have both been tried during the XXth century, leading to huge failures and enormous waste, not mentioning human suffering.

#### **Forcing development**

In the first one, economic development is centrally managed. A corpus of civil servants makes all the important decisions, which are enforced. Economic management sits on a single-party system where the population is indoctrinated and kept under fear. This has

been the case in the USSR, and in many small countries where it system spread, like Nicaragua, Benin, etc... It is still the case in North Korea, Cuba, Myanmar, Vietnam, and also China, in a more subtle way<sup>1</sup>. These systems require centralised authority on all political, economic and social matters,. The logic of such systems is for them to become threats to the rest of the world, and to extract money from blackmail. But the money required for military spending (needed for blackmail and internal security) and for feeding the people becomes larger and larger. Except possibly for China (which seems to be even crueller to its citizen, while achieving some economic success) the process leads toward self-destruction<sup>2</sup>. At the time these lines are written, both Koreas are meeting and one can imagine the difficult situation of the South Korean government when it estimates the eventual cost of reunification.

Their citizens have no other choice than becoming either a *homo sovieticus*, or a dissident. In fact they keep low (except when wooing the regime), and one day in the USSR, where the party understood early that it would never acquire the support of the masses, the intelligentsia has stopped playing the game. Totalitarian systems cannot reform. They can only implode. This is why dissidents are so meaningful, even when martyrdom reduces to very small numbers.

The fall of the Soviet system is a tremendous source of experience, not yet fully studied. What is quite remarkable is that a small number of extremely courageous people can, through standing up and refusing to run after personal power or money, make those very powerful systems to collapse<sup>3</sup>. This is true in totalitarian systems. It is also true (albeit less spectacular) in those systems where governments are dependant on a politically powerful public sector (in a monopoly position) and where the residual private sector is made dependant on government decisions.

How the Soviet system actually collapsed through implosion can be better understood when reading the excellent book written in 1999 by George Weigel on Pope John-Paul II. The failure of the other development system is less spectacular. Nevertheless it took great courage on the part of small numbers of people fighting for democracy and justice in order to get rid of the cancerous power systems built by self-serving leaders often wooed by the international community.

The economic, human, environmental disasters of such policies are obvious, except to the nostalgic. Experience proves that economic development cannot be forced onto man. Carrots do not grow because people pull their leaves. One cannot force development.

### **Buying development**

At the same time, and for many reasons, including strategic, many other countries embarked onto another road of development.

The richer nations financed development institutions, either their own (bilateral), or multilateral such as the World Bank. These institutions have been financed by the taxpayers when bilateral (with the open purpose to provide markets for exported goods

and services), or by the bond market, based on the credit rating of the large countries, as for the World Bank. Money started flowing toward and through weak governmental institutions in weak countries. The result has been very mediocre to say the least. Star countries have fallen, such as Indonesia, or are still falling, such as Kenya, Tanzania, Senegal. Not only major sectors of the economy are ailing, but also wrong structures have grown out of flow of funds, through mismanagement or corruption. Corruption has also deleterious effects among the corrupters abroad, which often demand to be corrupted back by the people they corrupt in the first place.

Financial markets have recent been in crisis, when some holders of assets (sometimes mostly local) wanted out because of their growing lack of confidence. Once started, a financial crisis becomes quickly political when the local government – weak and often corrupt at least to a degree - tries to defend itself in asking for public trust. This often fuels the crisis further. The crisis becomes moral when people (often students) go to the streets and demand the dismissal of the corrupt. The problem is then to extract the cancer from the patient country without killing it. The international community (who have, along with individual governments and international or private institutions, fed the local rulers for years) is called for help, and accepts in order to contain the development of the troubles.

When I was in the World Bank in 1985, I had a study made by a courageous external consultant on the 120 local development banks supported by the World Bank in 70 countries. They had borrowed altogether about \$ 50 billion, including 15 from the World Bank itself. Out of the 120, many had disappeared, most of the others were in intensive care, only a few were reasonably healthy. The disease was not poverty, but lack of resistance on the part of their weak structures to the requests for services made by influential individuals, including authorities at all levels in the country.

What happened in many less successful countries can be illustrated by a short fable. A poor man tends his poor garden, with stones and brambles in a corner, little soil, but on which he can grow barely enough for his family. A well-intended foreigner comes, and is touched by this sorry situation. The foreigner leaves after promising to bring water, and the poor man is delighted at the prospect. Later, the foreigner comes with a water-hose and opens it. The powerful stream of water damages irreversibly the garden, inundating part of it and removing the layer of fertile soil. The poor garden is destroyed. Feeding the garden in this deliberate but inadequate manner has not induced a big step-up in production, but on the opposite has destroyed the feeble processes that were providing the small keep that was necessary.

Too much money was pumped into too weak structures. Additional means are not put at the service of initiatives and efforts that are viable. Viable efforts require both a constant and precise tuning of production of goods and services to requirements, and also an incentive for offering quality and innovation. This cannot be done at the stroke of the open.

“You have forced us to run, when we still had to learn to walk”, was the intelligent comment made to me by a head of government in a poor country.

On the whole this shows that money cannot by itself buy development. When it reinforces central inefficient structures and behaviours, aid can destroy genuine structures of management and of responsibility, built over centuries of successful survival. Wrong and inefficient structures grow quickly instead. More responsible and useful people cannot emerge when the less scrupulous manage to have their hands on most of the handles.<sup>4</sup>

### **Anthropological shortcomings cause disasters**

From this fable, we can remember that economic development has to do with multiple initiatives, like a plant works through a rooting system that includes myriad rootlets. Economic development is a living process, where free human initiative, ability to take risks and good work are required as well as constant internal pressure toward better satisfaction of precise needs by precise producers.

Economic development requires men, money and management, but above all it must be cultivated. The development process can best be compared to good agriculture, where farmers prepare, clean, make good choices, but know that they do not create growth. They just allow it to happen and help it happen. Of course skills and basic resources are required, but also freedom and a sort of competition where services provided to the community are valued freely by this community. The proponents of these two disastrous types of policies have both forgotten freedom and competition as tools that drive economies. Central management (whether forced or not) have failed.

The cost of such attempts is immense, although seldom approached. One can consider alternative scenarios of development: the one that took actually place and became history, for instance in the Soviet Union, and one “medium” scenario of development that could have taken place if the country policies had been similar to countries having kept their (however mediocre) practices.

In the real scenario, Ukraine has been destroyed as a grain feeder for itself, for Russia and for the world. Chemical weapons have been produced at the cost of several hundreds of billions of dollars and will require similar resources to be destroyed, to no one’s benefit as the end products are useless and the technologies not conducive to better production. The environment has been hopelessly degraded in many large areas, skills of people have been developed without allowing them to take initiatives, etc... There is an immense economic cost, in addition to the human waste and sufferings. Mediocre development would have spared all these and many more disasters. The end results would have been much better, even with very mediocre economic management.<sup>5</sup>

One can make similar statements in much smaller countries having been through such upheavals.

Both economic and political systems (totalitarian and money-driven) have failed because they are based on deficient anthropology. In the end, man is neither a pawn that can be forced, nor someone that can just be bought, even where corruption can be rife. In both systems, man is denied having any specific value.

This recent historic trend away from these two disastrous strategies should give all of us hope. Indeed, both wrong ways have highlighted the fact that man needs freedom in order to initiate economic life and make it grow. Both types of State economies deny individuals the right to develop their own business activities: Marxism because of its ideology, the other type because of the single-party system and its inherent corruption in. They both rely on the supremacy of the government's role in economic development. Ordinary people starting or running a business find that they need to be "protected" by the government or by groups of people close to the officials that run the country<sup>6</sup>.

If anything can be learned from these sad stories, it is that man should be reinstated as the centre of the development issue. But we have still to make progress on whom we call man.

### ***The market: an ambiguous liberation***

As a result of these terrible facts, most governments and most countries are today in favour of competition, with market-driven allocation of resources. This is true in the former Marxist-run countries where individuals, families, and other groups have experienced the change of system as liberation. In other countries, the role of central government is deeply reconsidered. Monopoly positions (which can be in the public sector, in the private sector or in both) tend to lose, at least partly, their grip on the economy and also on the political system supporting the central government. The field becomes more open to private initiative on the part of whoever wants to take risks. This is, when it takes place, liberation.

Except in a few backward situations and in reaction against these two mistakes, the market economy has taken over. Genuine markets are indeed tools that can prevent power to concentrate where it cannot benefit the community at large. Prices are no longer fixed by civil servants, as was the case in both systems, feeding therefore cancerous concentration of power and money stifling initiative. Initiative no longer requires assent on the part of the powerful, which require personal favours or bribes.

But this "liberation" can turn sour in a short time. Deep changes have taken place, democracy has been strengthened, but the old internal power structures prove often quite resilient. Mafias have expanded, which have similar effects as previous situations: stifling initiatives, concentrating power and money in irresponsible hands. Liberation has taken place, but sometimes bringing other diseases.

This by itself shows that man has within himself at the same time what is required for economic life, and also a certain ability to destroy it. Man seems to be the key.

## **A new situation is presently developing in the world**

Two concurrent trends are becoming dominant in the world:

- Competition is becoming more and more intense, and prevails in larger and larger areas. Some economic activities (financial, for instance) are globalised, others are in the process of becoming global.
- 
- Technical change is getting faster and faster. It concentrates on communications but it causes structural change in most parts of the economy world-wide.

As a consequence, firms are facing increasing competition and as a result are more and more conscious of short-term pressure. Time and money become more and more precious and this pressure spreads over the personnel at all levels. Protections and habits are often torn in pieces. Any C.E.O.'s time horizon is getting nearer.

The last time there was such a combination of pressure and speed of change was a certain period in the XIXth century. We tend – at least in Europe – to underline today the social cost of this period in Europe. Masses of workers were groping for jobs, and those jobs were poorly paid. A small proportion of employers were conscious of the social consequences of their decisions (while perhaps less and less free to decide otherwise). But most of them were accepting this as a fact of life that was good in the end since wealth creation was globally very rapid.

Are we not in a similar situation today? Indeed:

- Wealth is created at a very high rate.
- 
- Its distribution is a burning issue everywhere. The distribution issue is raised both within countries and between countries.
- 
- There is a high human cost everywhere change takes place, if only because competitive pressure hits individuals across continents where habits, expectancies, standards of living and levels of protections are very different.

One thing should be on our minds: we tend, especially in Europe to blame our XIXth century ancestors for their oblivion of the human cost of this huge wealth creation. We even tend to blame on them the emergence of socialism and of its Bolshevik variation (Lenin, Russia, 1917). Are we sure that we are not making a similar mistake today?

## **Constructive competition**

Quite obviously, competition is an active force in nature, and man is a competitive creature. When we look at a litter of lion cubs, we see the wisdom of their instinctive nature: they fight each other in play, but they manage not to harm each other. Playing gives them strength and flair and they acquire capacity for survival. Some of the male will be able to compete and become dominant males in the tribes, increasing the genetic wealth of the community of lions. Competition benefits each of them and also all of them.

Competition can therefore lead toward the good of all and the good of each.

### **Destructive competition**

But it can go the wrong way. The Romans picked up for fighting each other in the Coliseum in Rome the strongest and fittest men they could find in the people they had conquered. Goliath – if he lived in Roman times, would have been captured and forced to train and fight as a gladiator. Gladiators fight individually one against the other, which was cruel enough<sup>7</sup>. They compete for their life: losing the contest may cause them to lose their life. This is the wrong end of competition.

Competition in the economy can remain in the area of “being among the best” and enjoying more growth and profits than competitors. This is right. It can also degenerate into “fighting for one’s life in the short term”. It is tantamount to mutual destruction. It is not human.

There is a way to compete that degenerates into making it a deadly game for all.

### **Conditions for constructive competition**

Between the two practices, there is a fine line. On the right side, the individual can have a specific value, on the other, it has no value, or too small a (commercial) value.

Competition therefore degenerates when people are deprived of a specific human value.

Otherwise it remain within the area where both the community and also each person is served and protected.

Competition, the best way to allocate resources, can be a tool for the benefit of both the individual and the community if man is given a special value. It can also be a tool for destruction.

It is possible to list the conditions that must be met by competing decision-makers for competition to be constructive. They can be listed under four headings. The decision-maker make must:

- master the field of knowledge (quantifiable knowledge) which deals with the issue.
-

- understand that his action takes place in the midst of structures (legal, organisational) which are always somewhat imperfect, leading to inefficiencies and also injustice. He has then to elect either to work through such less than ideal situation or try to bring improvements and reform, or to rebel, thereby preventing the work from being done, possibly at the expense of his own position<sup>8</sup>.
- 
- opt for an attitude feeding mutual trust between people, rather than resorting to tricks. Tricks can be efficient in the short term, but they destroy trust. The trickster must then resort to coercion or to bribing in order to make up for the confidence he no longer inspires.
- 
- somehow find out before deciding what are going to be the consequences of his decision on other people.

One can easily understand why decision-makers pay attention to the consequences of what they plan to do on those who can resist them. They have to be compensated, or “put on board”, so to say. In other words they have to be forced or bought out, in order not to resist the decision.

One can also understand that decision-makers will pay attention to those who can benefit from their decision: they will try to mobilise them at their service, which will allow an increase in their ambitions.

But why would decisions-makers pay attention to the consequences of what they are to do on those who can neither oppose them nor help them? The only reason why they could do so is that they consider all other people as values to be considered irrespective of their capacities to help or to oppose effectively. Considering individuals as specific non-quantifiable values is a critical point.

This last point may cause surprise. One would normally say no one has to consider the results of what he does beyond the rather close circle of those who can do something for or against him. The others have to take care of their own interests.

This is the heart of the matter: who is the other for me when I make a decision? Is he only a tool that I can use for my own (legal and legitimate) purposes? Or is he, like me<sup>9</sup>, a mystery? Is competition an end by itself or a tool for a better world that may include values that competition cannot provide? Should the economy be a god or a servant? How to ensure that it is and remains being an efficient servant?

### ***Denying man's mystery or not***

This is where lies the fundamental anthropological issue: in the heart of any decision-making process. We know the importance of competence, of structures, of mutual trust. But these are not enough: We all have to make an anthropological choice: either man has, in this specific decision I am about to make, a specific, non-utilitarian value, or not.

Either man has for me a special anthropological value, or not. There is no in-between. My choice is unique and important, however humble I may be, and I have to make this choice every time I make a decision, any decision.

I have therefore to choose. But of course I would like to abstain from choosing.

### **Do I really have to make this choice?**

At first sight, many people hope that this anthropological issue can be circumvented. They believe that other people should be protected by authorities and also by themselves: everyone has to take care of their own interests. If this is true, then utilitarian initiatives, in the proper legal and possibly ethical framework, should be sufficient, and I would not have to protect my neighbor for any other reason than protecting myself.

In this line of thinking, if I am competent, able to accept less-than-perfect structures while reforming them, and a builder of mutual trust between individuals, no one can expect more from me. These conditions, implemented by just laws well applied, and by good ethics should provide all what is needed in order for the combination of self-interest to enable overall justice and prosperity. After all, the “invisible hand” from Adam Smith was supposed to work in a reasonably high moral environment.

This means that there should be systems of just laws and good ethics<sup>10</sup> that can operate this reconciliation and allow me not to consider that people are values, beyond their positive or negative utility for me. Mankind since its beginning is seeking after such systems. The “best” system has yet to be found.

Of course a minimum of rules and principles are required. This is very obvious today on the international scene, when globalization reduces the regulatory powers and open doors to abuse such as money laundering, and also practices closer to better management.

Centralized economic management, whether by force or by money, does not work. Can market work better? If so, at which conditions? Can the anthropological value of man be translated into a set of laws and ethical principles and put in practice? If so, I might be relieved from having to make the anthropological choice.

Laws and principles are required, but are they sufficient? By themselves they do not make up for all what is lost when one denied specific value to man.

But there are costly consequences to decisions where man is denied his specific mysterious value.

### **Consequences of making the wrong anthropological choice**

If the decision-maker ignores others<sup>11</sup>, three things will happen:

- the decision maker will find it more and more difficult to accept that other people do exist. He may then do very foolish things, even though he may be very intelligent and very successful. The decision-maker will get increasingly blind. He will aim increasingly at money for the sake of money, power for the sake of power, good image for the sake of good image. Many intelligent and successful individuals have ended up in disasters because they thought their own interest was the only important thing for them to consider, other people being just tools for their own interests. The decision-maker so-to-say deteriorates, it is a risk for him and a handicap for the rest of the world.
- 
- the area of activity around that decision-maker will become dangerous. Any newcomer wanting to be active in his neighbourhood and who has values (giving a specific value to any man) will find the place biased against him<sup>12</sup>. He will then have to:
  - either drop his values, play the same game and become cynical,
  - or accept being rejected into a ghetto while keeping his values, but becoming useless,
  - or, and this is the only good way for him, manage cleverly and honestly to stay in the race while keeping his values
  -
- The decision-maker may well benefit from his decision, even in the long term, but there will be an macro-economic cost borne by the planet<sup>13,14</sup>.

To make a cost estimate of a decision, one has to compare the consequences on the planet of the alternative decision (the one that would be made in taking into account the consequences of the decision on everyone). One has to compare two scenarios depending on whether a specific decision is made one way or the other and to develop “comparative accounting for the planet”. One evaluates the difference in the macro-economic situation of the planet in the two alternative evolutions. This approach has yet to be developed. It is the only way to estimate the comparative cost of making a decision rather than another one. We tend to overlook such macro-economic comparative losses.

The world is sent on a globally less profitable course<sup>15</sup> when decisions are made without looking at the consequences on those who can do nothing for or against the decision-makers. Wealth may have been created, but large costs may be hidden because not accounted for by anyone (like environmental damage but also unquantifiable human and social damage.

Many economic “achievements” are made at the expense of people, communities and territories or of the whole planet without anyone looking at these downsides. The problem is not so much that the rich rob the poor, but that the selfish rob the planet as a whole, the selfish being those who (wherever they are on the social scale, or even if they are legally right in their decisions) do implicitly consider others as mere instruments for their own purposes, denying them a specific value.

Respecting man is therefore the way to protect the planet as a whole, with people on it. The anthropological issue is at the heart of the future of the planet: if man is a mere tool for other men, the planet degrades from both a social and an economic viewpoint. On the other hand if man takes care of the consequences on others of what he does, the planet will improve in all aspects, economic, social, environmental, human.

### ***Ethics : a strategy of respect***

#### **A comprehensive and practical definition of ethics**

Quite obviously the above means that there are no sets of laws that can induce enough mutual protection in decision-making processes. The co-operation of the individual beyond the realm of the law is required. A strategy of respect has to be accepted and practised. It is at the end a personal option that is required when making any decision: are others for me just tools or are they “mysteries”, having a specific anthropological value. Laws and systems can help, but cannot fully make up for the lack of a personal option.

A strategy of respect is required on the part of everyone making a decision, any decision.

As already mentioned, a strategy of respect will include all the conditions mentioned in order to make competition constructive, i.e.:

- Competence,
- 
- Accepting less than perfect situations but being an agent of reform,
- 
- Being a proponent of mutual trust between individuals,
- 
- Opting for the positive anthropological choice.

One can define applying this strategy as being ethical. Ethics then contains the four components, equally important, with none to be overlooked or forgotten.

#### **A practical way for all (Catholics or not) to tap the Church’s treasures**

The four questions that the ethical decision-maker does consider before acting are:

- Am I competent enough to make this decision? How can I find what I may be missing?
-

- I am involved in an imperfect structure, with inefficiencies and some injustice. Do I accept these, and am I going to be an agent for reform and improvement of these structures?
- 
- Am I going to be a promoter of mutual trust, rather than a manipulator, doctoring truth to suit my immediate needs?
- 
- Am I going to try to find what would be the (negative) consequences of my decision on people, and especially on those who have nothing to do with it and cannot thwart my plans?

It may be helpful to remark that this analysis recoups the one made by the Catholic Church in its Social Teachings. The mere concept of considering the other as a mystery and not as a mere tool for one's purposes is rich enough to lead to most of the components of the Social teachings.

- Looking at the consequences of one's decisions on those who can do nothing for or against the decision-maker is equivalent to aiming at developing the "*common good*", which can be defined as the combination of the good the community and of the good of each of its members<sup>16</sup>. In fact the quest for the common good is at the center of this entire document.
- 
- Each decision is then at the same time rational in terms of competence, legitimate corporate or collective interests and also of caring for everyone. There is an element of disinterestedness, of unselfishness, in each decision. This is real *solidarity* (I take care of your interests not knowing whether you will reciprocate, and not ordinary solidarity, which has often, a hidden contractual slant).
- 
- The *universal destination of the private ownership of goods*<sup>17</sup> is implemented through the process, where the decision-maker is clearly fulfilling his responsibility not only toward his employer (which may be the State, a Church, an NGO or a corporation) but also toward everyone. He is "universally co-responsible".
- 
- The right to personal initiative is recognised: respecting other people requires leaving them the possibility to exert this right<sup>18</sup>.
- 
- Subsidiarity is also present. It is obviously a good way to organise a group ('let decisions be made by those who are closest to the ground and have at the same

time all the required knowledge and abilities'). This is an obvious consequences of But – even more important - it is also the way for anyone being in a position of authority to help those who depend on him to develop their talents. This is a parental, even fatherly, function, where the decision-maker does not behave as the owner of his position, but as the servant of the community he acts in and for. It is not quite clear whether this deeper meaning of subsidiarity can be derived from this concept of mutual respect.

As a consequence, one can visualize that the proposed definition of Ethics offers a way for the implementability of the Social Teachings of the Catholic Church. These teachings can therefore become tools for decision-making and a service offered to the whole world.

This approach can provide an answer to the double challenge:

- To convince non-Catholics that they are concerned by the Social teachings of the Church as are all Catholics,
- 
- To convince everyone that these principles are a tool for decision-making, not just an interesting and valuable theory. The present approach is an attempt to progress in this direction.

Economic systems can find in this approach a guide for their designing. Systems, structures, laws, will be helpful inasmuch as they make it easier for individuals to make ethical decisions as defined above.<sup>19</sup> This would be a source of hope for the world, beyond all ideologies.

But is respecting others enough and what does respect mean in the end?

### **Implementing respect for others**

*Paying consideration for others may mean a variety of attitudes, from a minimum to no maximum. Where do we stop having consideration for the fate of the other is a permanent issue in each decision we make. We can in practice put limits to our willingness to be altruistic. This may in fact divide us internally: governments and institutions have duties, then ourselves, then everyone is and should be on his own. This is a common type of thinking. This is far from being the worst case. Something can probably be built on such an approach.*

*The minimum is providing them with proper compensation if they are harmed. This is a legal issue. Any additional requirement is of an ethical nature that requires a free individual decision on the part of the individual or the institution that does the harm. The minimum may not be enough to avoid specific overall damages.*

A proper combination of legal and ethical rules might help toward a level of respect that could be considered as a notable improvement on most situations. Exploring toward them is a requirement for all.

In practice, when an individual or a corporation has to make a decision and want to be ethical, the approach could be the following. A true story will give quickly the idea.

But can a world based only on self-interest and on proper A multinational corporation in chemical specialties, with small units, develops problems and has to get more efficient and leaner. This means cutting costs and the new CEO manages a study with internal and external consultants and comes to the conclusion that one of the company's research centers (80 people, old-timers, competent but a bit remote from competition) should be dismantled and that these 80 people should be dismissed.

One of the two COO's does not accept this decision, and although these 80 people would be adequately compensated, he asks his boss to postpone the decision by one week during which he will try to provide a better solution for everyone. He indeed is strongly motivated by the damage that these 80 people and their families, etc... would have to suffer and would like to find a better alternative. After five days, and much thinking<sup>20</sup>, he comes up with another solution : the research center should be disbanded but a consumers technical support center should be set up with 50 of the 80 people. The company would then be able to sell not only its products but also advice into making the best use of them. The people are knowledgeable about the products and their use and could perform this function.

This was tried and achieved. The customers were slow at start to accept paying for these services but understood that it was in the end in their interest, and the corporation made a breakthrough in its very competitive environment.

This shows how consideration for th ones that were going to suffer (even if adequately compensated) brought on the table a solution that was either not thought of in th fort place or discarded early in the study process.

The point in this story is to show that caring for those who will suffer may open the imagination for other solutions that were just not considered. It may well happen that a better solution for everyone os found, such as in this case.

Obviously, there is no guarantee that there is no better solution for all. In that case at least a variety of solutions, with their plusses and minuses can be studies, all including the consequences of each decisions on all people, including those which are remote. Solidarity is allowed to emerge in an otherwise wholly utilitarian world. And the choice between sheer utilitarianism and a degree of real solidarity is then made very concretely on the basis of equally thought-out alternative conclusions.

The door is opened to real solidarity at the core of the decision.

One may then wonder how far the decision maker may be enticed to go away from

institutional self-interest and therefore what sort of paradigm should be expected from decision-makers on a practical basis.

Indeed, the COO's attitude vis-à-vis the 80 people to be dismissed was one of disinterestedness, of pure love<sup>21</sup>. And he found that there was a solution that was still utilitarian but less damaging to those who would suffer in the first case.

It may happen that the best alternative solution to the straight dismissal is less profitable and much more risky than the straight closedown of the research center. In that case the decision is very difficult to make and the decision-makers must then do their best. They have gone that far in considering alternatives, it is up to them to assess how far they can go.

We are here at the fringe between a minimum of respect and acting with love.

A brief story will help understanding where one can go from there.

### ***Love in action***

#### **The two types of innkeepers**

The poor wounded man is in the ditch. Someone, the Good Samaritan, is – at last – stopping and taking care of him, in a wholly disinterested manner, since they are perfect strangers to each other. Then there is the innkeeper who makes a living out of caring for guests. He will, at the request and at the expense of the Good Samaritan, take care of the wounded man, after emergency care.

The Good Samaritan acts out of pure love, and his action is very concrete. Love is not a plus, an ornament, in his action: an act of love is not an act with love added onto it, it is an act where love is everywhere: at the source, in the action itself and as a consequence or result of it.

The Good Samaritan is Jesus himself and we are called to imitate Him. We are also called to be the innkeeper. He takes well care of his guests, and he is getting paid for it. This does not mean that he puts no love in his work. He may or may not. The parable leaves the question of who is the innkeeper open: there are indeed several kinds of innkeepers.

The first innkeeper is the one that performs a good job but he does not commit himself to it further than the job requires. He is a good professional and puts his pride into working well, but love is not really part of it. His faith, or lack of it, has no bearing on his work. The services that he provides may be of good standards, but the wounded people are not told what force drives those who help them. The material and psychological needs of the wounded are taken care of. But the wounded are not told that, in the care that is provided to him, Love is alive and is at their service.

There is another sort of innkeeper, where he makes a contribution as close as possible to the one made by the Good Samaritan himself. The people and institutions that practice this attitude are basing their activities explicitly on Jesus Himself. They trust that God will one way or the other provides for what they need. They run their activities in the name of Jesus, they live their daily mission with Jesus, in His presence, with His help. They mention His name with joy, and describe Him as the perfect Servant. This innkeeper is a believer who acts according to his beliefs.

### **From sheer respect and full love**

Both innkeepers have much in common:

They both must be good managers of the resources they collect. Any wasteful management may in the end be depriving the needy from what they could otherwise get. Sloppy enterprises do damage to themselves and to their shareholders.

They are both ethical in the sense described above:

- one out of respect for others, who are not considered as mere tools for profit;
- 
- the other because he considers others as people sent by Jesus, or even as being Jesus Himself.

Some may say “we do not have to be Jesus in order to do as the Good Samaritan does”. This may be true: Jesus does not claim having a monopoly to love, on the contrary. Being Himself Love, He wants it (or himself) to be shared, to invade all places in a spirit that is the opposite to a spirit of conquest. Therefore, Jesus will not be hurt if someone commits an act of love while not recognising Him behind his good deed.

But wanting to follow Jesus is a powerful motivation for love.

Are both innkeepers interested in helping to remove the cause of the damages suffered by the wounded man, i.e. to get rid of the bandits? The innkeeper that works for Jesus certainly is. He wants to do something to decrease the number of people ending in the ditch. The other may or may not be interested, it is a matter dissociated from his business.

One of the innkeepers is submitting himself to rule of Love. In theory, the other innkeeper does not have to go that far. Respecting others and doing a good job is enough for him.

Hence the question: can ethics based on respecting others be put in practice without love?

One would like to say “yes”, but the answer is not that clear in practice. We all have indeed within ourselves forces at work that may make it more difficult for each one of us to make ethical decisions.

### **The three traps in economic life**

The personal utilitarian approach to decision-making puts a high value, or an exclusive value, on money, on power, and on reputation. These can be, so to say, three goods that are worth acquiring for themselves. This means, in Christian language that they may become idols, rather than simple tools that can be used for better purposes. They are the three main idols of economic life : money for the sake of money, power for the sake of power, image for the sake of image. Quite clearly, there is nothing wrong by themselves in these three goods, and everything depends on the way we consider them: as absolutes, or end in themselves, or as tools for better ends.

It is a fact that we all are, deep in our persons, tempted by these three goods. This may be so incrustated into our beings that be are hardly aware of it when we make a decision. Other times, we are aware, we try to resist, and sometimes we succumb.

### **Internal and external challenge**

This is linked to very fundamental features of our beings and also of our personal stories.

=> *In our persons:*

One could link these three temptations to the three basic needs in the human being: the need for subsistence, the need to contribute and build, and the need to love and be loved, which is a condition for personal growth.

Somehow these three basic requirements are “twisted” in each of us: need for subsistence, through fear of lacking, is turning into greed ; need to contribute, through fear of being oppressed, is turning into pride and will to dominate ; need for love, through actual circumstances where love was denied, is turning into vanity.

Quite interestingly, the three temptations of Christ in the desert relate to these three “twists”: “Change these stones into bread” relates to material goods and greed, based on genuine hunger ; “jump from the corner of the temple and the angels will soften your fall” means “if you jump and if angels prevent you from being hurt, all the people in Jerusalem will know that you enjoy special protection from God. You will be highly admired” and this is the temptation of vanity, and “adore me and I will make you the ruler of the earth” is the temptation of domination, enjoying having power for the sake of power.

Obviously, the three temptations are basic in economic life, and this is where respecting others may fall short of not falling into these traps.

=> *In others and in society:*

When we succumb, we are wounding ourselves. When we deny love to other people, they are also wounded. A “structure of sin” can take place or be reinforced, in which I can become a sort of “pivot”.

Man is a fragile material. Man is easily wounded, by his own deeds, as well as by other. When wounded, he easily becomes a menace. Those whose are would are apt to start wounding others. This is why there is an ongoing series of wrongdoings that create conditions making it difficult for individuals to respect others beyond the strict area of the law or of minimal ethics.

### **Forgiving and healing**

The way out of this vicious circle is personal conversion, and forgiveness. This is the route offered by Jesus to all men. With Jesus it is possible to forgive, to convince, to reform. Others can be helped to heal and become less wounding. Specific structures of sins can weaken and even disappear.

In other words what happens deep inside each one of us and what happens in the world are connected in two sides of the same coin, of the same fight for life, our own personal life, life of others life of the world itself.

It shows clearly that Christians cannot hope for changing the world if they do not accept a route of personal conversion, which they have to humbly offer to everyone.

### **Conclusion**

The anthropology that is best for development is an anthropology of competence, reform, truth and ability to work in one’s own interests i working for the benefit of all those that may have a stake – even very remote - in what we are doing.

This reconciliation between working for all people and working for oneself is not an utopia, if we accept that the world is so imperfect that perfect solutions will be very rare. But there is a way for permanent improvement, that can derail each time one tries to find progress in just one of the areas indicated. Competence and scientific progress are vitally needed, but not enough. Neither is structural reform, nor better reliance on truth and transparency. All are vitally needed, but disinterested solidarity and love for other people are also and perhaps above all necessary.

Necessary above all, because love is the only engine that can at th same time dive us the vision and the energy that we all need to overcome the processes of death that lead to poverty, fear and death, while the world is called to be a beautiful garden in which everyone has a role in serving each other.

The anthropology for development is an anthropology of mutual love.

And this love for man, when man is often so disappointing, has to be based on the existence of Pure Love as the beginning and the end of everything.

*Fourth International Symposium on Catholic Social Thought and Management  
Education - Puebla 2000)*

*Annex to Jean-Loup Dherse's paper on Anthropology and Development*

## **Social impact studies in corporate decision making**

By Jean-Loup DHERSE, formerly Vice-President (Energy and Industry), The World Bank.

### ***Background***

The economic situation, in the world is one of increasingly acute competition among all economic agents. Economic selection, (like natural selection), is very active as a result. Corporations tend to become global. Global corporations are pressing on each other for markets. They run the risk of being taken even before they show any sign of weakness. Some of them may in addition be facing situations where new and agile startups in some e-business may interpose themselves between the corporation and its markets, and then take over the large corporation, however efficient the latter may be.

In some extreme cases, not infrequent, competition is no longer a race toward making the podium (reaching top positions), but a fight between gladiators where the winner has the right, or even the duty, to destroy the loser.

### ***From a global point of view***

The consequences of such a situation are spectacular:

1. a yet unknown speed in the increase of wealth for the world, concentrating mostly in shareholders value. Indeed, among the various components of capital (agricultural land, property, bonds, shares...) shares are accounting for most of the overall increase (doubling) in value in the past ten years.
- 2.
3. a concentration of the global benefits on those who have capital (and are better off). Those who do not are not sharing in these benefits (without necessarily being worse off). Concerning asset ownership and also income, the spread between the richer and the poorer is getting wider. This is the situation both between countries and also between individuals within the same country. Country average figures are less and less representative of individual situations.

- 4.
5. Corporations enjoying a strong position are often proved to be quite vulnerable and their downfall can take place very fast. Many jobs are being created and many other jobs are lost. The balance is very positive for smaller corporations as a whole, and somewhat negative for the larger. Consequences on people and on communities are very high and cause many changes and often disruptions. Governments everywhere face huge challenges, for which they are not always well equipped, if only because their legitimacy and jurisdiction are limited in time and in extension of territory.
- 6.
7. Predictability in market and wider economic conditions has generally decreased. The life cycles of many manufactured goods produced, and of modern technologies, are getting significantly shorter, causing decision-making, both at the political and corporate levels, to become ever more challenging.
- 8.
9. Consequently tensions are getting more visible and more acute in many parts of the world, especially where the positive consequences of globalization are not as visible as the negative ones. This came to light as a surprise to many at the occasion of the recent WTO meeting in Seattle, and to a more modest level in Davos. While such actions on the part of "civil society" are far from threatening the dynamics of the present changes, they may be the tip of a growing iceberg of accumulated hardship and tensions that may, after some years, prove to lead to new, globally unmanageable, situations.
- 10.
11. The social role of corporations is getting both more important and more difficult to manage. Indeed corporate decision-making processes include generally only those items that can be described as a cost or as a benefit to the corporation. The consequences of their decisions on those who can do nothing for or against it are usually outside the scope of their studies, even when consideration is given to some of the "stakeholders". Social consequences of their decisions are therefore left out, when they cannot be translated in benefits or in costs to the corporation. This is true of both many quantitative consequences, and also of most qualitative consequences, which are not quantifiable, such as quality of life, etc...
- 12.
13. To illustrate the present situation in the world, one can go back to the earlier period of very rapid technological and economic change, i.e. the first half of the 19th century, the industrial revolution. Both technological change and competition were then very acute and social consequences of change spectacular. Many families were better off, and life was very hard on many others, with a gap that could be crossed over only by few. Tensions accrued for generations and finally caused the rallying of many people to the ideologies developed in the

meantime by bourgeois intellectual, with communism as their epitome. Nazi totalitarianism was also an indirect consequence of this situation. Stemming from the hardship and shame of defeat and from the fear of communism, it brought Scylla after Charybdis.

14.

15. The analogy between these two periods of deep change in the economy and in society (the 1830's and today) cannot be pushed too far. But it remains that corporate short term "bottom line" policies on one part, and sustainable global social peace on the other, are getting more difficult and also more vital to reconcile. This puts the onus on all political and economic leaders, especially business leaders. In this context, principled business leaders, who are willing and able to reflect on the longer term consequences of the decisions on society, are ever more instrumental for a better future.

### *From the corporation's point of view*

A few points are to be noted:

1. Corporations are causing societal change principally in their decisions. Corporate decisions of some magnitude, made by top management, (and often by the board of directors), are based on feasibility studies where the proposed course of action is fully described, alongside with the description of the requirements (in terms of people, money, management), as well as the benefits (in terms of profits, public image and position in the competitive field) and the risks involved (commercial, technical, strategic, political, etc...)

2.

The negative consequences of the proposed course of action are also carefully considered when there is a risk of backlash on the corporation on the part of those who may be hit and not be adequately compensated. Such compensation is included in the study, as well as the cost of initiatives that the corporation may have to take in order to redress and improve its public image when put at risk in the proposed course of action.

3. Environmental impact studies have become (in the past thirty years or so) an integral part of corporate decision making process. Consciousness of the need to protect the physical environment has indeed become a fact of corporate life. Its impact on decision making is at the same time quantitative (protecting the environment can cause additional capital and running costs) and qualitative: environmental protection as such is important to the corporation irrespective of

- quantification. This is true on three accounts: (1) it is required by law, (2) there is a need to protect the corporate public image vis-à-vis shareholders as well as the public at large, and (3) protecting the physical environment is also a matter of principled leadership on the part of those who participate in the corporate decision-making process.
- 4.
  5. Decision-making is obviously not an exact science, and qualitative considerations are growing in importance for corporate decision-makers, including for those who are uneasy about including anything more than the short term "bottom-line" when they consider their options.

***Proposition : making social impact studies which help devising more socially effective alternative courses of action***

1. It is proposed to principled business decision makers that corporations should add another chapter in their studies leading to corporate decisions in the form of "social impact studies" (SIS). Such studies would be made in addition to feasibility and environmental impact studies. These SIS could also be described as "human environmental impact studies", and existing "environmental impact studies" could be described in terms of "physical environmental studies". Both concepts are quite parallel to each other.
- 2.
3. Social impact studies (SIS) would assess positive and negative impacts of the proposed course of action on those who would be affected (or impacted) by it. Positive impact is often already included in the existing feasibility studies. Therefore concentrating on the negative sides is more fruitful. Impacted people include those who are close to the project, within or outside the corporation, as well as the more remote groups of individuals who might suffer indirect hardship. Some of these people may be legally protected. Others are in the position to weigh on the company in terms of economic disruptions or damage to its public image. Others again have no way to weigh on the corporation: they would nevertheless be included in the study, which would otherwise bring little that is novel.
- 4.
5. Once the study would be made, the question of alternative courses of action would be opened (or re-opened) within the corporation. The purpose is to imagine (or to consider anew) and to design further alternative ways for the corporation to progress toward its aims, that would be less costly to society.
- 6.

The corporate decision-makers would always have to decide in the end what the corporation should do. But the study process will be widened. In giving consideration to the social consequences of its proposed courses of action, the corporation would be assured not to overlook alternatives that would in the end cause less tension in both society at large, and in its components (such as all institutions, including families) as well as on individuals.

The idea is definitely not to press the corporation to accept increases in its project's capital or running costs, but to make sure that it is not overlooking alternatives that are definitely better in social terms, and not more costly to the corporation.

In the process it may well happen that the socially better alternative will prove to be more economic to the corporation itself, though not necessarily. Principled business leadership does not put the corporation at a disadvantage, and can even prove to carry a competitive edge, though it is not based on the expectancy that it will *necessarily* prove more effective for the corporation.

### ***Social impact studies (SIS)***

The content and methodology of a SIS has to be carefully designed. Consultants could develop a typical methodology for SIS to the attention of principled business leaders. Quite obviously, each corporation will want to develop its own methodology with a specific list of points to be covered, etc... Nevertheless one should propose a concrete approach to such studies, in order to help principled business leaders to visualize the challenge that their corporation would face in the implementation of this proposal.

SIS methodology would cover the following points.

1. It includes both qualitative benefits and problems: the upside and the downside are both important in their own right. Indeed positive benefits derived by Peter are not a per se justification for harming Paul, whoever Peter and Paul may be.
- 2.
3. Comprehensive lists of impacted institutions and groups of individuals should be established in each study. The identification of impacted entities is critical and checklists could be developed in order to minimize the risk of overlooking some indirect, more remote institutions or groups of individuals.
- 4.
5. Impacted institutions are those with which the corporation is interfacing. They can be other businesses that are suppliers or customers, local or national communities, local and other governments, as well as other components of the social fabrics, such as families, including the families of the individuals involved.

6.

Impacted individuals and groups of individuals range from those who are close to the corporate project one way or the other, as well as those who are only indirectly affected, even when the link is tenuous. Groups of impacted individuals can be quite remote. An example may be the decision on the part of a corporation to shift imports from a well known source of supply to a more remote one using an unknown workforce, even for a small fraction of the goods required by the corporation. The type of manpower that suppliers may use in remote parts of the world are socially important to the corporate buyer, even if this import represents only a small proportion of the value of the goods sold to the public. The SIS should be as comprehensive as possible.

7. Degrees of impact on institutions and on groups will have to be defined: the aim would be to be able to weigh with the same scales the respective impact of the corporate course of action on each of the impacted institutions or groups of individuals. This may be required in order for the final picture to be readable, and for the respective social impacts of alternative corporate courses of actions be compared at the final decision stage.
- 8.
9. Research will provide results needed for developing a preliminary typical methodology. There is no doubt that developing such methodology could become a very important activity for specialized teams in corporations, in universities, and in firms of consultants.
- 10.
11. Software firms with strong development capacities could be interested in developing methodology and products that could help corporations to identify and assess the consequences of their planned decisions on various categories of people. This could represent for them an opportunity for a breakthrough in management supports.

### ***Additional remarks***

Many corporations already integrate part of this SIS approach in their routine, though not necessarily in the same manner and spirit.

Corporations will face dangers when some people or institutions may want to exploit the social mindedness of principled leadership for their own purposes and ambitions.

Corporations will have to ascertain that their openness to accepting the principle of making SIS for their own internal purposes would not become the source of additional demands made by political or other pressure groups. Corporations have to keep control

over what is a very important and intimate part of their life. This challenge is part of the difficult challenges to be faced by principled business leaders.

On the other hand making SIS as part of their internal routine may also be a major protection for corporations against growing pressure coming from a variety of institutions and voices in society.

Last but not least: widening acceptance of this proposal could spread through a process of positive contagion. Accumulation of such alternatives would make over time a real difference at the local or global levels. The world could become a better place for all.

---

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>For many years, many people living in Europe and in the US accepted that losing freedom was the price that one or two (or three) generations of Russians, or of Chinese, had to pay to get out of poverty. And heavy financial support was provided to these totalitarian regimes in order to buy peace from them. This has proved to be utterly false in the USSR. The situation in China requires more time before it can be truly assessed

<sup>2</sup>China has been able to attract foreign support not only from threatening aggression (this worked with Taiwan), but more recently from opening its markets to foreign firms. US and European governments and firms are competing against each other to court the Chinese government, without regard for the victims of the regime. Public opinion manipulates itself into the belief that economic development will bring China reforms and freedom. This was said for many years of the Soviet Union, and proved false.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. George Weigel's book on Pope John-Paul II, showing how defending truth about man has allowed Karol Wojtyla to be the de facto main threat to Soviet Russia, and how this was clearly perceived at the top level in the Soviet Union.

<sup>4</sup>Fortunately some countries never fell into these traps, and managed to move out of stagnation without falling in those traps. It took special attitudes on the part of their leaders and also on the part of people. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore are among those. The anthropological background to such success stories could lead to interesting conclusions. The same is true in a different manner of those newly industrialised countries, which have been through major difficulties and have courageously emerged as genuinely developing nations.

<sup>5</sup>One can make the same estimates for scenarios such as the development of the nazi-power in Germany, which has led to so much destruction outside and then within Germany. The historical interplay of bolshevism and Nazism, which has been perhaps the most tragic sequence in the XXth century, is responsible for immense destruction, and also lack of opportunities for any people and for the whole world. Of course many argue that destruction leads to reconstruction, which provides opportunities. But one can ask the

people who have been through such stories for their views. They will confirm that their personal stories are on the whole disastrous even though they can presently more fully participate in this reconstruction.

<sup>6</sup>This blunt statement deserves developments specific to the country where it is applied: the poor countries are indeed very different from each other. Nevertheless, it remains true in countries which have been relying heavily on funds provided by bilateral and multilateral aid at the same time have developed “cancerous” internal processes which discourage private initiative, sometimes down to almost nil. Many other countries have developed on their own (like the south-east Asian “dragons”) with heavy participation by individuals and private groups that sometimes have reached huge proportions (like the Korean “chaebols”). In these countries, financial crisis have developed and are an occasion for deep reform, while remaining open to internal private initiative.

<sup>7</sup>Like boxing. Sumo fighting is mutually respectful, although the consequence of the required food ingestion is death at a still early age. Mayas, Aztecs and Incas had very deadly sports like the Romans, or even worse.

<sup>8</sup>One can say that totalitarian structures call for the second attitude, because they cannot reform. (Totalitarian structures can develop in democracies through the convergence toward the “politically-correct”.) On the other hand, in non-totalitarian structures, accepting injustice and being an agent for reform is usually the better choice.

<sup>9</sup>I know that I am a mystery, or I do not know who I am.

<sup>10</sup>Which may help each other but do not fully coincide, except if laws are produced by someone (dictators or majorities) and that the will of that someone is deemed to be ethical by definition.

<sup>11</sup>Meaning those who can do nothing to him either for or against. Obviously, any decision-maker will consider the interests of those who can thwart his plans, and he will try to get a contribution on the part of those who will benefit from what he does.

<sup>12</sup>This is the situation that is called “structure of sin” by Pope John-Paul II in his teachings (*Encyclicals Reconciliatio* and *Penitentia, and Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*). The concept is accessible to non-believers, since the only issue behind it is the question: “Who is the other for me when I make this decision? Is he a mere tool for my purposes, or is he, like me, a mystery?” This question is for everyone, and is not necessarily based on religious belief. Religions may have different answers to offer, but this is another matter. (Indeed, the answer proposed by any particular religion or faith may be one criterion of the value of this religion for mankind.)

<sup>13</sup>This may have happened in the XIXth century. The cost in economic terms of this enormous wealth creation has been tremendous: if indeed, the Bolshevik revolution is the price that has been paid, we can indeed list the costs to the planet (and to the Russian people in the first place) of those events.

<sup>14</sup>When the decision is a crime, one can say that “Crime can pay, but the planet suffers a huge cost from each of them.”. But even when the (selfish) decision is legal, its consequences on the planet are the same.

<sup>15</sup>In spite of the high figures showing wealth creation, and which do not take into account the other side of the picture, i.e. the losses suffered by others. This analysis may surprise economists, but it is no more than the extension to the economic and social environment of the facts now accepted concerning the physical environment. Physical damage to the planet is not accounted for against wealth creation. Social and economic damage has still to be accepted as a macro-economic liability, as was the case for environmental damage twenty years ago.

<sup>16</sup>*Cf. Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Doubleday, esp. §1906 : By common good is to be understood ‘the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfilment more fully and more easily’ and ff. Our proposed definition is well in line with the CCC’s definition and is more “operational” at the same time.

<sup>17</sup>Id. § 2402-5

<sup>18</sup>*Centesimus Annus*, 35, §2. Amongst others (See FR. D.Melé’s paper on Wealth creation, Puebla 2000)

<sup>19</sup>This is a development of chapters 3 and 4 in “*L’Ethique ou le Chaos?*” Presses de la Renaissance, Paris, 1998, by Jean-Loup Dherse and Dom Hugues Minguet, O.S.B., not yet published in English.

<sup>20</sup>And also much prayer as he is someone that integrates his personal spiritual life with his work life.

<sup>21</sup>Love is not considered here as a feeling, but as a way of life where the interests of others take precedence over one’s own interests. It is the result of a personal preference applied if possible in al