

***DEVISING AND REALIZING THE  
COMMUNITY OF MANKIND:***

***THE CHURCH'S PROPOSITION***

*Proceedings of the*

*Conference for the Presentation of the*

*Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*

***UNESCO, 3 October 2006.***



## Summary

	Page
Preface	5
Mgr Jean-Charles Descubes, <i>Presentation of the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church</i>	7
Chantal Delsol, <i>Are family and nation « natural » communities ?</i>	12
Jérôme Vignon, <i>What contribution can Christians make to globalisation ?</i>	20
Cardinal Renato Raffaele Martino, <i>Loving our neighbour, the heart of the Social Doctrine of the Church</i>	34
Associations which supported the Conference	44



## Preface

This brochure contains the main texts of a Conference organised on 3 October, 2006 at UNESCO House, with the participation of Cardinal Renato Raffaele Martino, President of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace and President of the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People. The object of this Conference was to officially present the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, whose French version was published at the end of 2005. A number of Christian lay organisations and movements joined together to organise this event, in conjunction with the Council for the Family and Social Questions of the French Bishops' Conference.

The topic selected, *Creating and Building the Human Community - the Church's Proposal*, was aimed at presenting the Social Doctrine of the Church as the basis of an invitation to work together, permanently open to all those motivated by the building of a society with an ever-greater capacity to meet the essential needs of men.

The participants in this Conference included Msgr. Jean-Charles Descubes, Archbishop of Rouen, President of the Council for Family and Social Questions of the French Bishops' Conference; Chantal

Delsol, philosopher and author of many authoritative works; Jerome Vignon, High-ranking Civil Servant at the European Commission and President of the Assises de la mondialisation (Conference on Globalisation); Luc Ferry, Former Minister, philosopher and also author of many reputed works and Cardinal Renato Raffaele Martino. Apart from Luc Ferry, who did not wish his text to be published, their papers are printed in this brochure on the basis of the texts they have given us. The organizers thank them for having thus facilitated the preparation of these Acts.

The texts of the contributions are followed by a presentation of the movements and organisers associated with this Conference.

An English and a Spanish version of these Acts has also been published and disseminated with the support of the International Catholic Committee for Cooperation with UNESCO which the organisers would like to thank as well as all the people who translated the documents. They would like to thank also Michel Kubler, from *La Croix*, for having moderated the roundtable.

These Acts, which exist in a digital version, can be obtained from Évangile et Société, 32 rue Médéric, 75017 Paris and by Internet from [herve.lhuillier@wanadoo.fr](mailto:herve.lhuillier@wanadoo.fr)

## **Introduction**

**Jean-Charles DESCUBES**

**Archbishop of Rouen**

**President of the Council for Family and Social Questions  
of the  
Bishops' Conference of France**

### **Presentation of the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church**

When he signed the Encyclical *Rerum novarum* on 15 May 1891, I do not know if Pope Leo XIII was aware that this text was to give rise to what Pius XII, in his radio message for Pentecost 1941, called the *Social Doctrine of the Church*, the *Compendium* of which the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace has published.

The word of God and a word on God, the Gospel is also a word on man and society and the Church has always considered it as an integral part of the mission which Christ entrusted to her, namely to affirm the values which allow our society to be human and fair. It has never ceased inviting Christians and men of goodwill to organise the earth in a just and peaceful way.

The Book of the Acts of the Apostles are abundant testimonies of this: at the beginning, then throughout its history, the institutions set up on the initiative of the Church and the writings of the fathers and theologians, whenever the world has undergone in-depth human, cultural and social changes.

It was, however, with the birth and development of the industrial society that the social doctrine was drafted. In France, on the initiative of lay persons (Frédéric Ozanam, René de la Tour du Pin, Léon Harmel, ...) what is termed *Social Catholicism*, but also through the stands taken by the French Bishops during the Restoration concerning child and women's labour then the observation of Sunday as a day of rest.

In Germany, with the Catholic workers' associations of Father Kolping and the action of the Bishop of Mainz, Monsignor Ketteler,

- recalling that the true right of ownership only belongs to God and that an owner cannot be the absolute master of his goods,
- fighting economic liberalism,
- demanding the payment of a minimum wage, the reduction of working hours, the regulation of work for women and the ban on employing school-age children,
- recommending the participation of workers in the profits of the companies,
- and calling for State action in the economic and social field.

The Church's duty is to work with all her might to solve the social question which is the most important problem of our day and age, declared the German Bishops in Fulda in 1869.

Thus a plan on how the poverty of the destitute and workers could be alleviated was prepared with a view to the first

Vatican Council. Its interruption, on 20 October 1870, does not allow us to know if the Commission which directed the work on this subject would have approved it.

But in March 1881, the Count of Breda and René de La Tour du Pin addressed two papers to the Pope which can be considered as the first of the files which led to the drafting of *Rerum novarum*. The Count proposed that the Pope take an initiative by organising a Conference of European Governments in the Vatican during which, while no decision would be made, they would plead the cause of the poor and the workers; a kind of “social Assisi Conference” if you so wish.

The files flooded in from France, but also from Germany, Austria and England (where Cardinal Manning intervened in 1889 in the London Dockers’ strike and obtained advantages for them), and even from the United States and Switzerland (where, in order to aid the Catholics in Geneva which included a large number of poor immigrants, Msgr Mermillod founded the Fribourg Union). The doctrine drafted was taken up by Leo XIII. The way thus opened up by Leo XIII was continued by his successors: the anniversaries of the publication of the Encyclical are all occasions to state and complete the social positions in adapting them to new situations.

What is more, following this, after the meeting of the Latin American Episcopal Council (CELAM) in Puebla in 1979, John Paul II re-launched the expression « social doctrine of the Church » and through this, the social doctrine itself. It must indeed be recognised that in order to respect the autonomy of terrestrial realities, affirmed at Vatican II, it was nonetheless necessary to draw the conclusions of a social nature of the Gospel and of faith.

All during his Pontificate and through four Encyclicals (*Redemptor hominis*, 4 March 1979, *Laborem exercens*, 14 September 1981, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, 30 December 1987, and especially *Centesimus annus*, 1 May 1991), John Paul II worked to make people understand that the social doctrine is an element of the Christian message as such and not only an offshoot. “The teaching and the dissemination of the social doctrine of the Church belong to its mission of evangelisation, he writes in *Centesimus annus* (5). It is an essential part of the Christian message because this doctrine proposes its direct effects in the life of society and places daily work and the fight for justice in the framework of the testimony rendered to Christ the Saviour”.

The decision taken by John Paul II to propose a kind of manual of the social doctrine of the Church goes back to the Synod of American Bishops meeting in Rome from 16 November to 12 December 1997. The Bishops of the United States and the Latin American continent asked the Pope to make available to the laity “a summary or an authorised synthesis of this doctrine” This synthesis “would be limited to formulating general principles, leaving their practical implementation to ulterior developments after a study of the problems linked to different local situations” *Ecclesia in America*, 1999, §54).

The drafting of this document was entrusted to the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, presided at that time by Cardinal François-Xavier Nguyen Van Thuan. In autumn 1999, some Bishops and Rectors of Catholic Universities from various countries were convened. The drafting of this *Compendium* proved more complex than it appeared. Its Italian version was, however, completed in September 2002 and presented in its final version by Cardinal Martino, the new President of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, on 2 April 2004.

Your Eminency, I am particularly honoured to welcome you on the occasion of the second anniversary of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* and its official presentation in France.

The Council that you now preside in Rome is a study body which takes an interest in everything that concerns social justice between nations, the progress of poor countries, international aid and the promotion of peace.

The courageous stands of your Council and the international missions entrusted to its Presidents testify to the Church's fidelity to her tradition of commitment in the service of man for the cause of the Gospel. I sincerely thank His Excellency Msgr. Fortunato Baldelli, Papal Nuncio in France and Msgr. Francesco Follo, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at UNESCO, for their presence. In the drafting of the social doctrine of the Church, the laity has played a decisive role. I therefore thank most cordially and sincerely *Évangile et Société* and its President, Hervé l'Huillier, as well as the Catholic associations which are at the origin of this meeting and responsible for its organisation.

In concluding, allow me to quote one of my predecessors, the President of the Social Committee, Msgr. Joseph Rozier, former Bishop of Poitiers: « the social question is nothing more than the question of man and his future, through the tasks, the activities and the commitments in which his adventure is played out, that of freedom and the relationship with others, that of knowledge and conscience, namely, the relationship with oneself and that of work and the relationship with the world. It means, in every field, recognising, respecting and making man grow in his sphere of existence ».

# Chantal Delsol

Philosopher,  
Professor at the University of Marne-la-Vallée

## Are family and nation « natural » communities ?

We have to manipulate these words with great care. Community, for example, has to be taken in the general sense of “a human group” without the connotated meaning of “communitarism”.

What does the word “naturally” means? The excesses of the word nature are well known : stiffed essence, “given essence”, in the name of the myth, a religion, etc.... All the silly things we may have said in the name of “Nature” : women can not be engineers because it is not in their nature, we find in a magazine article at the beginning of the XXth century... Man is a metamorphic being, this meaning of nature is therefore impossible : metamorphic, but to what extent? Here I will not talk in the name of a religion, but I will start from anthropology : from the characteristics of mankind as we see it appear in History.

We have to differentiate two types of anthropology : philosophical and cultural. Philosophical anthropology, if we single it out, brings characteristics to the human condition beyond cultural differences. We realize that what unites man through time and space are certain fundamental questions : why should I die? Where do good and evil come from? Some

may think that a philosophical anthropology does not exist (philosophy of *desconstruction* : man is a fading track on the sand -Foucault, or the subject of a grammatical fiction - Borges-).

But then, it would mean that anything is possible to mankind, that by consequence it may become too many (Arendt). Since the totalitarian governments, one can not object to the existence of philosophical anthropology anymore. The totalitarian regims, by building a new kind of human being using a voluntarist manner and mistreating him, have shown, by default or abandon, the importance of anthropology. Robert Redeker has correctly demonstrated that the main result of these totalitarian regims is to bring to light the existence of anthropology : we can not do anything we want with man. It does not mean however that we know who is this human being. But that he should be a constant interrogation to us before deciding such and such experiment concerning him. Not everything is possible with man, it in deed means he must have a face.

In return, cultural anthropology is diverse, relative and uncertain. It brings answers to fundamental interrogations. Each culture percieves man in its own way from the shared point of view of philosophical anthropology. Every man asks the question of death (beginning with the "Neanderthal man"), but the various cultures answer this concern towards death with different religions or wisdoms.

Our remarks on family and nation stand in this difference between the two anthropologies.

Philosophical anthropology tells us that man is an animal which:

- thinks about about ephemeral nature.
- knows the separation between good and evil, the latters presenting the same general characteristics (evil always stands on the side of separation and good on the side of union)
- lives within a time scale and seeks to last

- answers its interrogation with cultures ( ways of life and thinking)
- transmits this culture to its lineage
- is different and search its own identity and the one of the group he belongs to.
- works for the permanent metamorphosis of his situation to try and improve it.

Then, we may say that

- a group is necessary to a human being for **transmission**, in order to differentiate the subject from his kinsmen
- a large group called community or society is necessary to the human being to incarnate the identity of the culture he belongs to.

Regarding this, family is natural in the philosophical anthropological meaning and nation is too. But these two groups are metamorphics.

I will then answer progressively to the question.

There is no humanity without a form of family nor without a form of government. Nevertheless, family and nation may change forms. The question, then, is to know which will be the consequences of these transformations. For each culture is a coherent world : a type of family corresponds to a type of human ideal, a type of joint identity corresponds to a vision of society (what I mean is for example that we can not develop simultaneously a religion with an authoritarian God and tolerant politics or independant individuals and a welfare State, etc). A lot of different models are possible : but before we start defending one model, we must know to which cultural world it belongs to. The two institutions we are discussing will bring here two typical examples.

In his work The Origin of the Family, Private property and the State (1884), Engels relied on the work of the

ethnologist Morgan to stress that the oldest forms of families are polygamous or polyandrous, and that conjugal marriage recently appeared in history. Ancient times are characterised at the same time by group marriages and collective propriety. Marriage appears with property and corresponds to the expression of male domination. Engels, and after him marxism, justifies the abolition of the middle class family type because of its alienating nature, but he goes further: he justifies this abolition by establishing that this family type appeared historically after other types which could therefore reappear.

Today's discussions on family types base themselves on the same premises. The book written by the ethnologist Cai Hua about the Nas in China (*A fatherless and husbandless society*, PUF, 1997) describes a matriarchal society living in the Yunnan province today, and in which the "system of visits" prevails, a sexual system both polygamous and polyandrous. The author's conclusion is eloquent: "marriage doesn't appear as the only sexual way of life institutionalized as possible anymore. Without marriage, a society may perfectly keep on and work as well as others." (p. 360), "the Nas case is a testimony of the fact that marriage and family can't be considered as universal nor logically or historically anymore" (p 359).

If marriage in groups or polygamy/polyandry have existed before or exist somewhere else, it demonstrates that the institution of classical European family have only a relative value and could easily be abandoned. It does not represent a fundamental human constituent, it is not part of a "human nature".

Here appears a matter of cultural anthropology. The problem set by maternity is not: can men live without the European scheme of marriage or family? Obviously, they can, it is confirmed both historically and geographically. But the problem is: what are the consequences on this kind of family, in what cultural world it establishes , or inversely, which world would it arouse if it establishes itself.

The case of the actual Nas, where the man is only a “water-cart man”, as they call him, and where paternity does not exist, is frequently found in primitive societies. The major characteristics of the matriarchal pattern are the absence of marriage, birth control by the mother, eviction of the father and sacralisation of pleasure (cf. Michel Rouche, “Is matriarchal family back?”, in Family, from science to ethics, Institute of family science, Bayard, 1995, p.84).

Today’s obliteration of the father in favor of a modern form of matriarchism is done in the name of Progress. However, the whole of this Evolution consists more in a movement backwards to ancient forms from before the apparition of the patrilineal and patriarchal patterns.

Must we consider as a progress an evolution which has made us progressively closer to ancient matriarchisms? It is by starting from the criteria of the referents we believe in that we are able to define what is a regression and what is an improvement. What are the essential justifications of the stable biparental family, which our tribes are replacing? We will set ourselves outside the religious standards which are not consensual anymore: conjugal faithfulness, for example, can not in itself require any justification anymore.

The stable biparental family can recognize itself only one justification: it aims at raising children endowed with autonomy, that is to say, subjects.

The subject is not a fundamental idea of nature. The person grows as subject, recognizing by himself the hard law of reality. In order to do this, he has to take in, consciously, the category of possible. It is only from this awareness of possible that he becomes able to make choices. The subject used to initiative receives the fatherly law, and the one of substitute authority, to be able to pass on his own law later on: he becomes autonomous. A human being becomes an autonomous person only when he makes the law his own, if he accepts to think for

himself the limitations, even if it means he has to grope around to search constantly its outlines.

In other terms, personal autonomy only establishes on the awareness and the responsibility of the limitations: we only give ourselves our own laws because we hope to master our own end, something we do not give to others to take care anymore, like the child do in the mother's almighty realm. The human being could not become autonomous without making the sacrifice of the principal of pleasure in order to inhabit the reality of his own limitations. If he does not step forward in the recognition of these limitations throughout education, he won't free himself from the category of the impossible or of his own restrictions : because that, nobody can do it for him. On the contrary, he will have to undergo the exterior law of reality: the community law in holistian communities. A mathriarcal society is not capable of sheltering personal autonomy. This, because it lies within the double logic of protection and submission, where autonomy is absent.

The raising to autonomy is a task of closeness, affection and patience which is accomplished by making attempts and mistakes and where risk is accepted. Only a family where the roles of authority are shared and lasting can take on that risk. The family possesses the means to propose an education of "initiatives", essential to the subject's construction. The State can only provide an "initiation".

Yet, the disappearance of paternal authority, if not of the father, will not make global authority disappear and won't protect the individual from oppression. Because the individual eventually needs a law and the government, no matter which one, will impose it upon him. In order not to undergo paternal authority anymore, he will be under the influence of an anonymous one. This second authority will be different from the first: governmental law will fall directly, strong with its legal power, on a defenseless individual's neck. Whereas, parental law may have a few chances, if we pay attention to it, to aim the learning

of freedom which will develop a subject capable of mind independence when facing all the types of power.

It is even easier to understand that nation is not “natural” in the philosophical anthropological meaning. The phenomenon of nation is recent, and perhaps there is in Europe only a few nations that really are one in the Renan meaning of the term. We know to which historical need the nations answered to, the model they aroused (see Hegel’s regrets concerning the German constitution and the attitude of his country towards France). We also note that the Westphalian model is, more or less, fading away in favor of larger groups including in themselves more limited ones, here in the name of efficiency, there in the name of worldwide competition. We see that nation, as a model which the Occidental people tried to export all around the world, failed in establishing itself and has even created sometimes harmful or dangerous situations. Nation is a model of cultural anthropology that answers the problems of a given historical situation in a given culture (for example, it is antithetic with tribes). It corresponds to a size and type of society which answered during long centuries to the European needs (the Chinese and the Russian on the contrary needed an Empire).

In the structure of philosophical anthropology, human beings need to gather in groups more than autonomous or independent (in the Greek autarchy meaning or the bodinian sovereignty meaning, which are not the same but similar in some ways), to live in their cultural melting pot and to defend it if necessary. These groups go from tribes to Empire passing by all sorts of models, including nation. The interrogation is not: can nation disappear? Obviously, it can. Moreover, it is possible that it already is only a speech: of what independence does she really dispose, and even more, of what real autonomy (France is governed mainly by European laws today) ? The question is better: what will be the changes of our cultural world if we replace nation by bigger and/or smaller groups?

To answer that interrogation, we would need further developments which would have to answer the following interrogations:

What is the coherent size of a group which fulfills the identity need today? (does an individual feel more Basque, French or European?)

What is the coherent group size that guarantees independence or sovereignty in the bodinian meaning? If it is not nation anymore, is it Europe? Or both, each for different needs, in which case we need to change the definition of sovereignty and come back to plural and relatives sovereignties from before Bodin?

These interrogations are all the more intricate that the meaning of identity need has changed: individuals who more and more feel they are “world citizens”, and have become travellers, fear to have to identify themselves to framed groups. They do not accept to dye for the group they belong to anymore, no matter which one, but maybe for fundamental human values even if those are scorned outside of the group.

Finally, the idea of independence and sovereignty have become a great deal abstract. Isn't there only one country today entitled to claim it, the United States? Has the idea of territory, in which nation takes its roots, the same meaning as before?

In other terms, concerning nation, we find ourselves in a period of transition. We know that men need to root their identity in framed groups but we do not know which one anymore.

The hesitations of cultural anthropology should encourage us to explore deeper philosophical anthropology instead of denying its existence.

**Jérôme Vignon**

**President of the**

**Assises chrétiennes de la mondialisation**

**What contribution can Christians  
make to globalisation ?**

*Introduction*

The theme on which I will concentrate will link an essential aspect of the present-day economy, globalisation, with the Christian vision of what constitutes a human society. In basing my discourse on the recent experience of the « Assises chrétiennes de la mondialisation »<sup>1</sup>, I would like to take the fruitful path of research opened up by the tradition of Christian social teaching, in presenting a perspective of what the contribution of Christians could be today.

I shall first of all refer back to the innovation which the Encyclical *Rerum novarum*, represented in its time and the

---

<sup>1</sup> « Dialogues pour une terre habitable », official report of the Assises chrétiennes de la mondialisation, Bayard Press, September 2006.

fecundity which it generated subsequently for economic and social life<sup>2</sup>. I would therefore like to suggest that today's « new things », which have taken practical form through economic globalisation, call for a renewed expression of the Christian vision on the social question.

Then, using the established facts of this Christian vision, assembled in the Compendium but also in more recent texts published by the Bishops' Commissions in Europe, I will endeavour to outline the visions and questions which could be the subject of the discernment and the commitment of Christians.

Finally, I will deal with the difficult question of dialogue on this discernment. This will provide the opportunity to look at the cultural aspect of globalisation and the difficulty of such a dialogue which is sometimes a great source of conflict between Christian anthropology and the utilitarian positions that are expressed on the globalisation platform which has become the platform of Human Rights.

### *1 Fecundity and topicality of the Christian vision of the economic and social world*

When it was published, the Encyclical *Rerum novarum* caused surprise amongst the leaders of European economic and industrial circles, who, at that time, were mainly Catholic. It showed, in fact, an image of industrialisation which revealed its human and social face, the costs which it generated and the sufferings and injustices which it could cause, in the euphoria of an excessive confidence about progress and according to a majority conception of ownership as a right which was not combined with duties. With astonishing audacity, including in

---

<sup>2</sup> « *Rerum novarum* », Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, 1891.

the progressive circles of the day and age, the Encyclical called for the forming of intermediary bodies, particularly of workers' trades unions that would be independent of the employers' world. At the same time, it already distanced itself from Marxist economic visions sealing human destiny in production mechanisms alone.

Out of this was born a humanistic and balanced concept of the relationship between freedom, the creativity of the company and the rules which must enshrine it so that man's dignity is accomplished in work. Over the last century, this vision has deepened. Its practical scope was considerable even in the particular context of French society, which was, however, one of the most marked in Europe by the principle of the separation of political and religious powers. Some of us remember, in this respect, the retrospective given by Martine Aubry, former French Minister of Labour, and who could hardly be suspected of kindness towards the Christian faith, on the platform of the *Semaines sociales de France* (French Social Weeks) during the celebration of their hundredth anniversary in September 2004<sup>3</sup>. I quote Martine Aubry:

« Participating in the drafting of the social doctrine of the Church and involved in political debates, the Social Weeks have led Christians to act and to make things change. As precursors, they proposed, often well before 1914, reforms that sometimes took a long time to be implemented, such as unemployment insurance, universal health insurances, a just living wage, taxes in keeping with income and the reduction of working hours ».

---

<sup>3</sup> « Europe, a society to be invented », 26-27 September 2004, Lille Grand Palais

And Martine Aubry went on to mention, for the North Region of France, « the breakthroughs of which these militants of Christian social doctrine were the inventors or the inspirers, such as the creation of a family supplement in 1919, the first council housing estates on the initiative of Father Lemire at the beginning of the 20th century, and again, the first workers' training school, on the initiative of Father Six in 1919, the mutual benefit societies, production cooperatives and in 1929, the first social insurance systems, precursors of the Social Security System ».

When we place ourselves in the circumstances which led to the visionary Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, we are tempted to think that our economic situation today is profoundly different and calls for an updating which, without a doubt, transcends the anniversary celebrated by *Centesimus Annus*. The need for this updating is justified in two ways:

- First of all, there has been an upheaval in the economic world, not only over the past 100 years, but even over the last fifteen years. A hundred years ago, the new economic event was the progress of industrialisation and mechanisation bringing with them an upheaval of rural societies. Today, and particularly over the past fifteen years with the end of ideological and political rivalry between East and West, the new event is composed by the universalisation of economic globalisation, given the voluntary enrolment in its wake of the very large emerging nations, China, India, Brazil, Mexico, and South Africa, which were first of all recruited by colonisation, then escaped from this in the second part of the 20th century. To these emerging nations, we can today add Russia which is currently negotiating its entry into the World Trade Organisation: who would have thought this possible, only 15 years

ago? The *Compendium*, amongst the « Res novae in economics », clearly mentions « the opportunities and the risks of globalisation », « the international financial system », and the « role of the international community in the age of the global economy », without, however - if I can be allowed to make a personal observation - attaching fundamental importance to them. Published in 1991, the Encyclical *Centesimus annus* could not have been fully aware of the developments still to come from globalisation.

- The other justification for an updating of Christian social teaching on economic globalisation comes from the feeling of powerlessness which accompanies its developments. Whereas each and every one, particularly in our country, agrees to recognise the decisive character of economic globalisation by sometimes denouncing its gravely perverse effects and sometimes urging the authorities to adapt our economic and social structures, very few see it as a humanisation and cooperation project. Here, we are in the field of litanies. Whoever ventures to express a qualified opinion on globalisation, relocations, immigration and its management is very rapidly suspected of betraying his camp or of attacking another camp. The result, it should be said, is a rather generalised avowal of incompetence or indifference. In the circles of business executives, it takes the form of an often unqualified assent to the free play of the market forces which would seem to be supported by the apparent success of the American economy. Amongst a large number of « alter globalists », it is expressed, and this, in my opinion, is the same thing, by a condemnation without appeal and without a well-thought-out and well-founded alternative, of the few international institutions

responsible for overseeing, in other words, for humanising, globalisation.

It is not a question of contrasting indifferent pragmatism and litanies of accusations. They find their source in a real difficulty where I see the need for a renewed Christian contribution. It concerns these *nubs of political and social contradiction* which objectively block the progress of the humanisation of globalisation and which, in a certain way, justify the popular feeling that « politics surrender to economic forces ». I have borrowed this analysis from the economist Jean-Noël Giraud, to my knowledge a non-Christian and a specialist on Energy, when he addressed the National Congress of the Christian Movement of Business Executives in March 2001. According to Jean-Noël Giraud:

- a) First of all, the mechanisms of the globalised financial markets penalise those practitioners who are business executives or governmental leaders when they recommend regulatory reforms.
- b) The division between winners and losers of the liberalisation of trade within « rich » or « poor », countries numbs the capacities of proposal or initiative, particularly in a democracy.
- c) Finally globalisation itself, in testing national identities as a source of cohesion and integration, stimulates a nationalistic sense of belonging and mobilises the reflexes of sovereignty as obstacles to the development of joint international rules.

Hence the surprising conclusion of Jean-Noël Giraud: « I can only see the Churches, with their international stature, as being able to raise their voices loud enough and in a sufficiently

relevant way, to show the path to a better collective regulation to humanise globalisation »<sup>4</sup>.

## *2 A Christian inspiration to humanise globalisation*

Can we meet this challenge? Can we, to make things simple, establish on the basis of the principles and wisdom accumulated by Christian social doctrine a « vision » that is both useful and the inspirer of a reform of globalisation which can be proposed not only to Christians, but to all the practitioners that make up the embryo of an international community.

I feel that this can be done. The foundation remains the one laid by *Rerum Novarum* and confirmed by the major declarations of Vatican II, which already stated the essentials but probably in a far too general way: the creativity of the company, free initiative and free exchanges are irreplaceable sources for human development. But they must be ordered by rules, in respecting values or fundamental criteria and showing subjectivity, that is, the quality and personal dignity of every worker, whether he or she is salaried or not and involved by his or her activity in this situation of economic interdependence. Such rules call for the setting up of a « Universal World Authority »<sup>5</sup>.

Yet, even if we have an embryo of international principles or rules, subject to the vagaries of national ratification, in the field

---

<sup>4</sup> « A human economy is possible », National Congress of the MCC, January 2001.

<sup>5</sup> The reference to a world authority with a universal sphere of competence appears for the first time under the pen of John XXIII in the Encyclical « *Pacem in terris* », 1963. The *Compendium* alludes to this in paragraph 371.i

of the environment and development, thanks to the loose conglomeration of the United Nations, and in the field of work, through the ILO Decent Work Agenda, we are still a very long way from a world Authority, even a partial one, to ensure its general adoption and, what is even more important, its effective implementation. Here, we are clearly at the heart of the problem.

The right diagnosis was made, in my opinion, in a recent text, which almost passed unnoticed, of the Bishops' Commission for Justice and Peace France in 2004. What did the Commission say? Taking into consideration this historically new situation which would like the vast majority of sovereign States to wish to be incorporated into the system of international exchanges, there are quite clearly *two ways* of envisaging the international order.

The vision which prevails today is the one which is based on multi-polarity. A certain number of great political and economic powers that are called poles consider that they can do without world rules recognised by all and that they could make their interests prevail through the system of influence which surrounds them and on the basis of a world or regional power struggle. It is, in fact, the « Babel-based » version of the international order<sup>6</sup>.

In a certain way, the recent failure of the Doha negotiations clearly illustrates the predominance of multipolarity. This failure really shows a disregard for « the preferential option for the poor », a concept which does not only apply to the field of

---

<sup>6</sup> In French terminology, we speak of *international regulation*. I prefer the idea of multilateralism which does not simply cover rules, but also legitimate institutions which are able not only to draft and promote common rules, but also to see that they are implemented.

the development, but also to that of exchanges and trade: compared to the preceding negotiations of the GATT Rounds, the Doha Development Round, launched in the year 2000, was the one which, since the origin of the GATT negotiations, went further in tariff concessions and effective import tax reductions agreed by industrialised countries in favour of exports from poor countries. This failure invites us to work with all our might for another perspective, that of multi-laterality which ensures that the world order is based on supranational rules compelling recognition by all and whose legitimacy does not stem from force but from the principle of proportionality which respects national specificities. Multilateralism is the « Pentecost » version of the world order.

The fact that the multilateral alternative is only faltering at world level and is only really embodied in the European institutions - and I clearly say so this evening - should suffice to alert the Christian conscience. It also opens up a vast project for the development of Christian social thought, in conjunction, in the very spirit of Vatican II, with all the research carried out by international civil society, with which, of course, Christian inspiration must not be confused. Here are some examples of these projects which have, as yet, been scarcely explored. I have selected them because they illustrate those nubs of economic and social contradictions indicated by Jean Noël Giraud and which would make a summary application of major moral principles unwise. For example:

- What right do we have to stop emerging countries from consuming just as much energy as industrialised countries have had the possibility to consume?
- How can we prevent certain social categories in industrialised countries (farmers, employees from sectors which, for the most part, have an under-

- qualified labour force) from having to pay the price for the opening up of international trade to developing countries, even if this is indispensable?
- Who will guarantee a just payment of investments in the field of research and development when the countries that will benefit the most, particularly in terms of healthcare, are not solvent?
  - How can standards of quality and respect for workers' rights be promoted in countries which do not know the rule of law nor social partners and where, by its nature, a large part of the work is informal?
  - What limitations do the dynamism and social cohesion of the company impose on the rights of its shareholders? What separation of powers is necessary to prevent abuse?

In these fields, the research of universities, National Bishops' Conferences and the Christian lay world is not inactive. I will quote, for example, the reflections published in 2005 by the Belgian Commission for Justice and Peace which is revitalising the applications of solidarity in the completely renewed context of North-South and South-South relationships as well as the highly pioneering work of the Social Committee of the Bishops of France, devoted last year to « *Benchmarks for a globalised economy* », undoubtedly one of the most well-informed reflections today on the financierised economy and the opportunities and failures which it holds. It is not a case of under-estimating the wealth of this research but to recognise that it lacks visibility and appears fragmented with regard to the expectations caused by globalisation.

### *3 Globalisation and pluralism*

Perhaps this splitting up and this fragmentation of the contribution of Christians to the humanisation of globalisation stem from the dichotomy that we have allowed to be established between the religious or theological point of view and the economic and social point of view. I must therefore now approach the specifically cultural or anthropological dimension of a Christian contribution. This cannot, in fact, be reduced to a contribution of principles and wisdom aimed at the establishment of economic structures which generate justice, even if justice and social cohesion are the necessary conditions of humanisation in the Christian sense of the word. The Christian contribution also aims at revealing the meaning which is the foundation of such an aspiration and which cements the individual moral guidelines and the right structures. How can what gives a meaning to life, taken in such a global vision of persons and their communities, be shared?

It is here that economic globalisation, because of the outstanding assent that it encounters, confronts us with two concepts of the approach to truth: the Babelian-based concept adapts to the supremacy of one ideology over the others; it is not far from requesting a single language, a single moral and religious corpus and a one-to-one a relationship between the religious and the political aspect, whilst the Pentecost vision will relinquish such a supremacy to allow an area of dialogue and debate to be opened, through a pluralistic definition, whose main issue will be the pragmatic construction of a universal, but not absolute, base of common rights and principles. Transcending religious and philosophical specificities, this base is essential for founding a free acceptance of multilateralism.

This direct relationship between the development of a democratic international order and the emergence of a base of common values emerged recently once again, with the attempt, aborted for the time being, to establish a European Constitutional Treaty. This same relationship caused Pascal Lamy, Director General of the World Trade Organisation, to say recently that the main contribution of the Churches, as « experts in humanity », was to help with the establishment of this common base. This also invites the Church to show great reserve, as if there must be a common base, it can neither reflect a dominant influence, nor express the theological depth of the specific identity of each Church.

How can this dilemma between pluralism and specificity be overcome; how is it possible to give it a meaning, without affirming a superiority of some kind? I will say, first of all, how, as a Christian Conference on Globalisation, we have tried to overcome this dilemma. We have chosen a synodal approach, essentially founded on a mutual receptiveness to the perceptions and the experiences that each and every one carries within him or herself, even if it means abandoning a single discourse. Above all, we have admitted that the meaning to which we wished to testify could already be seen outside the Churches, that is, everywhere where men and women, companies and trades unionists, NGOs and persons responsible for public life, or ordinary citizens, anticipate through innovating behaviours these rules still in the making. In other words, we have tried to show the fruits of freedom when it is animated by the meaning that we are calling for.

Have we, by doing this, underestimated the dangers of a dilution of the Christian identity and its theological roots? A few moments ago, I mentioned the perspective of a world multilateral order, attached to the image of Pentecost, this task

of forming a common conscience towards which civil society, governments, representatives of companies and professionals are working. The construction of this is being carried out too slowly in the melting-pots of the international institutions, at the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank, of course, but also within the United Nations, as at the Council of Europe or the European Parliament.

The Catholic hierarchy is showing concern, and I share this concern, at seeing the extent to which the debates in these institutions sometimes give rise to an antireligious and particularly anti-Christian combat, whose challenge consists in the meaning to be given to human rights. In a more acute way than on a strictly national level, these bodies are seeing the development of a humanistic argumentation, which, in the name of freedom, calls for a multiplication of rights based on the sole criterion of utility, with the danger of undermining the sense of responsibility. In the name of democracy, this argumentation asserts equality in all fields, even if this means denying the essential qualities of otherness and opening the way to abandoning the weakest. In the face of such attacks which often stem from a militant atheism, relativistic by construction, the Christian conscience cannot just pride itself on its religious basis. It must indicate with confidence the practical fruits of the principles of responsibility and solidarity with which it is nourished, principles which, I would once more like to stress, make it possible to understand the longevity and the effectiveness of the European institutions.

We are living in a world of a pluralistic nature, a pluralism which is good news in itself as a condition for the development of international institutions founded on right and not on constraint. In this new context, the testimony of values and principles progress through the argument of authority, but through the attachment to the practical transformations which

are indispensable for justice. It results from this that if we fully desire to contribute, like Christians, to a really human globalisation, we must not consider as secondary the unfailing and unfaltering construction of a more just multilateral economic, environmental and social order. We must show, on the contrary, the coherence between this target and the application of the principles of responsibility, solidarity and dignity of the poor which, for us, give a meaning to freedom.

This is no doubt a subject which would merit an Encyclical, devoted to the humanisation of globalisation.

# **Cardinal Renato Raffaele MARTINO**

**President of the Pontifical Council for Justice & Peace**

**President of the Pontifical Council for Pastoral Care  
of Migrants and Itinerant People**

## ***LOVING OUR NEIGHBOUR: THE HEART OF THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH***

1.- I am happy and honoured to be here, at the headquarters of UNESCO for this providential occasion which brings us together for the presentation of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, drawn up by the Pontifical Council « Justice and Peace » at the request of Jean-Paul II, the unforgettable Servant of God. I would like to thank the organisers of this meeting: His Excellency Mgr Jean-Charles Descubes, Mgr Francesco Follo, Permanent Observer to UNESCO, Monsieur Hervé l'Huillier, Président of Évangile & Société, and particularly our dear father Jacques Turck. This initiative is very significant and does credit to its organisers by the fact that it shows an openness to differences of opinions and to dialogue on the

difficult and complex issues associated with modern culture, the promotion of cultural rights and authorities deriving from a Christian social ethic.

2- I have been asked to focus the presentation of the *Compendium* on how love lies at the heart of the social doctrine of the Church. With a slight correction to the theme which was proposed to me, I would like to underline from the beginning that *love not only lies at the heart of social doctrine; but that it is the very heart*. Placed in this perspective, the fundamental objective of the social doctrine of the Church - *building a civilisation of love* - is fully revealed. In fact, the first commitment to which the social doctrine calls Christians is to diffuse love in social relations, at all levels and in all circles. Jesus teaches us that the fundamental law of human perfection, and therefore the transformation of the world, is the new commandment of love »<sup>7</sup> (cf. Mt 22,40; Jn 15,12; Col 3,14 ; Jc 2,8)<sup>8</sup>. *Love only can completely change man and society*<sup>9</sup> (Cf n° .583).

3- *In the prospect of the civilisation of love, the Compendium offers itself as a manifesto for the realization of a new humanism*. To present it in this way does not seem at all exaggerated. In fact, in the introduction, it is stated that it was developed with the aim of advocating and sewing in the furrows of civilisation *a humanism complete, united and open to transcendence* (cf. n° 7). It is a *manifesto* in the sense that one can find therein the ideal and historic

---

<sup>7</sup> Vatican Council II, Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, 38 ; Cf id. Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium*, 42 ; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 826.

<sup>8</sup> Pontifical Council Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the social doctrine of the Church*, n° 580 and cf. n° 103.

<sup>9</sup> Cf John-Paul II, *Novo millennio ineunte*, 49-51.

coordinates for a new society, to give substance to the still vital demands of the Gospel and of Christianity. It is always necessary to translate empirically the essence of Christianity, in all cultural contexts and in all periods of history. The richness of the Gospel must revive and diffuse itself in *the social and cultural ethos of peoples*; for the hope of each generation, to nourish its commitment to grow in civilisation. In fact, in the current context of globalisation, the *Compendium* outlines for the human family *a complete and united humanism* and seeks to invest in the best part of the person and of all peoples, in the positive forces of history.

4- The *Compendium* is without doubt a complex and articulated text, which, given the organization of the present event, is impossible for me to present in all the greatness of its theme. Allow me, then, to recall briefly the *principles* - the central character of the human person, the common good, subsidiarity, solidarity - which the social doctrine presents as a fundamental and essential condition for realizing a society drawing its inspiration from the prospect of *a civilisation of love*. These principles are like the load-bearing pillars of *a social edifice* built according to designs proposed by the *Revelation* and by *natural law*, and to the geometry of the *Fides* and of the *Ratio*, and which support it entirely. The principles of social doctrine must therefore be considered in their *entirety*, without undue emphasis on one or the other, and they must be able at all times to be introduced into such or

such context and applied within the framework of the society<sup>10</sup>.

- a) *The personalist principle.* The *Compendium* states: « The Church sees in man, in each man, the living image of God Himself »<sup>11</sup>. «Man, considered in his empirical historical aspect, represents the heart and soul of Catholic social education. All of social doctrine, in effect, develops from the principle which affirms the inviolable dignity of man»<sup>12</sup>. The *personalist* principle is therefore concerned with the absolute dignity, the central character, the intangibility of man considered according to his essential characteristics as an *individual* and a *social being*; it should be *the subject, the basis and the object of all social actions*<sup>13</sup>: man should never be *abused*. Society should place itself *at his service*: It can also demand much from its members but should never use them. The *personalist* principle is realized in the promotion of *human dignity* at all levels against all types of economic, political, linguistic, racial, religious etc. discrimination, and in particular in the promotion of *fundamental human rights*, basic for all societies and a *priority* for all juridical organizations. Moreover, these rights must be considered as a reality which no law can transgress ; they should be recognised in their totality and in the anthropological perspective of a humanism which is complete, united and open to transcendence.

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 160-163.

<sup>11</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 105

<sup>12</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 107

<sup>13</sup> Cf. PIE XII, *Christmas Radio message 1944*.

b) *The principle of the common good.* The common good is understood to be the ensemble of conditions which favourise the full development of the *person* and *intermediate bodies* - protection and promotion of human rights, of the family, of freedom of association, etc. Only the *united* effort of the whole of society - or of the community of Nations, in the case of international common good - can lead to the realization of these objectives. The *Compendium* states: « *The demands of the common good derive from the social conditions of each epoch and are strictly bound to the respect and full development of man and his fundamental rights. These demands concern above all a commitment to peace, the organization of state institutions, a sound legal system, protection of the environment, the provision of essential human services, of which certain are at the same time human rights: food, shelter, employment, education and access to culture, transport, health services, freedom of information, and protection of freedom of religion*»<sup>14</sup>. In order that the *common good* should not be confined exclusively to the care of politicians - who, in every case, invariably retain the primary responsibility - but that it remains the objective to which all men are called upon to share, it is important that a culture of participation be encouraged at all levels of social life. This «*expresses itself essentially by a series of activities through which the citizen, as an individual or in association with others, directly or by means of his representatives, contributes to the cultural, economic, social and political life of the civil community to which he belongs. This participation is a duty which all must conscientiously*

---

<sup>14</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 166

*fulfill, in a responsible manner and with a view to the common good. It cannot be circumscribed or confined to a few specific constituents of social life »<sup>15</sup>.*

- c) ***The principle of subsidiarity.*** The *Compendium* states « *This principle is necessary because every person, every family, and every intermediate body has something original to offer to the community. ( ...)* Certain forms of concentration, bureaucracy, assistance, unjustified and excessive state presence in the public system, are *contrary* to the principle of subsidiarity.(...) Corresponding to the application of subsidiarity are: the respect and effective development of the pre-eminence of the individual and the family; the valorization of intermediate associations and organizations, in their fundamental choices and in all the decisions which cannot be delegated or assumed by others; encouragement offered to private initiative, of the kind that all social bodies, with their own specificities, remain at the service of the common good; a pluralist articulation of society and the representation of its vital strengths; the protection of the rights of man and minorities; bureaucratic and administrative decentralisation; balance between the public and private spheres, with a corresponding recognition of the social fonction of the latter... »<sup>16</sup>. The principle of subsidiarity is therefore concerned with the role of aid - subsidiarity derives precisely from *subsidium*: aid - which the greater authority must offer to the fesser body: the public powers must only intervene when the initiative of individuals or intermediate groups finds itself unable to realize their

---

<sup>15</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 189.

<sup>16</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 1.87

projects independently. In a positive way, this principle underlines the value of *civil society* - families, groups, associations, businesses, charities, educational and religious institutions, etc. - compared with *political society*, chiefly regarding the state. Regarding the obligations of the state towards the civil society, already in his encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, the blessed John XXIII states that the action of public authority has a rôle « *of direction, stimulus, assistance, and integration*”<sup>17</sup>. In any case, one should not be under the illusion that all the state needs to do is withdraw in order for civil society to flourish automatically. Certain obligations must be fulfilled by a course of action which keeps together, either in a combined or complementary fond, public and private initiative - health, education, aid - and the circumstances in which the state must in any case intervene - for example, when private enterprise is absent - and where it must not in any way interfere - for example in the administration of justice.

- d) ***The principle of solidarity.*** *The Compendium* states that solidarity is both an *ethical-social principle* and a *virtue*, a veritable and actual realization of *justice*<sup>18</sup>. This principle essentially consists in the consciousness of the fact that humanity constitutes a vast and complex *unity*, which takes priority over each individual and every thing, and is larger and more fundamental than that experienced or realized by any specific individual. It expresses itself in the awareness of a basic *interdependence* between all men, inviting everyone to an *effective apportioning* of goods,

---

<sup>17</sup> JEAN XXIII, Encyclical Letter *Mater et Magistra*, part II, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph

<sup>18</sup> Cf. PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 193.

resources, responsibilities and difficulties in a climate of reciprocity and equality of rights and obligations: *solidarity as in being indebted to others* for what we have received from them; *solidarity as being with others and for others*, to answer to their needs. When interdependence is *is the firm and persistent determinant?* to commit to the *common good*: that is to say, for the good of one and all, for we are all entirely responsible for each other<sup>19</sup>. For the sake of us all, it is important to preserve genuine solidarity from its simplistic image, so widespread today: solidarity as public assistance, state control, an encouragement to parasitism, etc. Solidarity should express itself not only by individual means, but also through associations, communities and institutions.

5- Using these pillars, it is possible to construct the solid edifice of an organised society framed by the coordinates of *the civilisation of love and a complete and united humanism*. *it is possible, above all, to promote peace*. We can understand the *Compendiums* consideration of peace if we distinguish between peace defined as the absence of war, and peace as a way of life wholly humane. On several occasions, the document attributes the former meaning to peace, but it attributes much more, infinitely more to peace as taken in the latter meaning: For this is genuinely the « perfect» peace, which comprises truth, liberty and justice and is the only kind which also assures us of attaining peace as the absence of war. I don't believe I'm mistaken in stating that the *Compendium* always speaks of peace, even when the word itself is not used: it also speaks of peace when it speaks of justice or solidarity, of the unity of the human family, of God's design for mankind, of every man's rights and his respective duties, and of the dignity of the

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. JEAN-PAUL II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, 38 (1987)

individual, of peoples and of cultures. In the *Compendium*, the word peace also acquires a strong cultural significance, so important today. The sense of mutual respect of religious traditions and cultures, the dialogue between religions, international cooperation, and the culture of welcome are all fundamental dimensions which further peace. According to the *Compendium*, therein lies the ultimate meaning of the construction of a shared social life, and therefore of peace<sup>20</sup>.

6- All the teachings of the *Compendium* take their form and their inspiration from love, not only that love which cultivates *passing relationships* - direct and emotional contact with others - but above all that which cultivates *long-term relationships* - those upheld by cultural, political and economic institutions which are principally linked to a social and political commitment. The new commandment of love, on the one hand, invites us to rediscover the true face of that unknown person who lives nearby and, on the other hand, it instructs us to identify with our neighbour - even those whom we will never meet - through cultural, social, political and economic institutions. This dual aspect of Christian love, directly personal and indirectly institutional, can be found in the parable of the Good Samaritan (cf. Lc 10, 30-37). The charity of the Samaritan is revealed in the utmost care with which the Samaritan approaches the wounded man lying on the road. The narration underlines this by slowing the rhythm so as to scrutinize each moment of the action: « But a certain Samaritan...came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him. And he went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine... »(Lc 10, 33-34). The action of the good Samaritan, in identifying with his fellow man, does not end there in the direct contact with the victim: it goes beyond

---

<sup>20</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and peace », *compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. 494-496.

his physical presence as he takes charge of the cane given to him within a structure and with the appropriate personnel (*hotel and landlord*) and with the necessary economic resources (the two pence). That is *the social and political charity* which the *Compendium* describes in the following terms: « From many points of view, the neighbour which one should love introduces himself "*in society*" so that to truly love him, to answer to his needs or to his extreme poverty, can mean something quite different from the good that one would wish for him on a personal level: *love on a social scale signifies, according to the circumstances, making use of social intermediaries to improve his life or eliminate the social factors which are the cause of his poverty.* The works of mercy, by which one responds *here and now* to the real and urgent need of one's neighbour, are undeniably acts of charity, but the commitment to *organising and structuring* society in such a way that one's neighbour should never find himself destitute is an act of charity just as indispensable, especially when this destitution becomes the condition with which a large number of people must contend, even entire populations: this situation assumes today the proportions of a truly *global social question* »<sup>21</sup>. Thank you for your attention.

---

---

<sup>21</sup> PONTIFICAL COUNCIL « Justice and Peace », *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 208.

## **This conference was organised and supported by**

### **Évangile et Société (Gospel and Society)**

Évangile et Société was created as an association governed by the French law of 1901, by the CFPC (the former name of the EDC (Entrepreneurs et Dirigeants Chrétiens) (Christian Entrepreneurs and Business Executives) and the CFTC (Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens - French Confederation of Christian Workers), with the aid of politicians and academics.

The creation of this organisation can be explained by a particular context: at a time when the Semaines sociales de France (French Social Weeks) lay dormant, when the life of Christian movements was marked by the often frontal oppositions resulting from radically different interpretations after Vatican II and in the period after May 68 and when the French public authorities launched the reform of companies in the context of the vertiginous rise of unemployment.

The objective of that era has remained the same today: to get to know, study more deeply and disseminate Christian social thought in an independent framework, that is, without allegiance either to Church structures or political movements. Évangile et Société thus remains an ecumenical and apolitical association, but also an association which has the permanent concern of comparing the texts of reference and reality, by calling on experts in the fields in which it works.

Évangile et Société is working to develop its action in conjunction with the organisations and initiatives of the Christian social movement on the strands of training and reflection and as a laboratory of joint actions at decision-

making level in political, economic, social and religious spheres.

Évangile et Société has also contributed to the creation of AIESC (International Association for Christian Social Teaching), formerly called the International Flying University, through which it maintains links with personalities of the Christian social movement in various countries, in Europe and Latin America in particular.

It has also contributed to the creation of OCHRES (Observatoire Chrétien de l'Entreprise et de la Société – Christian Observatory on the Company and Society) which has the role of observing the realities of the political, economic and social world (*cf. Infra*).

Throughout its history, Évangile and Société has organised meetings, seminars and conferences to disseminate and study Christian social thought in more detail. Amongst these events, particular place must be given to the large meeting at the Mutualité in Paris in February 1983 which marked the launching of mobilisation against the projects of the Mauroy government to undermine the freedom of the school.

For the past several years, Évangile et Société has organised an annual day of reflection called « One Year of Christian Social Thought », part of which is devoted to the summary reading of the texts of reference published by the Churches, and the other to work on texts with a topical theme.

Contact: *Évangile et Société*, 32 rue Médéric, 75017 PARIS.  
Address: [evsoc@wanadoo.fr](mailto:evsoc@wanadoo.fr)

**Le Conseil pour les questions familiales et sociales de la  
Conférence des évêques de France  
(Council for Family and Social Questions of the French  
Bishops' Conference)**

Le Conseil pour les questions familiales et sociales is chaired by  
Msgr. Jean-Charles Descubes, Archbishop of Rouen.

Its mission:

The Council is composed of six Bishops, experts, and a  
secretary.

The successor of the Commission sociale des évêques de France  
(Social Commission of the Bishops of France), created in 1950  
by the Plenary Assembly of the Cardinals and Archbishops of  
France, the Conseil pour les questions familiales et sociales has  
the mission:

to identify, in social life, the significant events, situations and  
facts not only at national level but also in their international  
dimension,

to consequently alert the French Bishops,

to pay special attention to the way in which the family, the unit  
of all social life, lives and is structured.

The National Service for Family and Social Questions works  
either on order or on its own initiative, on points considered as  
important, and publishes the results of its work.

The Council for Family and Social Questions entrusts missions  
to the National Service for Family and Social Questions  
according to five Departments:

Family (marriage, education, training),

Economy, policies and social structures (work, economics, politics, tourism and leisure activities, associative life, socioprofessional organisations, intermediary bodies),  
Health (care, prevention, social protection, dependence, mental health, disabilities),  
Rights, freedoms and peace (Justice and Peace, human rights, development, peace and security, justice and society, prisons),  
Research and innovation with their ethical implications.  
All these factors must be taken in their national, European and world dimensions.

The main mission of the National Service for Family and Social Questions is that of expertise for the Council for Family and Social Questions, the dioceses and provinces by responding to their orders.

The Service fosters the training of leaders in the fields that fall within its spheres of competence.

The Service is at the disposal of the dioceses and the provinces for their action in the field of family and social issues (Social Units ...).

The Director is Father Jacques Turck.

*Contact: main documents on the website of the French Bishops' Conference, [www.cef.fr](http://www.cef.fr). Address of the National Service for Family and Social Questions: 8 rue Jean-Bart. 75006 Paris.*

## **The International Catholic Centre for Cooperation with UNESCO (CCIC)**

For sixty years, the CCIC has been a place of reflection, information and exchange. Its action is based on convictions, solidarity and commitment.

Major priority strands of action:

To bring UNESCO's message to the Christian world and propose the Christian (Catholic) message to UNESCO, hence the need to reinforce and reaffirm together our own convictions and then make them known (consolidation of the CCIC's functions and information and communication tools).

To bring together in the unity of the Christian vision the plurality of our commitments; hence the need to analyse with experts, first of all amongst Catholic organisations, and in a critical way, the major challenges that are intrinsic to UNESCO's different fields of competence, discuss these together and, if necessary, identify internal and external action strategies.

To maintain dialogue and promote a Christian vision of the priority problematics of UNESCO's partners; hence the need to organise a number of annual symposia on cross-disciplinary questions such as, for example, the merchandisation of man today through globalisation, education and science, the Christian vision of justice and development (revive the main strands of the Church's social teaching), the challenges of dialogue and truth seen from an intercultural and inter-religious viewpoint, etc.

To cross-fertilise the interests and spheres of competence of the different Catholic Centres working at the United Nations' bodies (Paris, Geneva and New York); hence the need to know each other better in order to collaborate more fully and better serve the causes which are ours.

To propose partnerships and actions in the field, particularly in the sectors of training for dialogue and international life. Suggestions from members and friends of the CCIC will always be welcome.

To identify financial partners interested in committing themselves and living the CCIC's mission with us. Approaches

in this direction have already been undertaken and practical collaboration mechanisms are being established.

➤ A function of information

◆ Through its « *Informations rapides* » (*Express News*) in French, English and Spanish disseminated by Internet every fortnight and in which are presented not only UNESCO's main documents on education, science, social and human sciences, culture and communication, but also information on the work of grassroots' Christians in these fields.

◆ Through its quarterly magazine « *The Month at UNESCO* » published in French, English and Spanish. Each issue includes an information file which analyses one of the components of UNESCO's programme in order to create dialogue between the specialists of the Organisation's programme and the vision of Catholic action.

➤ A function of reflection

Through symposia entitled « CCIC Conversations – Seeking and Sharing the Truth Together », a biennial cycle of meetings with, as the central theme in 2004-2005 « the human person at the heart of the world ». Six meetings have taken place since 2004: « Merchandisation of the Human Person », « Merchandisation of Education », « Merchandisation of Culture », « Merchandisation of Work », « Communication and Globalisation », « The Life Sciences and Ethics ».

➤ A function of aid

Follow-up of the Working Groups of the Conference of ICOs: « Family » and « Education-Communication ».

From the viewpoint of Canon Law, the International Catholic Centre for UNESCO (CCIC) is an international public Church association of the faithful. The choice of its Director is subject to

the approval of the Holy See, which also appoints an Ecclesiastical Adviser.

The CCIC is also an association governed by French law (Law of 1901), run by lay persons and bringing together Catholic organisations or movements and individual members (clerics or lay persons) established in many countries. The Association was also recognised as a « charitable organisation » by Prefectorial Decree dated 14 June 2001.

President: Prof. Msgr. Guy-Réal Thivierge (Canada), Secretary General of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, Paris

Director: Gilles Deliance

Contact: CCIC, 9 rue Cler, 75007 Paris - Tel. 01.47.05.17.59 - Fax 01.45.56.90.92

[infos@ccic-unesco.org](mailto:infos@ccic-unesco.org) - [www.ccic-unesco.org](http://www.ccic-unesco.org)

**The Confédération nationale des Associations familiales catholiques  
(The National Confederation of Catholic Family Associations)**

The Catholic Family Associations form a framework of commitment and mutual aid, open to all those who wish to act in society at the service of the family and in the light of the Catholic Church's teaching.

Their action is aimed at:

Giving an added value to the family based on marriage and open to life as a means of the happiness and fulfilment of the person.

Identifying locally the needs of families and taking the initiatives to meet these needs: services, meetings, training, educational assistance...

Acting as a force of permanent proposal amongst economic, social and political practitioners so that the choices of the family and welcoming the child are facilitated.

The 2000 Charter, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly of the AFC, gave the movement a new impetus. The AFC works, not only in the Confederation but also in the local Federations and Associations, to implement a true dynamics of revival and progress. Today, the AFC has the objective of being « radiant », that is, to become a structure which radiates the hope that it bears, a structure that is welcoming and attentive, listened to and understood.

At national level, the AFC has a Board of Administration of 24 members (elected), within which there is a Bureau. This Board elects the President, lays down the general guidelines of the Movement, implements resulting actions and assures the different representations at national level. Its missions are based on six major themes:

a civilisation of Love: bringing the insight of the doctrine of the Church in fields such as the marital bond, life, solidarity between generations;

education: to offer a family vision and practical services to families;

family policy: to be a force of proposal amongst economic, social and political practitioners;

Church life: to be watchers and awakeners of the rooting of the movement in the Catholic Church and of its opening up to the world;

international: representing families in European and world bodies; to be a force of proposal, in conjunction with the other AFCs in the world;

development: to intensify the charisma of the AFC.

*Contact: 28 place Saint-Georges. 75009 Paris. Site: [www.afc-France.org](http://www.afc-France.org)*

## **Les Semaines sociales de France (French Social Weeks)**

Organised by Christians, the Social Weeks of France are an observatory of social life and an area of reflection and proposal, amongst the oldest in the country. They aim to be a forum and not a « movement ».

Their sessions are a meeting place for all, believers and non-believers, open to all those who are receptive to dialogue, seeking a meaning and in favour of the revival of the social bond in our country.

This dynamic depends, in France, on a growing number of regional partnerships and, in Europe, on a network of social Christians from the vital forces of more than twenty countries.

Today, when ethical values and references are questioned and relativised yet sought after, the Semaines Sociales de France would seem to be in keeping with our day and age. The national forum that they offer is a response to a triple need:

for combining forces, because Christians involved in social action cannot exist without a place where they recognise each other,

for memory, that is, for history, knowledge,

for meaning - because what we do has a sense and a significance.

On the threshold of this new millennium, the Semaines Sociales de France wishes to be an active centre of reflection and of action.

The aim of the *Semaines Sociales de France Foundation*, created in January 1998 in the framework of the Foundation of France, is to guarantee, on a permanent basis, the carrying out of this mission.

Its activities to make social reflection progress:

- to constantly develop a collective trans-disciplinary reflection on the questions of society, in a climate of research, confrontation, listening to each other and free expression, at national and international levels.
- to encourage the creation of branches of the Semaines Sociales de France (antennes des Semaines Sociales de France) in the major French regions, to adapt reflection to realities in the field and to refer the fruit of their work back to the national sessions.

The Semaines Sociales also aim at training people and organise, every year, a three-day national session which includes lectures, debates, testimonies and round tables.

To inform public opinion, it:

- publishes the book - le livre - which gives an account of the annual session and its conclusions;
- organises reflection groups and participates in symposia in France and abroad: see à l'étranger;
- maintains close relationships with the media and the public which follows its work through, amongst others the newsletter published by the Semaines Sociales: « Lettre des Semaines Sociales ».

Contact: 3 rue Bayard, 75008 PARIS. Site [www.ssf-fr.org](http://www.ssf-fr.org)

### **Entrepreneurs et Dirigeants Chrétiens (Christian Entrepreneurs and Business Executives)**

The movement of Entrepreneurs et Dirigeants Chrétiens - which was previously called the CFPC - groups over 2,000 executives from companies of all sizes and all sectors of activity.

It proposes to its members « *the means of working to recognise the presence of Christ and the action of the Holy Spirit in the lives of*

*persons, practitioners and partners in company life and in their relationships », according to the Charter which defines the Nature and Vocation of the movement, and which adds: « We are seeking together how to answer the call of the Gospel in the active exercise of our responsibilities ».*

The movement is organised in sections of some ten members, accompanied by a spiritual adviser. Each meeting is the opportunity for a sharing of experiences and a more detailed study of the mission of company directors in the light of Christian social teaching.

Standing Committees and specific Working Groups carry out studies on the fundamental problems raised by Christian business executives. Their analyses and conclusions are disseminated both inside and outside the movement.

The members are invited to assemble every year in Conferences, which are alternatively regional and national. The Conferences, which are privileged moments of reflection, questioning and prayer, are also a time for listening to testimonies and economic, religious and political experts, and an opportunity to discuss the major debates that are of interest to companies.

The Entrepreneurs et Dirigeants Chrétiens fuel their reflection through the movement's magazine *Dirigeants Chrétiens*, which gives a spiritual insight into the major themes of economics and management.

Contact : Les Entrepreneurs et Dirigeants Chrétiens - 24 rue Hamelin 75116 Paris -  
Tel. 01 45 53 09 01 - e-mail: [lesedc@lesedc.org](mailto:lesedc@lesedc.org) - website: [www.lesedc.org](http://www.lesedc.org)

**Le service diocésain pour la pastorale des jeunes du diocèse de Paris**  
**(Diocesan Service for the Pastoral Care of Young People of the Diocese of Paris)**

Perhaps we harboured illusions some decades ago when it was considered that a child who had learned its catechism to receive the initial sacraments was immediately ready to progress naturally in Christian life. Yet it is necessary to note today that times have changed. The objective of the pastoral care of young people is to allow adolescents, students and young adults who are starting a professional life, to continue this path which is sometimes strewn with obstacles and chaotic.

Sixty years ago, at the end of the War, what was called « Greater Paris » numbered 40,000 students mainly grouped in The Sorbonne, in the Latin Quarter, to which must be added the Law Students, Medical Students and some engineers.

Today, the Ile-de-France region accommodates over 600,000 students divided up between 336 places of higher studies. At the same time, only a third of the children born in France today are baptised.

Catholic students now know that they are in the minority in their amphitheatres and their groups of friends. They can be assailed with the temptation to withdraw into themselves and with anxiety about the world as it is and which appears to increasingly evade any global appreciation.

The primary mission of the different chaplaincies, groups and movements belonging to the Church and which are its envoys is first of all to open their eyes to the salvation obtained by the

death and resurrection of Christ and endeavour to make them understand more clearly that they are invited to base their lives on this faith and that once they have understood this, they no longer have anything to fear. They must also free the hearts of these young people from all anguish to enable them to love, so that they will be able to participate in a world in which they have the urgent duty to testify to a Hope. They must have courage because it takes courage to live as a man or woman. The chaplaincies and the various practitioners of this pastoral care of young people try to organise periods of training to enable the young to acquire the knowledge and understanding of the faith they have received and whose practical implications they can see and imagine in their daily lives in friendly, emotional, family and professional circles.

It is also a question of opening their eyes to a reality in which they do not always believe: that they are not alone. This is done by organising « mass » events with and for them in the momentum of the World Youth Days like the FRAT, which assembles every year over 10,000 adolescents from the Ile-de-France region, or the Palm Sunday pilgrimage to Chartres for students and by proposing areas of encounter between the faith and culture (launching of Internet websites, meetings and debates on films, public rock concerts on All Saints' Day). It is a case, every time, of opening them up a little more to the world so that they will open up a little more to God.

### **L'Observatoire chrétien de l'entreprise et de la société (Christian Observatory on the Company and Society)**

Ochres, Christian Observatory on the Company and Society, was launched in March 1997 by Évangile et Société. It has assigned itself the specific mission of observing economic and

social problems, particularly those which concern the interactions between companies and society.

This mission is carried out in the light of Christian social principles. It aims at setting people and ideas in motion so that they can contribute to the building of a more accomplished human society.

The Executive Committee is the working body of Ochres. Meeting once a month, it is a forum of exchanges and reactions directly tuned in to current affairs. It prepares and manages the work of the Observatory in eight fields of vigilance: ideas and debates, the economic aspect, Churches, the company, Europe, policy, the social aspect and trades unions. A monthly press review, *Questions et Evénements*, examines the current situation in these eight fields. The Steering Committee, composed of some thirty personalities from the economic and social world, meets four times a year. It discusses and enriches the analysis of topical questions.

Every quarter, Ochres publishes a bulletin on the economic situation entitled *La Note de présentation Trimestrielle* in which it groups the reflections of its members and the reports of the debates of its Steering Committee. It undertakes specific studies on subjects which appear critical or which merit a particular clarification: integration of young people, work contract, unemployment insurance, etc. To do this, it uses the expertise of ad hoc working groups. In order to gauge current affairs, it has developed a Christian Social Barometer: a quarterly survey addressed to over one hundred « social sensors » which select, classify in hierarchical order and assess the events of the quarter and state on what aspects they have contributed to making the advent of the kingdom of God progress or regress.

Ochres can be at the origin of any action able to foster the understanding of a crucial problem for the organisation of society, the free confrontation of viewpoints and the emergence of practical proposals.

Contact : [www.ochres.org](http://www.ochres.org)

**This Conference has received special support from the co-publishers of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*: Le Cerf - Fleurus - Mame, Bayard Presse and Média-Participations.**

