The second example, which has been abundantly shown by studies in Sweden and in which several other European countries have participated, concerns *the difference in priorities* with regard to social responsibilities, whatever they may be.

Indeed, let's say it, the 'political' agenda of men and women in all fields is not the same – and it does not have to be either.

Such a difference is sometimes striking and takes on forms that are always unsettling. I remember the beginning of Martine Aubry's book, *Le Choix d'Agir*, where the difference in this choice of priorities between men and women is clear.

These two examples are not random. They are at the heart of the difficulties women face in participating with men at different levels of decision-making.

But the entry of women into decision-making roles is only a first step. It follows a period of learning the 'unwritten laws' that sometimes are more restrictive than the real laws. This is as true in the public service as in economic institutions, and even more so in political life.

As soon as a position becomes available, women have to put together their own list. In the 1980s I saw it in Quebec between female engineers and the president of the Chamber of Commerce. Whenever there was the possibility of a management position in a company, everyone got a move on. And indeed, there were those who applied and who, more often than not got the job.

This can only work when a firm solidarity is established among women and the networks work not to promote people but to promote ideas and make them fruitful.

A third aspect of this action from within is the excessive labelling of activities or domains into «soft» or «hard». In political life, it was considered good form to downplay until recently the importance of portfolios for women, considering them «soft». These were the likes of education, social affairs, health, environment, or culture. «Soft» are they? Is this not the hard core of any real social reform? Have the «hard» domains – par excellence foreign affairs and defence – not become the intersection of society and our global problems, and faced with the hegemony of one only do they not therefore become «soft», incredibly «soft»?

Another distinction was made: one that put issues affecting women to the one side and women's perspectives on all issues on the other.

And so women made decisions according to one of these two agendas. Today – and I hope I have got my point across with the quite deliberate twists and turns of my argument – the issues that affect women are issues of relevance to the whole of society.

Similarly, no societal issue is extrinsic to women. The 'Circularity of the real' goes much further than our apparently Cartesian distinctions – even if Descartes would not agree.

Finally, it should be said that any woman, in a decision-making position, is better able to support her ideas and decisions built on the links with the different forms the women's movement takes in her circle.

IV. THE USE OF POWER

But the issue of decision-making is beyond any other consideration an exposé of the problem of power. Let us make ourselves clear, power is everywhere, and we must not be shy or afraid to speak of power.

In effect, power flows from one sphere to another. Moreover, it circulates in such a way that it poses many difficulties for any society, for example, in the promiscuity between politics and the media, or between economic agents and politicians, and so on.

We are, in fact, at a turning point in our understanding of power itself.

Even when it is said to be democratic, power easily finds ways to be cryptic, authoritarian, and in practice exclusive.

But also, the power that wants to attract the crowds, will fade in what Laurent Fabius called, 'the discreet charm of the consensus' when he was Prime Minister and I find that there is no more beautiful expression to express the nullity of that power.

The transition of the very notion of power is urgent. It will take place on several levels, two of which I think are the most decisive:

— it will be the transition from power *over* people, devices, institutions, even the very interpretation of history and facts, *towards* power *with* others, in place where the team is needed in the multiplicity of its skills and perspectives on things and facts.
— it will also be the passage of a power which is resolutely *against*, which is at ease only in opposition, which excels at denouncing what is evil, towards power *in order to* accomplish goals, *to* herald new ideas, to implement measures able to undo the knots of our problems.

Reflections on power emerge in different places – the power that is competence and compassion, conviction and responsibility, that knows it is new in a context of multiple interdependencies.

The power exercised by women should avoid taking the long way and assume its new shape from the outset. It is an opportunity for women and for society as a whole that women's access to decision-making is taking place at a time when power is being compelled to change in nature, where it has to combine flawless technical and operational *rationality* with a concern *for others,* without compromise and without cowardice.

But just a handful of women will not be enough to make this change. Since my youth, I have been working to contribute to achieving a critical mass, a number whose interaction can trigger the chain reaction capable of releasing the social energy necessary for change.

I suspect that it is exactly this chain reaction that scares those who oppose change.

For what is at stake in the lifting of this ultimate taboo is perhaps the fact that, for once, it is not men who determine change or its magnitude. It is rather the movement that, for a whole century, has moved society from within.

But there is no reason for the outcome of such a movement to raise fears. *Decision-making* by women will manifest itself in all kinds of ways. A reorganisation of procedures, norms or even values will probably take place. But how could the 'ethics of the future' be constructed, as Hans Jonas calls it, if it did not make room for new actors and their way of responding to problems, that is to say to their way of living responsibility?

V. THE SEXUAL CONTRACT AT THE HEART OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

We are thus at the heart of the social contract and the sexual contract.

It would be illusory and useless to want to change the sexual contract leaving the other components of the social contract untouched. This is a whole that encompasses power relations within society.

Several elements of the social contract have, in the light of what I have just said, to undergo a profound transformation if we want to achieve the balanced participation of men and women in decision-making.

I'm only listing them.

1) Increased citizenship, the very idea of *political representation*, and the intervention *on the part of male and female citizens* in decision-*making* about States' commitments on the international scene.

2) The reinforcement of sovereignty, which, for some, is being nibbled away by the European Union and other regional groups, but in fact is opening the way for an *enlarged sovereignty* exercising its share of responsibility for all peoples who integrate the region.

3) The establishment of political mechanisms for the *regulation of economic and financial power*. Indeed, we are here before one of the key questions which would lead to a world order. As for those who say we are talking again about regulation. We know what deregulation has caused in the world, and we do not wish to accept this unjust, unspeakable misery of so many people.

4) The establishment of a *minimum base of social rights* capable of reducing the gap that still exists between those whose rights are being fulfilled and those left behind, the disorganised, vulnerable unemployed, most of whom are women.

5) *The redefinition of work* in terms of an active society in which all members, at all stages of life, adopt paths that fulfil them and serve society.
   Combined action within the European Union is essential so that new and daring ideas like Martine Aubry's 35 hours can really succeed all across our Union.

6) The recognition of associations and organisations, not only as important elements of civil society but as true 'social partners'.

In fact, at the social level, civil society can no longer be organised around a single centre, that is to say unions and employers. The diversity of social structures, their flexibility, mutual interdependence, their cross-fertilisation by corporate philanthropy, and partnership on issues that also affect economic and social structures will change the civic and social landscape. It makes notions of social partners obsolete. The social partners become all those who come together around a concrete problem, who are attached to it by their interests. In post-industrial society, trade unions, employers, associations, voluntary organisations, all should be true social partners, including women's organisations.

We indeed have the opportunity, and I am coming to a close, to be able to contribute to one of the major transformations of this century and one with repercussions in the coming century.

On Saturday, there will be a statement signed by the representatives of our governments. But the Paris Conference cannot be like other major international conferences of this decade. Let me remind you of the Earth Summit, so important, in 1992 in Rio, where the powers-that-be, all but the United States, committed to reducing greenhouse gases to such an extent that by 2000 they will have dropped to the level of 90. Now, five years later, the United States had increased by 8%, and also we Europeans with a clear conscience have incurred a further delay of eight to ten years.

No, enough hypocrisy. I'm sorry, but that's what I think. If we are here, if the European Union represents a certain set of values, all of us, government and civil society, must commit to implementing what has been decided here.

A few years ago, at a very difficult time in world history, Pierre Trudeau, one of the greatest politicians of his generation, said quite simply: 'Leaders must lead';

A timely motion if ever there was one.

Today, those who have the power have the ethical responsibility to carry out what has been decided.

What good is power, if not to act and to articulate the concerns of others in all circumstances?

Thank you very much.

Caring for the future[16]

INTRODUCTION

We ended the millennium with the certainty, at the same time astonishing and frightening, of having being witness to scientific and technological innovations, to sociological and political changes that, in less than a century, radically altered the planet, the societies in which we live, and our own conception of identity.

Women's rights, the legal consecration of their full citizenship, are, in the eyes of those who understand the essence of things, the greatest achievement of the twentieth century. I do not have the false humility of claiming to have been merely observant of what has happened. Ever since the awareness of my womanhood was awakened in me, I have been part of the group of women who, throughout the world, sought, as Prof. Irene Ramalho said:

> *an equality that does not compromise our identity and a difference that does not humiliate.*

And that is why what I have to say to you today finds inspiration in the ever more vivid awareness of the equal imperative of this equality and that difference. Antoinette Fouque, in the book *Il y a deux sexes,* reaffirms it in a way that I fully wish to echo:

> *Equality and difference cannot consolidate themselves one without the other nor be sacrificed one to the other.*

And denounces today's society that, despite all the progress,

> *is about displaying women where they in fact are not as such and excluding them where they do exist*

Infiltrating all those domains where the males made the laws, built the city, created values, established modes of operation, was a necessary step.

But as intruders in another's field,
if we have not on the way left behind our identity
and the culture of women that we have inherited,
we soon realise that this approach is only worthwhile
if our contribution brings new perspectives,
    another way of expressing reality,
    of balancing its problems,
    of imagining its organisation
    and to give it meaning.

How can women then rebuild the world?

By their analysis being based on another place. The place of one's own identity and the place where the subject identifies with the object.

It is a scientific, intransigent, exact analysis – which does not bend to established standards or to *lobbies* or special interests.

In this reading of the world, one should not be cowardly indulgent but lucidly compassionate.

Nor reduce the complexity of the real to a linear juxtaposition of problems, neatly arranged in sectors,
    in departments,
    or, should we say, in disconections.

Women know from experience that everything has to do with everything. They seek correlation, for only in this way, as has been shown by physics and other sciences of nature, is the act of understanding possible.

And, having understood, they will seek
non-piecemeal solutions,
integrated,
where life, therefore, pulsates.

It is this mission that we are going to talk about.

1. LOOKING AT THE WORLD

The world is no longer just a world in transition.
It is true that there are transitional processes in very concrete aspects of social reality,
but these processes are nothing but the tremors of a stable global situation,
at which the world has arrived at the beginning of the millennium and that it is important to boldly face head-on.

1.1. It is an *intensely populated* world. Each piece of arable land can scarcely more be divided and productive.
The genocides of the African Great Lakes Region
– Rwanda, Burundi –
were the dramatic illustration of this scarcity of land.

When I was born the population of two billion had doubled over a century; since then the world population has tripled.

To continue with the same rate of fertility the world will grow at the rate each year of nine more Swedens;
in every six years one more Latin America;
and in the middle of the century, the addition of a world of equal size to that of the 1960s.

While the FAO ensures that there is enough food for such a population size, two huge problems threaten future generations:

— the growing imbalance of resources between North and South, and the total imbalance of basic goods within each society (each North has its own South and each South has a North of unknown dimensions in other latitudes);
— the risks of genetically processed foodstuffs, both in themselves and in their use as 'weapons' for embargo and deterrence, in a world in which protectionism behaves paradoxically and cynically in a market of free competition.

To add to these difficulties, in the world, drinking water is scarce, due to drainage, contamination by fertilizers and non-biodegradable components of urban and industrial waste.

1.2. Women are now present in many structures of national administrations and international institutions.
This presence has to be translated into dedicated work so that the living conditions of human beings improve.

It is my conviction that it is urgent to replace the cold and increasingly macroeconomic concept of 'development' with the concept and practice of Quality of Life.

As the President of Brazil says, and we can say of other countries:

Brazil is not an underdeveloped country – it is an unjust country.

But how to say this and what does this mean for the millions who live in shantytowns or the legion of the landless?

Quality of Life means:

— getting beyond survival level,
— considering to be imperative all international instruments available (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Convention on the Rights of the Child, World Nutrition Programme, Health for All Programme, ILO Convention 122 the Employment Policy, the World Charter for Nature, etc.)

It is a long list of commitments for the international community in which civic, political, social, economic and cultural rights are proclaimed as 'interdependent and indivisible' in the two International Covenants which install into the body of international law the spirit that inspires the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This long list is an integral part of Quality of Life.

Thus, their implementation works
like other *objective indicators*
of Quality of Life.

But what is equally important in Quality of Life
is that it is also a result
of a *subjective evaluation.*
After survival level is surpassed,
different rights and degrees of implementation
are measured out for each person
in response to aspirations
and choices of lifestyles and personal priorities.
They do not have, beyond this threshold,
the same content for each person.

To work for a society in which the Quality of Life is thus
measured at a time
by objective and universal rights

and by the satisfaction of subjective and diversified conditions,
is a new way of looking at society and the world.

We turn away from archaic representations of the 'masses' as a uniform whole so as to guarantee each human being not only the answer to their fundamental needs but also respect for their identity and the characteristics that define it.

2. A HEGEMONIC WORLD

2.1. The Quality of Life that we seek
is not a juxtaposition of a new perspective
on a representation of the world that would remain unalterable.

We were all our lives contemporaries of a Cold War that
maintained two ideologies in a permanent state of latent
confrontation. Both resulted from the same paradigm:
a Promethean conviction in the progress of the sciences,
embedded in a story that is linearly unfolding.

If we had doubts about the naivety of this paradigm,
the events of the last decade would suffice
to readily show us
that the reality is another
and that the paradigm not yet formulated
has to be outlined with new coordinates.

We live in a world in which, contrary to the thesis of the end of history
– centred in the West and in a mechanistic perspective of democratic life
– we feel that
we are beginning to write history.

Because where is the time
in which 'they shall beat their swords into ploughshares
and spears into pruning hooks' (Is. 2,4), as the founders of the United Nations
expected, making theirs Isaiah's prophecy,
and so was written at the United Nations Plaza in New York?

Where is the equality of all peoples,
regardless of race or religion
or the size of the countries to which they belong?

Where is the solidarity and sharing
between the different nations
and mutual appreciation for the respect of
diversity that enriches the mosaic we form?

Instead of this might of a rediscovered universality
– where difference excludes levelling uniformity –
the 21st century began under the aegis of a new hegemony
        fruit not only of the force
and imperialism of the most powerful,
but above all, and at its root, the consequence
of an overwhelming ideology
which, without identifying itself, traverses the entire planet:
that of nationally, ethnically or religiously based fundamentalism
wanting to impose its view of the world on others
and the law that is born of it.

Never has nationalist zeal struck so many different peoples, compromising national,
regional and even world peace.

Never has the force of the economy reached such sacred
proportions as revealed by 'the religion of the market'
worshipping the golden calf which,
in my religious tradition,
is the denial of values and the quest
for a deeper meaning of life and of the human person.

The information and communications revolution has allowed
economic and financial agents
to rapidly appropriate opportunities.
It completely transformed the production process
that, by being parcelled out, made it possible
for there to be international division of labour
on an as yet unknown scale:
there are no more factories
but rather assorted units of production of the same article
situated thousands of kilometres away from each other. In each place someone is an
accomplice and profits;
but everywhere in the process
those who work and enter the transnational chain of production
are increasingly penalised

and are deprived of all means of protection.

The dark side of globalisation is its exploitation consented to and stimulated by the market, which is invoked by policymakers as if it were a person, had intelligence and conscience, when in the end it is nothing but a blind mechanism in the hands of profit, greed and corruption.

The total elimination of the human and social factor of the economy is not all.
The current hegemony also disregards
the environmental factor of the economy,
we force upon the earth a burden of pollution and waste it cannot bear:
— life support systems are degraded;
— the diversified wealth of life itself is wiped out;
— beauty, the creator of meaning and source of spirituality for our human life, is destroyed;
— the energy we expend not only depletes resources but also leads us to doubt the viability of life for future generations.

2.2. Such hegemony cannot continue to be consented to

I am in the presence of women who can not only fight
against child labour,
against the absence of legislation guaranteeing health
and in particular the reproductive health of women
in the world of work,
but they can also exert pressure, make proposals,
influence opinion,
so that a code of conduct for companies is drawn up,
voted and recognised internationally
capable of defeating economic hegemony on the very terrain where it manifests itself.

Neither can women accept that nature
– to which in patriarchal societies they have always been compared – to be violated as it now is.

There have been commitments made by the vast majority of countries since 1992. But the international conferences, from Kyoto to Toronto, did little more than renege on their commitments.

Even in that area came the murderous logic of the market, with the purchase and sale of greenhouse gas emission rights.

How can women accept
– and so many are already responsible for the departments
of the Environment or Justice – that such a fallacy be
written into city law?

Actually, is the atmosphere not just one?
Is it not true that it matters not if gases are
emitted from the United States or from Somalia?
Is it not also evident that the purchase of these
rights is a form of new collective slavery,
from one nation to another,
preventing them from industrialising?

Women can change the course of things. I remember women like Wangara Mathai in Kenya or Vandana Shiva in India and the women's movement that embraced the trees to prevent them from being felled.

3. A WORLD LAGGING BEHIND DEMOCRACY

3.1. Gestures like that of these women are rare.
Because decisions that relate to populations
are increasingly taken away from them.

Today not only is the policy of prices of raw
materials decided from afar and often,
against the interests of the populations where they are produced.
The prices of essential goods also end up being subject to
a policy that is rarely ever left to
national decision-makers themselves.

Without citizen participation,
democracy is becoming more and more
what a French political scientist, Patrick Viveret,
called 'the confiscation of power' by democracy.

The delay or even the perversion of democracy is experienced in each country.
Even in countries that are considered exemplary in their democracy, there is dissatisfaction with existing democratic institutions. For example, the Swedish government has just published the report of a commission asked to study the conditions necessary for 'sustained democracy'.

This democratic delay is characterised essentially by:

a) a lack of definition of the objectives of each society;
b) a lack of mechanisms for participation in decisions relating to matters directly affecting people;
c) the non-existence, malfunction or neutralisation of *countervailing powers.*

In many other countries formal democracy itself does not exist or is confiscated by one class, one party, one sex.

The lagging behind of democracy and its slowness in accompanying the great transformations of our time, are particularly blatant on a global scale.
A globalised world lacks institutions of global governance.
It is vital that the UN completely changes its practices, which are over 50 years old.
As a matter of fact:

a) It has already been proved by many thousands of victims that 'to keep' the peace without being able to 'make peace' has negative consequences.
b) A Security Council confined to military security does not understand that war is rooted in the immense imbalances that permeate the world today and that major social and economic issues should be on its agenda.
c) The international Conferences of the 1990s built a global agenda, but following Rio, Copenhagen or Beijing, we do not see the UN realistically linking resolutions and commitments.

At the same time, world governance cannot agree
on a single control centre
for science and culture.
The recent announcement to the world
of the discovery of human genome sequencing
by President Clinton and Prime Minister Tony Blair
is an unethical
misappropriation of science by politics.

3.2. In recent years there has been a growing interest on the part of women in realising their right to full political participation.
This participation will only bring something new to society and do justice to the contribution of women
if parity goes hand-in-hand
with a clear renewal in the understanding of democracy.

Women in political power are
a social asset
if, at the same time, they are determined
    to democratise democracy.
Parity will be an appropriate tool to the degree that, en masse, women can change the rules of the game.

4. FOR A NEW PARADIGM: A WORLD BASED ON CARE

What, then, is the contribution of women to a new paradigm of the running of politics?

Neoliberalism, perversion of free initiative, has been associated with individualism and the perversion of autonomy. The synergy of these two movements is lethal for the human person and for society.

It is a new political concept that the world needs, a concept that does not always see politics in terms of the relation of forces but rather a healthy interdependence between all human beings, from the local scale to the world scale.

Raising the practice of the millennial culture of women *to the category* of elementary common sense, giving it *visibility* and, at the same time, *elaborating this practice as a political concept* to be practised by men and women is an urgent task. This concept is that of CARE.

I am not trying to bring any sentimentality or feminine 'essence' into the political scene. I am trying to bring, with many other women, a practice that also has a theoretical foundation.

First, philosophically. It was Heidegger who gave care a determining place in his philosophy of being.
Far from those who would primarily see a moral in care,
Heidegger defines the human being as a caring being.
Paul Ricœur takes up this same notion in particular in his book *Soi-même comme un autre.*
Emmanuel Levinas, affirming that 'we is not the plural of I' but rather a prior connection
    to the existence of all humans,
    only means that this 'we' presupposes care
    as a guarantee of individual and collective existence.

Then also politically.
In the Commission's report
on world governance
over which he presided, the former Prime Minister of Sweden,
Ingvar Carlsson, stated:

    The task for governance is to encourage

the sense of care through policies and mechanisms that facilitate cooperation to assist the disadvantaged or those in need of comfort and support.

It is curious to note that a former World Bank leader, when studying the mistakes of the banks and the repercussions they had on the lives and deaths of thousands of people, ended his work with a touching appeal for 'care', writing:

The guardian and facilitator of freedom on the planet
for present and future generations is care
- an attitude and a way of being in the world
which safeguards the human and natural wealth we have inherited from
the past, thus guaranteeing a future open to many different possibilities.

Thirdly, the work done by Carol Gilligan and later taken up by numerous female thinkers on societal issues shows that to an ethics of justice – *on which the existing democracy is founded and is limited at its best* – an ethics of care must be juxtaposed.

While the ethics of justice builds the whole political edifice over the human being as the seat of rights,
the ethics of care takes into account
the eminently realistic position that the human being
is also a being of vulnerabilities
which, in many situations,
prevent one from standing up to defend one's rights.

It is true that in practice we could say that
the social dominance of the welfare state was already, avant la lettre,
an expression of the recognition of situations of vulnerability.
But the conceptual casing of this formidable achievement
of the twentieth century continued to be only
that of justice, the rights and the norms that flow from them.
It is my conviction that one of the reasons for the difficulties
of the welfare state
is that it has not yet been emancipated from that conceptual
framework in which it was constructed.

An ethic of care can provide a new starting point for the role of the state in relation to the real political priorities of societies in which the human person should be the centre and the ultimate end of all political decision.

It will not be enough to add piously
to political democracy
social, economic and cultural democracy.
It will be necessary to build democracy simultaneously
on justice and care,
rights and responsibilities.

The discussion that has taken place in
the women's movement has been intense
since the concept of 'care' was elaborated by Carol Gilligan,
who had been a collaborator of Kohlberg
in the work that led to his theory of moral development.
In her book *Moral Boundaries* Joan Tronto
is one of the most eminent thinkers in this field
and I will seek to summarise the importance
of the concept of care alongside the ethics of justice:

> *First, the ethics of care*
> *calls for accountability and relationships*
> *rather than rights and norms.*
> *Then such ethics*
> *are more connected to concrete circumstances*
> *than to formal and abstract aspects.*
> *Finally, ethics of care is*
> *adequately expressed*
> *not so much by a set of principles*
> *but by an activity, 'the activity of care'.*

Throughout this journey we will finally find
both the thoughts of Hannah Arendt giving action
the ultimate expression of intervention in the world,
and the thoughts of the contemporary German philosopher Hans Jonas in establishing
as the great encompassing principle of ethics for our time
the 'principle of responsibility' as the most appropriate way of expressing the ethics of
the future that this millennium demands.

Female leadership
and world governability[17]

FEMALE LEADERSHIP

What new paradigms can we have recourse to so that globalisation is not a path of global destruction? What new forces, as yet untried, do we have in the world for governance to acquire a new face?

The aspiration that has guided my entire life is the conviction that women can be a force for radical transformation of the institutionalised irrational times in which we live.

Their leadership is the result of the enormous transformations that took place during the twentieth century. And above all in the unequivocal affirmation of their own identity, generated by the millennial culture of women (a people that came from afar) and sustained by the philosophical contemplation of its irrevocable and inalienable capacity to conceive, generate and produce life. This capacity is a philosophical fact – the ability to 'give birth' – which applies to all women irrespective of their status in society. Transforming that capacity, giving it visibility and status is the first step towards women's leadership that flows beyond that half of humanity.

This new leadership will thus be another way of looking at governability and collectively forging *a new political vision*.

THE CHALLENGES OF THE PRESENT MOMENT

While it is true that a reflection is always contextualised in time and space, to speak, at this moment, of governability in the world is to think over what the immense tragedy of September 11 has revealed to us and to know that on this continent, the continent where I live, all over the planet, everyone is questioning themselves, everyone feels emotional, compassionate, restless and perplexed.

---

17   Talk presented in Rio de Janeiro, on 20 September 2001, at *the Men, Women and Global Governance conference*. Published in magazine *Rio de Janeiro: Trabalho e Sociedade*, Year 1, no. 2 (December 2001), pp. 31-38.

For how can one speak of governability with lucidity and objectivity when all the material conditions on which it rests have been overwhelmed?

— the security of people as an expression of the dignity of the human being, the dignity on which all their rights are founded;
— the rule of law and justice over barbarism;
— the existence of States that fulfil their fundamental role of respecting, defending and furthering all the rights of their populations;
— the imperative of the existence and reinforcement of mechanisms that prevent insane and murderous acts.

How is it possible to reflect on governability when we passively take refuge under the shadow of a state we call the welfare state? Or when we trust unreservedly in a market that, in the terminology of the dominant ideology, is self-regulating and articulates itself as if it were a person (manifest in such expressions as: 'Let's see how the market behaves', 'We cannot predict anything because we have to see the market reaction', etc., etc.)?

We would speak of governability when, as the 1990s loomed, we assumed from the yearly succession of United Nations Conferences that we had paved the way for a *21st century agenda.*

For is it not true that all these Conferences pointed to a more humane world order?

— the conference on the rights of the child;
— the conference – here in Rio – on the environment and development, the Earth Charter and Agenda 21;
— the conference [on human rights that included] the rights of women as human rights;
— the conference on population and development where it was decided that procreation decisions belonged to human beings and not to States;
— the conference on women and the conditions of equality, development and peace;
— the conference on the human person at the centre of social development; conditions of habitability for all populations.

But all these intentions, many solemnly assumed by over a hundred heads of state, were engulfed by the black hole of a culture rejecting its ethical references and revealing:

— each person guided by their individualism, if not hedonism;
— each country in the defence of its own interests;
— society and civilisation in the euphoric grip of accumulation and consumption and prey to the eroticisation of violence.

I believe that this drift of humanistic culture is at the basis of the political behaviour of decision-makers at all levels. Few have bothered to give substance to this agenda.

Perhaps because they were convinced that in 1989 everything was finally settled and it was only worth continuing to get behind the 'victory of capitalism'. We were subject to the tyranny of the lack of alternatives. (It was perhaps this misunderstood realisation that led to speaking of the 'end of history', when the collective history in which all humans, without exception, are born equal in rights and dignity, is still far away – maybe ever further still... – on the horizon!)

The world became a void, with the predominance of what came to be called a 'single thought', that is, the simple perpetuation and generalisation of the already known. No objectives were defined, while the necessary strategies, ultimate goals and priorities they required were not carefully considered.

It is in this void that the words of Gramsci gain relevance, more eloquently expressed than anyone else so far, the tragic moment that the world is living:

> *The old is dying,*
> *and the new cannot be born;*
> *in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear.*

THE GLOBALISATION OF GOVERNABILITY

When morbid symptoms arise, the analyses must be more demanding, the perspectives to explore are more urgent, the more rigorous the need for clarification of terms has to be.

I begin with a reflection on the very concept of governability itself, which is not limited to government action, in fact far from it.

Governability is the potential of society as a whole to generate in its core normative principles, social movements and institutional mechanisms capable of ensuring, in their interaction, conditions that guarantee the quality of life of the population and healthy interdependence with other peoples of the globe.

In summary, we can say that governability requires:

— precise knowledge and exact definition of the data and facts;
— the ability to extract from this analysis and definition what is called in business language *the core business* or, in more philosophical terms, the logical paradox that is the very definition of any problem;
— once the data are set out, we have the formulation of possible scenarios to solve the problem;
— the clarification of the actors and mechanisms required by each scenario and, above all, according to the most plausible scenario;
— the swiftness and need of making a decision with the appropriate authority.

We are clearly entering, and in plain view, into a changed world in the way it assesses the relationships among peoples. If the mass demonstrations in favour of *another kind of*

globalisation on the one hand, and the analysis of each of the aspects of globalisation on the other, already required a fresh way of looking at the phenomena of our global society, the attacks of 9/11 made this task an imperative.

Governance results from the urgency of rethinking and reorienting change. For this, it is vital that the world finds the leadership it sorely needs.

It is no longer just about relations between States. The new society is not only forged at the national level. *Society forges itself in the combined spheres of the nation/region/world.*

At stake in governability is paying constant attention at all three levels to things as they happen, and to their permanent interaction. Only this attention permits the responsibility and the ethics of care, as the great thinker Simone Weil had understood in the 1940s.

At stake is not a policy made by political spectators but rather by men and women capable of imagining a more defined, transparent, controlled and efficient, and therefore more democratic international regulatory system.

We lived in a transitional world during the period after the end of the Cold War, but we were naive in thinking that only the former communist countries were in a period of transition. The transition has concerned the whole world. We are faced with a complex, planet-wide system unprecedented in the history of the world.

At every moment of a complex system there are, as the physicists show us, forks or knots, from which different branches can arise. These are moments of great instability. This is where the need for governance and the demand for leadership manifest themselves.

If until the catastrophe of 9/11 some countries saw fit to remain isolated from the world, ignoring the consequences of globalisation, today this supreme arrogance has definitively expired. The great areas of globalisation, which were the concern of activists, thinkers and multilateral organisations, are today the 'field of working' of all those who embrace the struggles for survival and the great human suffering that is attached to them. Insularity is no more. Globalisation is at the heart of governance. As a concern. And as a responsibility. As an object and as the very instrument of governability.

What is global is not what appears simultaneously in various parts of the world or establishes relations within the world. Globalisation refers to what applies to the world as an integrated and connected whole.

This distinction stems from a new phenomenon, only possible due to the radical scientific and technological transformation that has taken place in the last decades. The transition from traditional communication to communication at the speed of light is the basis of great change.

Two consequences change the geopolitics of the world: the unique possibility of instantaneous communication has become available (everything is experienced in real time everywhere) and it reaches all sectors of human society, changing in some cases the nature of these sectors.

It is therefore urgent to establish the conditions of governance in the major areas of globalisation:

1) Instant communication, the networked world

How do we regulate means of communication that are potential disasters-in-waiting? And to follow there are ethical problems such as the guarantee of intellectual property, the safeguarding of the right to privacy of communication between people. *Media* content, especially TV, must be regulated – but how can we ignore ratings and the desire for profit, perverse aspects of the right to freedom of expression?

Throughout this area governability must be on a necessarily global scale.

2) The economy and finance

The first areas to take advantage of this spectacular breakthrough were the economy and finance. To regulate these areas it is necessary to undo the myths that pervade them.

The first myth is that of self-regulation of the market. Jacques Delors often states that the market is myopic. That is, markets are spontaneously unstable and chaotic. Public intervention is necessary to ensure regulation.

The second myth states that competition has the potential to generate wealth for all. And the limits of competitiveness? For example, there are in the world 1.3 billion farmers who practice manual agriculture while only 28 million use mechanised agriculture. What does competitiveness mean in this context?

The third myth wishes to dupe us by saying that global pricing is an important criterion for the orientation of production. That is not true. Price is determined by the price of the most competitive exporting country, often acquiring that status at the expense of state aid to producers.

The fourth myth is that the market is the engine of economic growth. But how to explain then how the massive export of cacao, rice, bananas, meat and coffee to the North has not improved the lives of the South's producers?

A fundamental aspect is the creation of conditions for the modification of consumption patterns and production programmes. It is not a moral problem but a technical one. But to bring this true economic and financial revolution to fruition, it is vital to have decisive and globalised governance.

3) The *global commons*

Our global natural heritage requires this same attitude. I will point out just the most obvious constituents and the dangers to which they are subject:

— Forests – apart from the beauty they offer, forests are the lungs of the atmosphere. In certain regions, their destruction has already led to lunar wastelands.
— Water – is under attack at all levels: it is difficult to find at normal levels above sea level, water sources uncontaminated by the products used in agriculture. Rivers are the waterways that suffer most from the consequences of industrialisation and unchecked urbanisation.

— The climate is particularly affected by the use of the toxic gases resulting from fossil fuels. There are possible and feasible solutions, such as concentrating on renewable energies. But it is also one of the areas in which the trend towards the isolation of some countries, particularly the US, has been felt.
— Space is already crowded, constituting a danger to the planet's population, and is already part of the new arms race.

THE FEMALE VISION

It is quite deliberate that, instead of elaborating a new theory, I have chosen, by way of conclusion, to borrow the voice of women who describe, in our language, each in their own way, how they see the leadership of women.

Maria do Céu Guerra, actress and stage director, describes the newness brought by women's leadership:

> *Raise the dust,*
> *and do so in such a bold and radical way*
> *that its settling creates a new landscape.*

Maria Teresa Horta, a poet (one of the three Marias of *Novas Cartas Portuguesas*) sketches her 'Portrait' of a woman's leadership:

> *She measures the fire*
> *by the soul*
>
> *Makes a braid of laughter*
> *instead of tears*
>
> *Weaves the love she has*
> *for others*
>
> *Exchanges spirit and peace*
> *for courage*
>
> *She holds on to hope and*
> *comes back still*
>
> *Takes again the plumb line*
> *With which she traces*

*The line of life
that assumes*

*Using the reverse
 to the face*

*She sets and resets
her destiny*

*Goes further
in what she disguises*

*She dares the heart
And reaffirms*

*Embroidering the rainbow
of what is fragile*

And it is Maria Velho da Costa, writer (another of the three Marias) who issues her biggest vote for women's leadership:

And may you leave with this people at least the memory of a brief hour of complete and utter truth, of clear goodwill, of fresh intelligence and sensibility. Ours. Because it is not always the integrity of a leader and his liking for life that makes the human masses move. But it is always what they hope for, what they venerate when they recognise, what they remember as a sign, and but a sign, of their own vitality and greatness.

Impossible? Romantic? Sentimental? No because all this is possible only with the persistence of those who never give up. That is why I repeat many times what another woman poet, Ana Luisa Amaral, says humbly:

*... and in the desert take care
so that some flower
survives.*

It is to partake in this care that I invite you. And I am sure that in the desert some flowers will survive.

GROUP II

DEMOCRACY, CITIZENSHIP, HUMAN RIGHTS

The new rights: the emergence of identity[1]

1. AN AMBIGUOUS THEME

1.1. The Relationship of Rights to Identity

The title of this talk is deliberately left open… because I was hoping to see in my own reflection a way of giving a more precise outline to the insight that is implicit there. But I must say that at this moment the only thing I can add is exactly what is contained in the title as it stands: 'new rights' are both a starting point for the clear emergence of a new identity and the culmination of an awareness of identity.

The recognition of this dual development seems to me fundamental to the comprehension of the cultural and political phenomena of our time, from individual narcissism to collective fundamentalism.

An ambiguity persists as to the expressions used in the title.

First, what do we mean when we talk about 'new rights'? Some scholars believe that there is no reason to call 'new rights' only those that still have not been fully accepted. For them, rights such as the right to health, to education, to work, are also 'new rights'.

This is not my opinion: it is enough for rights to be enshrined in existing constitutions for me to consider them acquired. I no longer consider them 'new'. They have already found the appropriate manner to be codified at the highest level of the legal order at a national level. The same goes for rights incorporated in international instruments, duly voted on and open to the ratification of States. They are no longer strictly 'new'.

More complicated is the use of the expression 'identity'. What does it mean? According to the Larousse it is the 'Character of what is a whole while presenting a set of characteristics'. It is this 'whole' – individual or as a community – that I will endeavour to question from the point of view of 'new rights'. This will mean both personal and collective identity. It is possible that in the indefinite number we refer to in the expression 'set of characteristics' there are some that we will be able to see clearly.

In my opinion, rights must correspond to a living reality that at a certain point has become so strong that it needs to be translated into law. This is just the argument for identity.

1.2 Identity by birth – all in the past?

There was a time when man was defined in society by birth. It was his kinship that made him the holder of rights in relation to property and other people: these rights thus founded his identity. The son of the lord did not need to turn to other aspects of his life circumstances for his identity to be established. So much so that in some European languages – and even in countries with a long democratic tradition! – people keep the name which is nothing other than the designation of their parentage: this is the case of Fernandez or Rodrigues in the Iberian Peninsula or Jacobsson or Andriessen in Scandinavian countries … This person lived in a society where men were born *de facto* different in terms of rights.

The founding revolutions of individual rights overturned this millennial order. The nations of the world proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The statement is unequivocal: *'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights'.* That is to say that their identity is, initially, a blank page on which all rights can be written.

But where does the reality of rights really stand?

A simple fact illustrates this far better than theoretical arguments. A few days ago the French newspapers announced with great fanfare that Mr Bouyges, the world's leading concrete producer, had chosen and appointed his successor: none other than his youngest son! And the father (to whom television has granted a great deal of air time) reeled off the immense qualities of his son … What interests me here is the 'matter of factness' with which birth rights are readily accepted in practice by all of society! I have not seen or heard the slightest interest in this matter…

If this is still so blatantly the case in our society, how can we be surprised at the persisting inequality of human rights in the world? Is a Brazilian child born in a shantytown, one of many random large families, equal in right and dignity to a German child at birth? Is an infant girl born anywhere in the world equal in practical law and equality to a male child?

This means that equality at birth still has a long way to go. The identity is embedded in conditions of utter imbalance. For many children the conditions of their identity are still infrahuman. The link between identity and rights is thus broken. If the same dignity is not recognised in the child, his or her identity is, from the outset, impaired. It is an infringement of individual rights. It is an irreparable loss for humanity.

1.3. Identity defined by work

The great founding revolutions coincided with the rise of industrial society. The identity which had just been liberated in the law from the guardianship of birth was then shifted towards one's occupation. Industrialisation contributed to professional diversification; it highlighted the differences that were previously mitigated by rural and agricultural society as a whole;

it called for structured learning; made each child an object for career orientation; in a word, tied each individual to the work acts one had to do.

Chaplin, in the classic *Modern Times*, repeating the same gesture in a vacuum, is not only the pathetic portrait of a worker subjected to Taylorist logic. It is above all the universal and unforgettable metaphor of all men and women subject to the inexorable laws of industrialisation.

In this civilisation – a unique model that is taking over the whole globe, beyond the influence of political regimes and the degree of development – identity is perceived as the equivalent of what the human person accomplishes in the world of production. The status conferred by this work muddies the uniqueness of a person's identity.

Paradoxically, the economy, leading to a net distribution between capital and labour, also confers unequal rights: those of people who work, that is to say, of the immense majority of men and women – are rights obtained on demand. Equal labour rights are far from being achieved in the very systems that have been built on industrial work and its offshoots.

The work done is such an element of definition of the person that most of the rights enshrined today in our Constitutions or in ordinary law are born from our status as workers: the right to weekly and annual rest, the right to healthy working conditions, the right to health, the right to sickness or invalidity benefits.

We even witness the supreme irony implicit in our societies where family values and the virtues of the motherly role are extolled: women's rights in terms of social benefits are most often, even in the case of motherhood, secondary rights, borne of the rights of the worker to whom the woman is married!!

(I have tried in my country to make social security rights autonomous, linking them more to the human condition and solidarity rather than dependency on work. A significant structural element in public policies and the structures responsible for them lay in the separation between social security and work. This was only a short-term difference: soon social security was coupled with work, signifying a real setback in the understanding and expansion of rights.)

If 'old' rights have something to gain from 'new' rights, it is above all their autonomy from the world of work. It is not work that is the primary source of rights but life itself. The identity of each person can emerge only in a new relationship with work, expressed also by the law.

1.4. Non-universality and practical disparities

In spite of the pitfalls that I have just mentioned, an effort has been going on for several decades to integrate in the national constitutions and in ordinary law the fundamental rights which establish the conditions of the freedom of each person and of equality between all. At the international level, in-depth work is being done which is, in many respects, a decisive contribution to the move towards a definition of identity that is free from any constraint.

It is obvious that the formulation of rights finds two weighty obstacles:

— one concerns the real non-universality of concrete and fundamental rights: by tacit agreement and a certain complicity of silence, certain types of rights are not applicable to such and such group of people in such and such region of the world;
— the other occurs in every country and on every occasion: it is the disparity between legal principles and existing practices.

As long as universality and practical application are not recognised through the ratification of international instruments by the public authorities, rights fall short of their anthropological significance. There is a disassociation between rights and identity.

Thus, if there is no universality of rights for whites and blacks, if the rural population is far from having the same rights as the urban population in practice, if one does not recognise women's universal rights, while the disparity between them is clear, the contribution of human rights to human dignity remains debatable. It will be only idealised values, abstract notions, systemised yes, but bearing no relation to real life.

The consequences of such a situation do not only concern the identity of the human person: they have implications for the place of law in society, for the dialogue between society and state, for public policies to implement mechanisms that protect our rights.

2. NEW RIGHTS … SO WHAT'S NEW?

2.1. Interdependence of rights

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has emerged as a great source of hope, but history at the international level has taught us that the equality and freedom proclaimed there do not enjoy the same level of understanding in all states or in all cultures. Indeed, it was not until 1966 that the UN General Assembly was able to decide on the Covenants that would subsequently be subject to ratification by the member states.

The discussion over the years explains why today there is a difference of opinion regarding the content of 'new' rights.

At the time there was a clear division between two conceptions of rights. On the one hand, a group of States considered that there should be only one Covenant covering both civil and political rights and social, economic and cultural rights. On the other, a majority of States considered it essential to separate the two types of rights, noting that civic and political rights are, in their immediacy, constitutive of the rule of law, while social, economic and cultural rights represent more long-term goals, of which no state could seek immediate application. In the end, only the Preamble of the two Covenants confers equal legal dignity to both types of rights by affirming their interdependence.

If I touch on this question that apparently belongs to the past it's because the discussion itself is about the identity of man. In simple terms: is not the citizen also the worker, the consumer, the patient, the student, the tenant of a house? Can man be free when he is starving? And conversely does food meet all the requirements of man?

These are questions that resonate in the present day without real solutions at the planetary level. It is a question of 'freedom and the conditions of freedom'.

The divorce between liberty and the conditions of freedom is particularly clear in the attitude of the rich countries when they make the aid they give to poor countries depend on what has been called 'human rights situation', meaning exclusively by this respect for fundamental freedoms and guarantees. It is time to make it clear that the right to eat to satisfy one's hunger comes under the fundamental guarantees of humankind and not of the abstract human person, reduced to the condition of a conceptual ideal...

There is the question of the absolute timeliness of the interdependence between democracy and development. Democracy that does not give itself development goals or does nothing to ensure its own development runs mortal risks. All the Southern Hemisphere, especially the indebted countries and the LDCs, are there to convince us. But in the same way, where democracy does not exist, stagnation is gaining ground and development is waning – the Soviet Union and other Eastern countries are now showing it in startling and illuminating detail.

Democracy and development go hand in hand because the free individual is also the one whose basic needs can be met. Freedom and security are two pillars of full citizenship as described in international norms and in the evolution of public policies on our continent.

The identity of the individual is not limited to one's condition as a citizen. It is threatened when basic needs are not met. But the evidence of this is not unanimous. It is not surprising that social, economic and cultural rights are seen by some as 'new' rights, when in fact they are already 'old' rights.

2.2. Science and technology at the heart of new rights

What about new rights? They are largely, if not totally, founded on the evolution of science and technology according to three constituents:

— as an expression of universal access to the achievements of science and technology
— as a defence against the negative consequences of these gains
— as an affirmation of the primacy of the human person over the challenge of self-correcting science, before it is translated into new technologies and new objects.

New rights are the expression of the humankind's new context in the light of the possibilities opened up by science and technology. It is particularly a question of two rights that I will not go into great depth about here. These rights relate to the inviolability of the human person both from the point of view of identity and genetic autonomy and from the point of view of the defence of one's social identity, which IT systems can easily gain access to.

2.3. The right to a balanced environment

I wish to come back to the right to a healthful and balanced environment. The threats to the environment and to all subsystems that support life are the most complete and striking example of technological developments not intended for human benefit.

The criticism of such a development is, from the beginning, a plea for human dignity and the respect for our identity. But it is also the broadening of what makes up the identity of man. In this respect, such an evolution followed by the establishment of the right to an environment is a paradigmatic sociological journey.

At first, these are social movements embodying a heightened state of consciousness – this is the shockwave of the movement. Secondly, the aspirations of the movement win over public opinion and are taken up by the powers that be, becoming the swell that can change things. In fact, the right to a healthful environment goes as far as to influence industrial policies, the industrial production control system and even energy policies as they turn them on their head.

Due to the public discussion it elicits and the obligation it places on scientists and decision-makers to fully explain the reasons for their choices, this evolution makes it necessary to look at the very identity of man in a different way. Man is becoming less and less an abstract being, divorced from the logic of the laws that govern nature, to become a participant in the evolution of nature itself. He creates a system with nature, he grows roots and persists, he becomes debtor and creditor. From a real or potential victim of attacks on the environment, he becomes an acting protagonist, a stakeholder in the cosmic equilibrium.

2.4. Right to a healthful urban life

Most Constitutions that refer to the right to a healthful environment expand it to the social environment, to the factors that are the result of our lives in society and often weigh heavily on one's individual life. An entirely new phenomenon has emerged the proportions of which are constantly increasing: urban sprawl and the living conditions it entails.

In the face of the immense rural exodus that is taking place in the world and the demographic growth of the countries of the Southern Hemisphere, we can only note our inability to manage these giant urban clusters, called –'cities' only because of their dimension. It is not by chance that the last issue of the *UNESCO Courier* is devoted to cities. Extremely beautifully portrayed, it allows one to understand the tragic dimension of the problem. What about a city like Tokyo, which has grown in 100 years from 800,000 to 12 million inhabitants? And how can we consider quality of life in a city like Abidjan which increased the number of its inhabitants 100 fold in 50 years? In the year 2000 the 20 most populous cities in the world will be outside Europe and, with the exception of New York, Tokyo and Los Angeles, they are all located in developing countries.

This new face of human geography raises the question of new rights, all relating to the quality of life in these large cities. It is the defence against noise, air pollution, odours and the continual threat of violence that represents the mere presence of so many people in the same

area. It's the right to transport, the accessibility of basic services. But above all and for all the key question is habitat. As long as people are huddled in dens we cannot speak of respect for their dignity. The human mess is incalculable. It is a collective shame that we are not able, even in our ancient cities, to overcome such an exclusion of people from the human community.

The right to a decent habitat represents the geographical identity of humankind. We require a clean space, an extension of oneself, soil of our individuality and our human condition.

2.5. Right to a true cultural environment

The astonishing development of the media has created another type of environment. This one is cultural and mainly acts subliminally on our attitudes and feelings.

The media produce mental programmes. Choices of information are not made according to the importance of the event, but guided by competition and subject to ratings. It is more a question of stimulating, of coercing, than of informing – man finds himself reduced to the most elementary Pavlovian schema, a simple reflex mechanism. Knowing that each news item cannot exceed 1.5 minutes, one wonders what will become of man subjected to such a fragmentation of time.

A new right arises that is far beyond the mere right to information. A new arrangement of the cultural and psychological questions which are embedded in this right is indispensable. Because it is directly cultural, this right is more clearly perceived as a decisive right to identity. But we are still very far from having found the frameworks capable of providing it with the necessary structural foundations and the philosophy to support it. Humankind in full enjoyment of this right will be the one who will be granted the opportunity to restore the fullness of time to any fragmented information and verify the data provided to him. This is a major cultural assignment.

3. RIGHTS OF EACH AND EVERYONE

3.1. 'First degree' collective rights

All these rights relate to all humans whatever their situation or country. All people are concerned when there is an infringement of these rights. They are therefore structuring the social community in its historical development and are coexistent with all its expressions – they are its lifeblood.

That is to say that they are not only the expression of the defence of the life of the individual but also the shell of collective rights – groups, nations, relations between them, of any form of association of men with one another.

As first-degree collective rights, they constitute elements of the definition of society. Since this is not a fixed, static reality but a set of social dynamics that, at any moment, transform and produce it, the recognition of each new collective right will require a reorganisation of the institutions of the social community. It is at this stage that public policies decisively

intervene. It is at this stage that the question of the autonomy and emancipation of human communities also arises.

3.2. From citizenship to solidarity

On this path, civic and political, social, economic and cultural rights are expanded and enriched. Citizens have access to civic and political visibility and to accountability for society as a whole. They have *influence over the holders of power* – a key element of democracy. With the new rights, citizenship, in its responsibility and its obligation to control, broadens its field of action. Citizens can no longer pretend that they don't know: it is up to them to demand accurate information. They cannot take refuge in a world of their own: the world in which they live may no longer give them air or water.

In the same way, the human the welfare state cares for is no longer just a beneficiary of the protection of the omnipresent State in response to his/her essential needs. The right to health, food, housing, work, information is owed to him/her because s/he exists as part of that nature and society.

People of today are thus heading towards greater solidarity. It is not only an imperative of a moral order, even if *this order remains the founding inspiration of human acts and choices.* It is the situation of humans in the world and in the chain of life. They are no longer isolated. They are one with the cosmos, the planet, other living beings, other peoples, other humans. We have come far from the divisions resulting from the rationalism which grouped people into impervious ideologies. In addition – by the way – we do not know the nature of the relationship between this new consciousness and the détente that is happening at all levels on the planet. (The sober and responsible position of the recent summit meeting of the 102 non-aligned countries is a considerable sign of this new phase of geopolitics).

3.3. New rights – new duties

To speak of new rights is to talk about new responsibilities in this context of solidarity. For the role of the welfare state as the dispenser of all benefits (if only redistributed) is coming to an end. The state cannot be the substitute for a forgotten paternal power or an expired feudal power. Other bodies are being created that will be able to share the normative, executive and taxation role that comes down to different State entities. What matters to us here is the other aspect of rights: the individual, facing new conditions where one's personal life is so closely bound to the context of the city, the environment, information, that it is no longer an object of law or protection. It is subject to rights and duties, some correlative to others.

(I know that here I am touching on an old debate on the doctrines of law, but I think it is impossible today to deal with the question of duty. There is the participation of the man as a citizen in the management of public affairs. We are in the presence of this privileged moment of anthropology when the exact link between personal life and the unfolding of collective history, whether of a people, a continent or the planet, is realised in full.)

3.4. The scale effect

A non-objectionable correlation is that which occurs between the new rights and physical space. We are at a time when the geographical appearance of the world is constantly changing before our eyes. Even where borders are present, there is an interdependence that goes as far as individual life. We are well aware that the lack of basic social rights among the vast majority of the peoples of Latin America is due to the effect of debt and the fact that the work production of the whole country is destined to paying off interest on the debt. Awareness of such interdependence is not only a question related to the management of the world's economic condition. It may be that the moral obligation of the governments of these countries is in their union to defend the rights to survival of their populations.

In the transformations that are taking place within the framework of the EEC, extremely vital questions will arise. The effect of scale will be felt in all rights. Complex equalisation will be necessary. Rights will acquire a new countenance because they will make themselves felt differently. What will become of the right to social security, when the difference in average wages ranges from one in my country to ten in Germany?

Geopolitical spaces are wider than the nation-state. In Europe we are at a turning point. Already this space has mechanisms which function beyond state jurisdiction: the Court of Justice, the Commission on Petitions. And while it is true that civic and political rights are a first step, it is also true that social and economic rights are beginning to emerge and new rights, through an acute awareness of potential threats and danger, are on the way to making a real impact.

Does this mean that political institutions will no longer make sense? Of course not! But as the state is being diluted in the abolition of borders to integrate into larger spaces, certain normative functions will be passed on to these areas, while executive and supervisory functions will be more adequately exercised by local or regional entities (within each nation).

4. GROUP RIGHTS – HUMAN RIGHTS

4.1. Second-degree collective rights

For the vast majority of peoples, now organised into nation states, the right to self-determination has been the trigger for a collective awareness of their own identity.

In our time other social groups require the recognition of their rights – human groups that do not enjoy all the rights or which in practice they are excluded from, as well as specific groups whose living situation by demanding their own rights will help to expand our human identity.

4.2. Children's rights

The rights of children are raising ever greater demands. They indicate that the identity of a human is not reduced to what is written on one's identity card: beyond these code words there are spirits whose every moment of existence is decisive in the very definition of identity.

The Children's Rights Charter is in progress. What does it tell us?

The right to security, physical and moral wellbeing... And passing before our very eyes are pictures of the battered and bruised bodies of children in Ethiopia or Mozambique, the 25 million abandoned children in Brazil, the tens of millions of children who have no schooling or are victims of unlawful child labour...

These children do not make demands. But their situations compel us to not only be sympathetic to their current distress but to also acknowledge the effects of this distress on their future lives. For we can no longer pretend to ignore that the suffering, loss, and grief of these children will be so bruising to the soul that the future cannot heal them.

The right to education ... Despite all the declarations on human rights, we have not yet discovered a formula capable of providing institutions that ensure the education of young people under 15 who represent more than 50% of the population of the Southern Hemisphere.

4.3. The rights of the elderly

Elderly people are another group without a voice and yet in the Northern Hemisphere this group is only increasing.

Put to one side, disregarded by the pitiless nature of the market, they pose new challenges to society. On the one hand, trade union forces are demanding retirement earlier and earlier, in a system where jobs are growing at a slower rate than the population on the labour market. On the other hand, since life expectancy has risen by more than 20 years in Europe this century, the idea of retirement at age 55/60 needs to be rethought.

The rights of the elderly necessarily lead to a redefinition of the concept of work/occupation/ activity that is socially useful and personally rewarding, the reorganisation of cultural activities and the composition of the living environment in both its personal and community aspects.

4.4. Women's rights

This is the group for which we can say that everything has to be restarted from scratch, because to establish the rights of women is equivalent to rethinking education, work, politics...

If the 70s and 80s were women's decades, they were dictated by men. The price has been the silencing of women's culture and the non-assertion of the rights demanded by their millennial culture. The awakening of new ideas among women's movements can bring to the surface of society unsuspected values and thus demands and rights that will have repercussions on existing rights and individual and collective identity.

4.5. Individuation as a principle of law and identity

These different groups reveal that man is not an abstract being. He develops over time, from childhood to old age and death. To speak of human rights is to speak about the rights of the human person at all stages of one's life, whether woman or man.

Whenever a group takes the search for its rights further, it finds itself stronger in its identity. It is because, within one's core, each person undergoes the emancipative process of access to one's full identity. It is the unique process of one's individuation. Through it all the distinctions that make up one's personal originality come to fruition. With it all the energies of solidarity that weld people to others are strengthened.

It is only through individuation that rights give access to identity. Because it is at the heart of this process of individuation that each person discovers the law that is unwritten but made of absolute referents that restore one's full dignity.

In the mass culture the new rights will be guarantors of individuation and thus of increased humanity in each person.

International movement towards democracy[2]

PART I

We are facing a totally new political phenomenon; in all continents there is a movement towards democratization.

We are facing a total new political phenomenon; in all continents there is a movement towards civilization. This springs forth from the desire for freedom which galvanizes people. It is a time of euphoria and hope. People equate freedom with a better life, with new prospects for society, with peace.

It is, therefore, a movement from the bottom up. It has been understood by most political leaders, thus creating a wave without precedent of what can be seen as giving up power. At this stage it does represent a unique chance for popular mobilization and for the creation of new forms of democracy. At the same time all countries are subjected to a continuous pressure to introduce democratic regimes.

Such pressure is visible in the on-going process of political conditionality. It was established for the first time in November 1989 towards the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and included in the charter of the Bank for the reconstruction of Eastern Europe. Since then it spread to many other countries, up to the clear conditions put recently by Baker to China. From this angle, it is a strong condition imposed by the world and its most powerful countries – it goes from the top down. These two trends do meet – fortunately – and create, for the first time in history, a dynamism that provides reason for great hopes for the future.

The unique feature of such dynamism resides in the fact that democracy is not to be taught to the countries who are entering that path. Because, at this stage in history, democracy is under strong scrutiny in the traditional democratic countries. New forms need to be invented.

I am convinced that the Northern Hemisphere can learn a lot from the questions raised in the countries that are establishing democracy.

I am also convinced that the Southern Hemisphere can make a leapfrogging in regard to forms of democracy, by taking into account both the experience in the North and its own culture. Therefore, what I have chosen to say has this twofold movement and hope in the background.

At the outset, let me recall the basic ingredients of democracy as it appears in its best forms.

a) It is based on the principle of fundamental equality of all individuals before the law and the state. Therefore, it repeals all forms of discrimination or exclusion. Either by legislative acts or by tradition, it embodies a set of norms and rules to be followed by all individuals and institutions, and establishes a clear distinction among the basic institutional political and judiciary powers. Therefore, it requires as a condition a state of law.

b) It is expected to express, throughout its structure, institutions and processes of decision making, that sovereignty resides with the people. It thus creates an inseparable connection between sovereignty, citizenship and democracy. Therefore, importance of universal suffrage and free elections.

c) It accepts and encourages the status of freedom and the dignity of the human person, doing away with all threats to basic Human Rights. Therefore, inviolability of human person, freedom of expression and freedom of association.

d) It comes into being through a constitution as fundamental law constitutive laws are intended to provide the conditions for the expression of their laws.

e) It implies the balance of institutions and centers of power in such a way as to provide democratic control of all institutions and the support for the exercise of the basic principle of accountability of those elected to their constituency or nation.

f) It welcomes and stimulates the dynamism of society in all its forms: press, organizations, popular mobilization.

g) It is rooted in the culture of the people. Therefore, it takes into account way in which the fabrics of society constitutes itself and how the issue of power is perceived by such a culture. It is for me a fundamental question to try to see what, in each of our own cultures, can be captured by the democratic movement and translated into new perspectives and new institutions.

Democracy at the national level is part and parcel of the broader question of world governance.

Democracy at the national level is part and parcel of the broader question of world governance. Multilateral organizations have developed in the last decades, but they still represent a conventional way of dealing with *separateness* of events and issues.

However, in the last years, a new awareness has grown not only among scholars, but also among politicians and the people in general, concerning the interdependence of issues and countries. *Foreign relations* were traditionally a field apart from internal policies. Today there are no public policies in any country that may be designed with accuracy outside the frame of international relations. The attempt to re-examine the UN functioning came from the acknowledgement that there could and should be new forms of real democratic decision-making.

However, we are now uncritical with the way the G7 has replaced all international bodies (rich and powerful)! Obviously, the G7 works now because Japan and Germany are not permanent members of the Security Council!

The search for a democratic and rational way of dealing with issues at world level can only take place if it is accepted that our time is a time of complexity and that forecasting is an almost impossible task.

The difficulty of dealing with interdependence is clear in the way our governments are structured and our ministries function, in isolation to each other.

People/politicians need to be able to deal with adaptation, unpredictability, complexity.

PART II

In this vast area, I will tackle only three major issues, namely:

a) the connection between democracy and development;
b) the socio-cultural dimensions of plurality and the role played by elections;
c) the conditions for building up consensus.

Democracy and Development

It is my firm belief that democracy and development are two sides of the same coin. It has been difficult for Western countries to see this connection, as their own experience of democracy took place alongside a continuous process of economic growth, prosperity, and gradual building-up of social security systems. However, since the 70's, in some way as a result of the oil shock, questions started being raised about democracy, its institutions and the political class, which emerged through the Western type of democracy. The European institutions of the EC have also contributed, particularly the European Parliament (EP), to the awareness of important limitations in the present democratic system.

It is very clear, as it has been pointed out often in EP, that the Brussels Commission is not elected but chosen by the government who happens to be in power, the Council of Ministers is not elected. Only the EP is elected and yet the final political decision pertains to the Council. In the European jargon, this is the democratic deficit of the European institutions. What is strange, however, is that by the end of 1992 more than 80% of the economic and financial decisions

will be taken in Brussels, thus taking away from national parliaments some of the flexibility in the budget and other decisions. However, the political class, including national parliaments, does not seem to notice that!

The steps taken a few years ago by 12 newly restructured democracies seem to point out to a more vocal expression of the link democracy/development. It was clear for Latin America, the Philippines, my own country, when they met in Manila, that the burden of the foreign debt, preventing development to take place, was creating the fear of a setback in the democratic process.

We see it now very clearly in Central and Eastern Europe. There is no denial of the craving for freedom. But the freedom was the all-encompassing cry for a better life and more human conditions.

This does mean that there is a basic question about Human Rights. The civil and political Human Rights which express freedom and dignity *vis a vis* the state, such as freedom of expression and of association, go hand in hand with economic/social/cultural rights which guarantee food/shelter/education/work/information/medical care. Or, in other terms, one cannot in our time, envisage a political democracy where there is not a social, economic and cultural democracy. (I know that this correlation has been one of the cleavages in the East/West confrontation but the way we arrive at it today does not spring forth from an ideological assumption but from the assessment of facts in the last decades.)

However, in an increasing interdependent world, none of these aspects can be seen in isolation or taken in a simple relation of cause/effect. All interfere with each other in ways that sociology and political sciences are continuously unfolding before our eyes.

It is the complexity of such interdependence and its continuous changing pattern that prevent us to apply any coherent «gestalt» theory, which would give foreseeable configurations. Hence, some basic questions:

A) The satisfaction of «basic needs» can only be met in a sustainable way in the context of the medium and long-term perspectives in the economic, social and cultural field. However, democracy as lived in the Northern Hemisphere is sustained by short-term mandates.

There is a definite problem here concerning what I call the continuity of the governing acts, regardless of the persons who are at the elm.

A new ethics has to emerge by which any government has to avoid creating negative conditioning to future governments.

In the conduct of public affairs, *predecessors are neither enemies nor rivals but legitimate heirs of the same political responsibilities, as decided by the popular vote.*

I know this is *not* the common attitude. But is the only one that can assure that the power to be exercised is not power for its own sake, power over people and above them, acting at its own discretion. It is rather power towards the accomplishment of the goals that can serve the people.

In my experience, if this attitude is not present, political democracy may be there with its elections and institutions but it won't eradicate misery and destitution. In the long-run, its very existence will be at stake.

B) Another difficulty is to reconcile the work and time needed for the decisions which commit the long-term with the urgency the population feels (and rightly so!)

Because people get tired of problems – they don't elect people for the leaders to tell them how the problems are, they know them over too well; they expect the leaders to solve the problems!

How do you tell the Russians that the problem is not, to some extent, the lack of food but the fact that they need more and better railways and roads for the distribution of the goods?

It is there that in transition periods, the use of task forces working in close collaboration with the personnel of administration may be of great help. Even in countries of a relatively recent independence, the weight of public administration is already there.

There are other ways and means:

a) a tremendous proximity to the people, to real life, to real issues, examples:
  i) Felipe Gonzalez, talking concrete consequences on TV;
  ii) Tina Anselmi, while Minister of Labour, keeping one day a week to hear people and visit them in their places of work;
  iii) My own attempt to take decisions on the spots where they mattered.

A very clear mind for the spokesman of the government, able to translate the arid decisions into understandable measures.

C) Still within this context one difficult problem, underlined by General Obasanjo, is the way in which foreign investment is encouraged. I see it in three levels:

1) the legal framework of the foreign investment which determines what kind of goods can be purchased, the percentage of capital sharing in a new enterprise, the obligations in relation to the national norms;
2) the technological choices: the need for a very competent team, without financial vested interests, to help the decision-making process. In order to avoid:
  i) obsolete material;
  ii) outdated and polluting processes;
  iii) satellysation in one specific field.
3) the delocalization of enterprises, updated version of the international divi sion of labour.

I am stressing this aspect because democracy ought to reinforce national sovereignty and in some cases these processes make some countries incredibly dependent on others.

Need to show that our own process, if carried on honestly, needs to be explained over and over again to ears and minds only attuned to their own institutions.

Pluralism and Elections

Within the «Political conditionally» multi-partism gained such an importance that Poland, with all its passion, had 60 parties in the last elections!

Multi-partism is a way «to make» clear that the era of «one ruler» is over. Two points of clarification are important, however.

First, what is at stake is basically an appeal to tolerance, respect for the other's opinion and an acknowledgement that in a given society there may be divergent views about the solutions to be adopted.

Political parties are essentially the organized expression of such views. According to modern constitutions they should express what is alive among the people. In fact, the polarization East/West and its correlated propaganda has also led the political parties to establish themselves as structures who sell their ideologies and impose them on people. This is a fundamental perversion of the democracy. We see in most European political parties their incapacity to absorb new ideas, to arise to new challenges and to widen their own horizon. Basically, this means that the State (which is the fortress to be conquered by political parties) is still dominating society.

For the parties to come back to express what is alive in society they need to change radically from what they are today.

To become what?

This question leads me to the second point of clarification. Even pluralism is not the most adequate expression for democracy as power of all.

Wouldn't plurality of forms of association and organization define better what is at stake?

If the civil society precedes the state in the sense that is there that the ideas that will guide the state will emerge, then it is the encouragement of a living plurality that constitutes the best guarantee of a democracy.

The political parties would take a less dominant role if they would be part of a larger plurality of forces.

I consider extremely dangerous, paralysing and, in the long run, destructive of democracy, the tendency displayed in new democracies, like in my own country, to try to express the plurality of views in a society through the lines of cleavage of the political parties.

Plurality has to find its way between the tendency to fall back into a homogenized, simpler culture and the extreme fragmentation that may characterize the transition period. The fragmentation may be caused by differences in the set of ideas. But it may also be caused by the mere adherence to different leaders, because of their personal appeal or because of their ethnic belonging. Hence, the importance of an on-going process of deepening democracy.

Elections are the moments when the plurality of opinions is universally expressed and the strength of each opinion is weighed.

a) This is why the freedom of elections, the absence of fraud or coercion, even a certain solemnity at the moment of the individual vote, are so important. It is the moment for

unequivocal affirmation of citizenship and of its key-role in the direction a country is going to take.

The practice of international observers at national elections has increased. For some politicians it remains disputable. In my own understanding such practice must be looked at against the background of several events:

   i) in any case, at decisive elections, the foreign press is in the country and covers whatever it decides;

   ii) I doubt that ad hoc groups, in a kind of self-appointed righteousness, will be helpful. They hurt the dignity of the host country;

   iii) on the contrary, a group of eminent personalities, without any vested interests in the country concerned and who are not members of the international associations of political parties, could be chosen by a democratic international institution, either regional or world-wide or invited by the current government;

   iv) their task would be deeper than the vigilance or the uncover of any trouble. It would be seen mostly as a sign of support and solidarity from the international community.

b) In the Northern hemisphere, there is, however, a type of coercion which is exercised through the media.

The media, under the alibi of «freedom of expression», is very often taking sides:

   i) through the way news are given and pressures undergone;

   ii) through the attitudes of journalists present in debates among candidates;

   iii) through the sub-liminal messages it conveys during the period of the campaign.

We are still in the beginning of dealing with the media in a true democratic society: how to avoid the promiscuity between the media and the political class? How to make of the media what they should really be: mediation in communication among the masses?

a) Another – more sophisticated – interference are the opinion polls. They are a help to weigh chances, to give an idea of the forces present in society. But the way in which they are regularly published creates for democracy in general, and particularly for elections, some serious dangers:

   i) polls often emit the wrong signals and, yet, they determine what the candidates are going to say next, twisting often their own starting-point and program;

   ii) polls function as mirrors where naively individuals see themselves, and, if their intention of vote is not very strong, they interiorise what they see or hear. They identify themselves with figures;

   iii) this is possible because the analysis of polls by any media is based on the simple question: Who is going to win? And in our societies people still want to be with the obvious winner.

It is my conviction that opinion polls need also a legal framework so as to create a space where no signals are emitted and where people can, in good conscience, come to a decision about their vote.

Consensus-Building

One of the main tasks in democracy is the creation of a communal will, or, as some people say, the process of consensus-building. It is a key-question in a time when there are no clear indicators for the future ahead. It is decisive for the undertaking of major endeavours in a country. In the Western democracy, we are in a deadlock in what concerns the communal will. The existing mechanisms are not enough for people to express themselves in due time and around the important issues. So the gap between the political class and the citizens is growing everyday. The people don't believe anymore in the competence and capacity of achievement of their leaders.

The Reagan years have certainly contributed everywhere to transform the political debate into a political theater show, into yet another spectacle

The reaction of the people is rejection, and a total disbelief in the political class.

It is, in my view, at the level of consensus building that any democracy can express in an efficient way the status of freedom of individuals' opinions, as well as its connection with the trends alive in the fabrics of society.

The difficulties of consensus-building cannot constitute, however, a pretext for falling back in any form of one-man or one-party rule.

There are some difficulties which should not be omitted. But it is clear that there is among the citizens of the Northern Hemisphere a growing uneasiness concerning the current practice of democracy.

The persons elected are less and less connected with their constituencies during the exercise of their term of office. The electors feel that they are marginalized, not taken into account, as decisions are made without taking into account their thinking. One vote every 4 or 5 years becomes irrelevant.

The representative democracy has been devoid of its very essence – representation – and tends to become a mere formal democracy.

Several elements are at play in this dislocation of meaning. One of them is the role played by political parties.

In most countries, political parties have such a strict discipline of vote that the elected Members of Parliament, instead of representing the views of their electors, are, in fact, representing the views of the political committee of their party.

In the context of party-led decisions in a national parliament, we enter another contradictory process.

It is true that a government that has won an absolute majority has better conditions to implement its decisions. But, with party politics at play, it can easily block the parliament,

making of it a government sounding board. We encounter here another perversion of democracy. How to counter-act such dysfunction?

a. The obvious answer is to strengthen the representativity through a pact between the elected and his or her electors.

Moreover, in the respect of fundamental Human Rights of the elected, no one should be asked to act, speak or vote against his conscience. It is an issue pertaining to basic ethics in political life and yet very much absent from its concrete practice.

What would be the consequences? There would be a more difficult but also more realistic formation of decision in parliament. It would correspond to majorities of ideas, constituted by Members of Parliament with the same view on issues, regardless of their party-line. Such a practice would introduce in political life the concrete proof that politicians are listening to opinions and needs of the people and that the danger of behind-the-curtain arrangements would be avoided. Though a criticism may be made based on the unpredictability coming out of the majority of ideas, the gains would be such that they appear to me as worth trying.

b. Another way of counter-acting the way in which political parties occupy, with their own logic, all the political space, is the recourse to a more participatory democracy.

I am thinking of several elements – first, the introduction of forms of direct democracy. It can very well be built around the local space and local power. Decisions concerning directly the lives of people in their settlements can be better answered and taken by the people themselves.

Example, to cope with forest fires, to weigh pros and cons of a polluting industry, to establish centres of primary health-care, to use the school as a multipurpose cultural centre. Moreover, the local power is the one that can contribute more decisively for connections across national boundaries.

One important element to draw in more participation is the referendum both at the local and at the national level. They are not only a guarantee of involvement of the citizens (if they so wish); they are also an opportunity for locally or nationally binding processes of political awareness and civic consciousness-raising.

Participation is, however, strongly jeopardized, by the discredit of politicians, especially by the corruption of some and by the way in which the political class covers it up.

An instrument used today in some Western countries seems to me one of the best: to ask of all politicians a formal declaration of what they possess before and after holding office; otherwise, political discussions are reduced to mutual attacks of dishonesty.

Another institution is also very important; the figure of the «ombudsman» to whom everyone is entitled to appeal.

c. A third element is the recognition of social actors who have something to say to the political life.

All forms of associations and organizations, however small and however marginal, should be drawn into the process of decision-making.

The Northern hemisphere has used the concept of social partners in every issue concerning conflicts in the labour field. This concept should be enlarged. It is necessary to define fundamental issues and to discover the actors whose interest is vital in each issue. They should be also social partners.

A whole new path is at stake here. I think that wherever democracy is new, there are possibilities for such dialogue to take place and for new institutions to emerge.

c. In the beginning of a democracy and in the heat of political struggle a country needs sometimes reference points of ethical values and peaceful negotiation.

I think that an appeal should be made to all the religious forces, to all religions to play a role in this regard. Of course, I am not thinking of a theocratic society, but of need for the different religions to speak in the name of the transcendent values present in each human person.

CONCLUSION

What is at stake in everything I have said is the need for a radical change in the concept and practice of democracy. At this stage of history there are no models.

The vitality of every society provides the dynamism and the concrete ideas necessary to establish new democratic institutions and new channels for decision making. Africa can make a decisive contribution to the shaping of a wider and deeper democracy. Times for growth and imagination, times for doing what is just needed.

Governance and human rights[3]

I. INTRODUCTION

Let me acknowledge at the outset, as a context for what I have to say, that this Congress takes place at a turning point of our collective awareness. We are indeed at the point where a radical transition is possible to take place *for governance to be effective in the next millennium*.

In 20 years, the global network of computers, telephones, TV, increased its capacity a million times – we have changed scale of thinking and operating. And entered an unimaginable space of complexity.

The last 10 years, science and technology have moved forward more drastically than in the whole 20th century.

Which governance, then?

Things have changed drastically since Copenhagen. In the last three years, ideas expressed for 20 years have crossed the threshold of visibility and are there for those who want to see them, to grasp them and to transform them into political policy.

A state-of-the-art is being up-dated in all *fora* where concerned individuals and organizations are able to express the scandal of a world whose product has grown since the end of the II World War four times, the industrial production 40 times, the production and consumption of energy 20 times and yet, poverty has aggravated itself at an incredible pace. Facing this situation we are many to say: «More of the same won't do».

The question is not anymore asking more of this or that but to dare to go into *new concepts and to follow the paths opened by them*.

II. SOCIAL RIGHTS/DEVELOPMENT/DEMOCRACY

In the Report of the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life «Caring *for the Future*», it is underlined that «the non-fulfilment of economic and social rights does not

---

3 Paper presented in Paris on 6 November 1998 at the Beyond Copenhagen conference: *European Implementation of the Social Development Summit, organized by International Council on Social Welfare* (ICSW) [file version].

arouse the same indignation and advocacy as does the violation of civic and political rights».
It is a question-mark for me – people don't see?

So, if I speak mostly about social rights this morning, it does not mean that I disregard civic and political rights; rather I want to emphasize the importance of social rights as Human Rights by themselves and therefore as an essential part of governance.

For a long time social rights were dealt with in a piece-meal way, as they were mostly the response to the hazards of industrialisation and to the social conflicts that, for decades, agitated the European and North-American countries.

Though the two International Covenants on Civic and Political Rights and on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights had been approved by the UN General Assembly in 1966 (in 1995 only *129* States had ratified ICCPR and *131* had ratified ICESCR), the old distinction in political science between the two groups of rights remained untouched. The civic and political rights were considered to be at work as soon as they were declared and were said to be without costs, while the social, economic and cultural rights were said to need time and conditions to be implemented, depending on the special possibilities of the annual budget.

Even at the international institutions, as the United Nations Organisation, this distinction was clear. ECOSOC was in charge of the protection and promotion of all rights. And yet, until recently, the Commission on Human Rights dealt only with the civic and political rights; in 1987 a Committee on Social and Economic Rights was created but its responsibilities lacked the scope of the Committee on Human Rights (for instance, no State could complain against another State, in matters concerning the violation of social and economic rights).

Hence, *democracy* became confined to the rights expressing the «freedom from fear» while social, economic and cultural rights expressing «freedom from want» were left to the hazards of economic performance.

But, gradually, the *interdependence and indivisibility of Human Rights* has imposed itself – and thus has enriched *the Human Rights approach to social welfare*

Not only attention was drawn to the fact that the Preambles of the two Covenants on Human Rights were exactly the same, but experience has shown that democracy is weakened whenever social rights are not given a due place in public policies.

There was a reason for that tendency.

The concept of development has been a very important one. In the first years, such a concept wavered between a humanistic approach – «the capacity of a country to face, with its own culture, its own problems» – and a more economy-based approach. This one prevailed. Very soon «development» was equated with

«economic growth». Steadily there were other attempts, in 1981 even a seminar organized by the Secretary General of UN on an 'alternative approach' to the International Development Strategy.

Later, in 1987, the Brundtland Commission gave content to the concept of *sustainable development* and Rio seemed the climax and the consecration of such a concept.

Meanwhile UNDP developed the concept of *human development*.

But while these two dynamic concepts were worked out by social scientists and activists, at the governance level *economic growth* remained the main component of development.

For external use, the Northern countries used the expression «development». The Commission on Development in any national parliament and in the European Parliament was equated with development aid. For their own use, they tried to improve the standard of living of their own citizens, as a logic consequence of their economic growth during the first three decades after the Second World War.

But in the last 20 years, the Northern countries discovered that economic growth was not enough. Though their economic growth became smaller, it was still there. And yet they discovered that unemployment was structural and long-term unemployed people became easily marginalized. And they started speaking

about exclusion.

Paradoxically, however, the more the phenomenon became widespread and vital for the individuals concerned and for the whole society, the more governance stayed attached solely to economic goals as their horizon.

III. CIVIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS

This was clearly felt at the level of the European Union. Between 1995-96 (end 1995, early 1996?) the «Comité des Sages», a small group of academicians and politicians with the irreplaceable support of the rapporteur, Jean-Baptiste de Foucauld, made several proposals which, in our mind, appeared – naively, as facts later have demonstrated – as an opportunity for a *refoundation of the European Union*.

Sick as we were of the fallacy of the so-called «European Social Model», (making all the twists imaginable in other regions of the world where social rights were ignored in order to get more commercial success), we undertook the task of attempting to give shape to that social model.

We considered essential to include social rights in the Amsterdam Treaty, but what is finally there is still a hangover from outdated ways of looking at social rights. We proposed to look at work as part of a continuum, in an active society; to decide in what way a welfare state should be restructured; to make bold steps to enable men as well as women to reconcile their family responsibilities and professional activities; to strengthen the sense of participation and democracy in the European Union by treating civic and social rights as indivisible.

But these – like all other proposals to extend this process to the European Union – remained trapped in the preparation of a Treaty, discussed and prepared away from any political vision and sense of the times we live in.

Though, from an institutional point of view, the advance was small, the same is not true among the peoples of Europe. Everywhere – if I can judge from the many meetings I have addressed to in the different countries of Europe, and from the demands put upon my

calendar – groups of people, all kind of organizations, international NGOs, are inventing ways of leading further a task that is decisive for Europe and for its dialogue with other regions of the world.

Most of all, we proposed and did launch a process of consultation of the European citizens, concerning two questions:

— the way they saw civic and social rights in their countries;
— the minimum standards of civic and social rights they wanted to see established at the Union level.

IV. SIGNS OF A NEW VISION

Several other facts have taken place in the last three years which I look at as signs of hope:

— The Council of Europe, which has been the haven of civic and political rights, has moved courageously into social rights in the new terms. Its project on «Human dignity» equated with «fighting exclusion» is a clear signal of that sign. No doubt that also the massive participation of the former Communist countries has already brought into play their culture of social rights.
   The up-grading to the status of Human Rights of the goals

   to nourish those who are hungry

   to educate those who are illiterate,

   to provide health-care to the sick and vulnerable,

   has to be understood, as a *minimum*, as acknowledging that such goals are not open to dispute on the basis of economic rationality or on any other basis.

In other words social rights have ceased to be negotiable. They are as imperative as civic and political rights.

During the discussions leading to the Amsterdam Treaty two major factors took place in Europe:

— A transnational group of social scientists created a Foundation of «social quality», trying to overcome the pitfalls of the so much dilapidated concept of development. They issued the Amsterdam Declaration where the «social dimension» is reaffirmed in its partnership with the economic and the civic dimensions of human life.
— Another transnational event was a statement of several hundred economists in Europe reaffirming that economy contains other factors besides those that current governance implies. They stressed firmly «the social and the environmental factors of economy».

Of course, some well-known names around the world for some 10 to 20 years had been contributing to this affirmation, but it was the first time that collectively economists were defining economics as encompassing elements that have to do with the Quality of Life of people.

Recently «ecological economists» have reaffirmed in this country the urgent need for internalizing the costs of ecology into economics.

— This year, the Commission of Human Rights from the United Nations – whose mandate has been over the years to scrutinize the violations of civic and political rights as well as to review the progress made in the accomplishment of such rights – has created the function of a Special Rapporteur on Social Rights whose mandate for the next three years is the investigation into the situation of basic education as a human right. Among other things, this means that social rights will be also under examination as the civic rights have been.

— At the end of 1996, the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life based its report on the concept of Quality of Life measured by the fulfilment of Human Rights as agreed by the community of nations. Already in the beginning of the '90s, Gro Bruntland was the only head of government to say: «We need a transition from quantity to quality»
Two statements are included in that simple one:

— we move to quality when we are able to go beyond the mere threshold of survival and a minimum of quantity is not anymore the sole goal in life;

— we have to move to quality when we realize than the accumulation of quantity is betraying the very quality we want to achieve (pollution because of cars and planes, destruction of nature because of waste-sinks).

What we have come to call Quality of Life, however difficult to define, finds its origin in the individual basic rights slowly developed during the last three centuries and since proclaimed by the United Nations. Because human beings are interconnected through a structured society, there are fundamental rights that correspond to humans' material, social and psychological needs. Even in society's simplest forms, these rights are always individual or collective (or both). When societies become States, national rights spring forth from the needs of the corresponding social institution. And as within each society, there are 'individual' and 'collective' rights for communities of nations.

Today's conditions make it urgent that we proceed to reflect deeply on the interweaving of these individual and collective rights. As much as we declare the uniqueness and autonomy of each conscience – and the right of everyone to follow the dictates of his or her conscience – we also affirm that collective rights need clear definition in this era of globalizationn.

Many individual rights have been codified in international legal instruments, whereas almost all collective rights are enunciated only through resolutions and action programmes

adopted by the UN and other international organizations; the latter type has no legally binding force. The different categories of rights are not always in harmony with each other: dichotomies and contradictions exist.

Rights represent formal acknowledgement by the collectivity – whether State, family, employer, or international community – of basic needs. They also seek to define (a) content and (b) the limits of the two-way relationship joining individuals and communities at different levels. Civil and political rights are considered among *basic* rights because they enable citizens to participate in decision-making in different roles, at many levels.

Fulfilling needs depends on all the parties involved carrying out their obligations in a responsive, responsible manner. Without an implicit acceptance of responsibilities on all sides, the rights may remain little more than moral directionsfor social relations. Such directions never acquire the political and juridical weight necessary to influence effectively the behaviour of human beings.

This is why governance becomes more and more difficult. While some think that we are losing sovereignty to regional or global institutions, I see sovereignty enlarged to the collective responsibility of finding adequate tools to give substance, to establish norms, to create mechanisms that give shape to rights and responsibilities, and thus, make quality of life attainable for all.

V. BASIC SHIFT IN GOVERNANCE

I am proud to acknowledge that I based the concept of Quality of Life on the work done by the Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor Amartya Sen and some of his collaborators, namely, Professor Martha Nussbaum.

As an economist who is a philosopher, Amartya Sen has looked to the human being in his/her totality. Therefore he had to put into perspective the role of economics in governance. In one of his most recent books, specifically on India, he writes:

> *On the eve of independence in August 1947, Jawaharlal Nehru reminded the country that the task ahead included «the ending of poverty and ignorance and disease and inequality of opportunity».*
>
> *As Nehru pointed out, the elimination of ignorance, of illiteracy, of remediable poverty, of preventable disease, and of needless inequalities in opportunities must be seen as objectives that are valued for their own sake. They expand our freedom to lead the lives we have reason to value and these elementary capabilities are of importance on their own. While they can and do contribute to economic growth and to other usual measures of economic performance, their value does not lie only in these instrumental contributions. Economic growth is, of course, important, but it is valuable precisely because it helps to eradicate deprivation and to improve the capabilities and the Quality of Life of ordinary people.*

The first and the most important aspect of Nehru's listing of what we have to do is to make clear that the elimination of illiteracy, ill-health, and other avoidable deprivations are valuable for their own sake – they are the tasks that we face;

The more conventional criteria of economic success (such as high growth rate, a sound balance of payments, and so forth) are to be valued only as means to deeper ends. It would, therefore, be a mistake to see the development of education, health, care, and other basic achievements only or primarily as expansions of «human resources» – the accumulation of «human capital» – as if people were just the means of production and not its ultimate end. The bettering of human life does not have to be justified by showing that a person with a better life is also a better producer.

Is there a better way to describe the challenge for governance in the next millennium?

The logic of the move from interdependence and indivisibility of Human Rights to the acknowledgement of the basic elements of Quality of Life as the *task* of all decision-makers leads to nothing else but to a revolution.

It is because they cannot face the implications of such a radical change that politicians keep limited to the old fashioned actions, like the valse «nationalisation-privatisation».

There is not a «third way» between neo-liberalism and social democracy. The third way is ahead, is in the shape of a totally new type of governance.

The tasks ahead are immense. But they are feasible, viable, if citizens and politicians alike are ready to think in new terms and to act accordingly.

First of all, it is decisive that governance may be looked at and exercised in two time-frames: the *short-term* and the *long-term*.

These two time-frames cannot be dealt with in an independent way.

The short-term has to look at decisions with the awareness that many of them lead to *irreversible* actions: for instance, what kind of *energy* you are using (do you build thermo-energy with fossil fuels, knowing that in the long run this will increase the warming of the climate – or do you decide to invest more now in alternative sources of energy, knowing that you will be contributing to a better future for every one?)

The same reasoning can be applied to a fundamental individual right such as education: for instance, do you keep education and its budget in the wake of what the «economically correct» management of the governance (so far proned by the IMF) asks of you or do you give education (together with health and housing) the highest priority? In the first case you may keep the boat afloating but you can be sure that you will have regularly this kind of problem, as in 10 or 20 years you will be still missing the educated people, the critical mass able to deal with new and ever more complex problems.

But if you give education priority, at whatever cost, you will be sure of two things: one, you will have the talents and skills to face new situations; second, you are putting the Quality of Life of people in the top-list of your political goals.

One short-term decision *is vital*, both for the promotion of Human Rights and for the deepening of democracy. I am referring to the urgent *institutional* step of *NGOs and research institutes* to be taken in the preparation of measures for public policies as *social partners*.

It is a way to promote citizenship.

It is a necessary ingredient for a fruitful dialog.

It is also, as a consequence, a form of permanent formation of all activists, both in projects and in research, adding strength to civil society.

But the *long-term* cannot remain hidden and left to the ideas of persons with competence and imagination but without influence at the political level

Three long-term tasks can be outlined briefly:

a) *the redefinition of work*

Unemployment cannot be addressed adequately within the boundaries of the Nation-State. Neither can it remain to be seen as in the beginning of industrialisation. In a time of globalisation, tertiarisation, of always new technologies and in need of renewable fuels, production schemes of goods and services have to be revisited. «Transitional labour markets» will enrich the mobility, if social quality is the guiding factor.

Moreover, tasks now fulfilled within the home have to be acknowledged and made part of the wide gamut of work in what may be called an active society as OECD proposed in its report about «Shaping structural change: the role of women».

b) *to revisit the concept of education*

The redefinition of work and a world which becomes globalised make obsolete the old sequence of «learning/employment/retirement».

It is necessary to provide to all the possibility of learning «transferable talents and skills», enabling individuals to target specifically their talents at diversified activities in different periods of their lives.

c) *the internalisation of environmental costs*, obliging economy to work with new schemes of production and patterns of consumption, leading to a responsible stewardship of our planet.

V. A NEW PARADIGM OF ETHICS

All this cannot happen just out of good will, in a voluntaristic way. The tasks ahead cannot be expected to result from our logic of today, as new social constructs falling ripe into our hands.

They can only take place if a new move of *ideals, aspirations, values, norms*

guide us.

A new paradigm of ethics is perceived at dawn. Ethics of response to what is needed in ideas and acts– the principle *responsibility*.

Ethics to attention and concern for all, human and nature – the ethics of *caring.*

Clashes of power[4]

1. THE CONTOURS OF POWERS

Reading the works of Shakespeare at the heart of this millennium gives us insight into the true dimension of clashes of power. From the power struggle between heirs of royal houses and kingdoms to the head-to-heads of power between families, the power clash between different ethnic groups to the irreducible and subtle game of power between men and women. Above all, it makes us recognise the struggle for power within each human being. And that is the starting point for any reflection on the nature of powers: power is a structuring element of the human being. Power in relation to things and objects; power in relation to nature and the beings that inhabit it; power in relation to other human beings in interpersonal relationships; power in social relations and in the various structures of societies in which the political universe is expressed; power of the symbolic grasping of reality and of reference, sometimes exclusive, to age-old myths of one's own.

Clashes of powers happen at all these levels – sometimes with only one making its presence felt, but more often in the gruelling interaction of several among them. Even in situations where a first analysis seems to indicate a single cause, a longer look leads one to discern, even before we fully realise, the simultaneity of causes and the constant circulation between them. The events that mark the last year of this millennium – with the diversity of factors that have come into play in the Yugoslav Federation-NATO war – are an eloquent example of the complexity of this interaction of causes. They prevent us from reducing confrontations of the millennium powers to simplistic interpretations; they oblige us to seek the full of extent of the complex factors that have had the most impact at various times and places in the millennium.

We should add that the very notion of the millennium itself has been mainly felt from a European perspective where the dates of events are referred to as the central event of its story. Other civilisations have lived and dated their history until recently using other systems of counting time, such as the dynasties in China.

---

4 Paper published in *Notícias do Milénio: 1000-2000* under the title 'Confronto de poder: equilíbrio por um sentido de justiça'. Lisboa, Oporto: Lusomundo, 1999 (magazine published as a supplement of the Lusomundo group newspapers Published 07/08/1999 [file version].

At the beginning of the millennium, the Asian continent was crisscrossed by invasions and the struggles of different civilisations and ethnic groups; its social and cultural development had attained enormous splendour, manifested especially in the Korean, Chinese, and Japanese civilisations; its political organisation, though sophisticated, had not been able to cope with the great famines that cyclically decimated much of the population. Several religions on the continent became state religions and were characterised by a complete separation of the religious sphere from the temporal sphere, for which reason Asia has been spared 'religious wars'.

Africa had reached its peak in Egypt and the Maghreb in the two to three millennia that preceded the coming of Christ. The Arab region was invaded by the people from the east, particularly the Assyrians, and later the Arabs themselves descended on the eastern coast of Africa and razed the kingdoms and empires that already existed there, with forms of organisation which were among the most communal in the world, and practicing a religion deeply linked to the earth, the place of the spirit.

The then still-unnamed Americas were the scene of dispersed civilisations, with very sophisticated forms of art and great political development; but their agricultural base was very embryonic and basic technical structures were practically non-existent. Their religious forms were based on specific symbolisms and expressed a deep communion with nature, attributing equal spiritual experience to living and dead beings.

As each one had its own characteristics, these regions of the world, which do not seem to have had any desire to investigate the global reality in which they lived, are therefore considered in this article mainly as an object of European interest and fundamental elements of the confrontations of powers in Europe.

2. POWER IN RELATION TO THINGS AND NATURE

Common to all organised spaces, at the beginning of the millennium, in socio-political structures (some extremely well developed, others still nascent) was the confrontation – in the limited 'worlds' that each knew – for the possession of land and its assets.

Europe serves as a paradigm in this relationship; its political power was still rudimentary but revealed traits to be found in all civilisations. Land ownership was the mainstay of the feudal regime in which the lord and owner constituted the ultimate temporal authority.

Nature was – and would be for many centuries – an inexhaustible well of resources, which, given the regularity of natural cycles, generated the conviction that it was the great life-giving breast. The survival of each people was thus inextricably linked to the possession of land. Hence two fundamental consequences: on the one hand, demographic variations (natural expansion of living beings in a limited space) became the first factors of instability, neighbours' confrontations and establishment of frontiers conquered by force; on the other hand, the great natural phenomena which unexpectedly shattered the balance between men and nature easily led the various regions to associate the natural world with the transcendent

expression of their existence. The clashes of powers were the exploits of peoples battling for the possession of land.

We speak of peoples not only because of their ethnic and often cultural and religious identity, but also because their armies were the direct and spontaneous expression of that identity. There was still a long way to go before the existence of structured and professional armies – participation in a war was often nothing more than a personal survival strategy. Moreover, closer to our times (19th century), the War of Secession in the United States included the wide participation of people who had absolutely nothing. We should also mention that the armed militias we saw in 1999 (for example, in recent months in East Timor) were also made up of men lacking any other means of subsistence.

Under the feudal lords, populations had to return what the land produced, keeping only a portion established by verbal contract. (This portion was insufficient, as clearly shown in the painting *Les glaneuses,* done not so long ago in the seventeenth century, by the French painter Millet, where peasants scour the fields, looking for the lost grain on the ground after the harvest.) Land ownership was a decisive factor of power. The conflicts spread across the first half of the millennium were mainly fuelled by the appetite for this wealth from the land and increased as the land expanded. Agriculture required and gave rise to manufactured goods that brought added value to the land. It thus took the first steps towards a mercantile society. The confrontations generated in this context turned out to be, after all, confrontations of proximity.

The fifteenth century broke this logic, with the extension of mercantile society to other geographical areas. The Portuguese discoveries, stimulated by this new mercantile attitude (and thanks to advanced maritime technologies and know-how), went far and wide looking for goods that were rare in Europe. First, the Spanish, then the English, Dutch and French followed. More than trade, it was the permanent possession of the new lands that interested them. The confrontations were then extremely violent, leading in the case of the Americas (mainly in North America) to the almost total extermination of the native populations. And in Africa, the system of slavery introduced centuries ago by the Arabs made the continent bleed and contributed to racial segregation in America, whose wounds the great writers Toni Morrison and Alice Walker have shown – to confirm existing sociological studies – to be far from having healed.

The industrial revolution emphasised new types of confrontations. Raw materials were found mainly in the continents where the Europeans had set foot. The struggle for their possession was not only with the local people but also among the European powers wishing to strengthen their presence in new latitudes and thus extend their power.

Despite the independence of all the occupied territories that has taken place since the Bandung Conference (1955), it must be acknowledged that the same logic still dominates relations between states. The last 30 years show the difficulty of the new countries entering freely in the international market. While the choice of the free market economy model is a conditionality of international credit institutions, it is a highly protectionist market of the industrialised countries that is faced by the countries of the Southern Hemisphere. The

successive rounds of talks of GATT and the World Trade Organization reveal are a new type of confrontation of power which revolves around: the dispute for markets; unilateral definition by the importing countries of the price of raw materials originating in the South; the on-going logic of competition that is no longer aimed at guaranteeing the survival of peoples, but rather the excessive accumulation and unbridled consumption of the Northern Hemisphere.

Conditions are being created for power confrontations on a global scale. The Northern Hemisphere doubles down on its power, increasing its monopoly over knowledge and technology, through the exclusive domain of patents, while 1.3 billion people in the Southern Hemisphere live below the poverty line. The fact that in the next 50 years more than 3.5 billion people will appear on a planet that already has six billion people (only 1% of this increase will occur in the Northern Hemisphere) makes us fear a new type of confrontation that, having roots in the economy, will not fail to be a new face of war, aggravated, among other factors, by the spread of nuclear hardware that has been taking place since the end of the Cold War.

3. POWER IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STRUCTURES

The millennium can also be viewed – concomitantly – through the evolution of power struggles that have emerged from the social structures and political configurations that have arisen throughout the millennium.

The feudal system (thus defined in Europe but with very similar outlines in other civilisations) conferred absolute power on landowners and the writers of law and justice. Populations had to bow to this power for no other reason than that of personal and family survival. The beginning of the millennium saw the transformation of small fiefdoms, and in some cases actual counties and kingdoms, into nations that resulted from a tacit pact of defence, despite the great diversity that many of them had. Such a degree of diversity that, in the last century of the millennium, most conflicts of power leading to war had a strong component of defending the nation against its own political framework.

Until the great founding revolutions, the peoples defined themselves as nations with great potential for cohesion and response to external aggressions. The political system was defined as a system in which inheritance was decisive. In Europe it was characterised by absolute, and later constitutional monarchies. It is curious to note how, even today, in other continents, especially in Asia, the family power structure is still very clear, thus being unique in allowing women to reach the top of the political ladder (in India, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, and Pakistan).

The commercial expansion of European nations to other continents consolidated the movement that gave rise to the very notion of the State – an administratively organised space, a politically framed population.

The internal relations of each state with the nations that comprise it are deeply dissimilar. In some cases, we can talk about the nation-state, such is the identification between one or the other both for historical reasons (Portugal) and by deliberate policies of integration

(France). In other cases, the ambiguous relationship between the State and the Nations that make them up still exists at the end of the millennium. Expressions of this ambiguity range from movements considered terrorists from regions that seek autonomous state status to the division of the state into the regions that comprise it. The risk of Russian disintegration and the war that tore Yugoslavia apart are the most recent examples of this rupture.

Africa is the region of the world where since the independence period we have constantly seen the confrontation of powers of real nations (based on cultural and ethnic affinities) within the borders of states set down by the conflicts between colonising powers for the conquering of new territories. We cannot forget – as Georges Steiner, in his excellent book on the definition of culture without condescension shows – that, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries,

> *the intellectual wealth and stability of middle– and upper-middle-class life during the long summer of liberalism depended, directly, on economic and, ultimately military, domination of what is now known as the underdeveloped or third world.*

It is from this domination that, while possessing political independence, African countries seek to free themselves in a well-known mechanism in which the oppressed in turn becomes the oppressor.

The founding revolutions, and in a paradigmatic way the French Revolution, did not end clashes of powers but introduced radical transformations not only in the conceptualisation of citizenship but, beyond the strictly political sphere, in the cultural realm. Steiner considers them to be great storms of the being, metamorphoses of the historical landscape so violent as to acquire, almost at once, the simplified magnitude of legend'.

It was during this period that Locke and Rousseau, among others, developed the bases of the 'social contract' that remained unchanged in its foundations in the last two centuries of the millennium, granting legitimacy and rationality to the nation-state. If, on the one hand, the idea of the 'social contract' allowed the extension of the exercise of politics to increasingly larger areas of people's lives, it also helped to exacerbate the desire for the domination of several nation-states in relation to others.

At the end of the millennium, nations once again gained prominence, while states were reduced to aspects of collective management. Most of the tasks traditionally assigned to states, regardless of their size, tended to be carried out by entities of a wider regional scope where diversity made political governance increasingly complex. It is in this context that it is legitimate to think that the Quality of Life of citizens will be increasingly ensured at a level of proximity that would make human actions effective and human.

Sovereignty will become more clearly defined and take on a greater degree of complexity. The urgent need now to equip Europe with a defence force will require that it be given a 'Bill of Rights', setting out the levels at which decisions must be taken. It is desirable that this should happen in other regions. A multipolar world can arise, without domination or hegemony and in which confrontations are solved by negotiation.

4. POWER IN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS DIMENSIONS

Neither the pursuit of the appropriation of more wealth nor the power struggle that stems from stand-alone monopolies are far from being the only factors to determine the great power clashes during this millennium. Deep transformations also mark the religious relationship between peoples and civilisations.

In the first half of the millennium there were two types of confrontation: between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, as a result of a long antagonism between Romans and Greeks, and between European Catholics and Muslim Arabs who for centuries populated the southwest of the European continent.

The separation of the eastern Church, for theological reasons, from the Church of Rome is at the same time the cause and effect of the vivid cultural traits which characterise, on the one hand, the countries that are geographically at the western end of the 'European peninsula' with which the Asian continent ends, and, on the other hand, the great spaces which, while European, opened to the east to face the Asian world. In the former was established a centuries-old cross-roads of civilisations and ethnicities and influences that resulted from the successive invasions of the first millennium AD and the movements of expansion and retraction that led, for example, Denmark, Sweden and Lithuania to join the European continent or that made the great Italian cities property of the Normans. In the latter, there is a stronger homogeneity resulting from the almost total predominance of the Slav ethnic groups. Therefore, while in Western Europe there is a sociocultural aptitude for a centralised Church capable of uniting peoples of diverse identities, in the world of the Slavs it was possible for there to be a Church that shapes itself according to diverse national configurations and plays a central role in them.

In one place or another, different cultures were developed, culminating in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in literary and artistic expressions with singular characteristics. It is enough to think that, while Western literature following the French Revolution (in what it means as a global phenomenon) focuses on the great themes that translate the loves and deeds of men, if not in the contradictions and narcissism of a bourgeois culture, the litera-ture of the Slavic world develops the questions of the mystical universe of the Slavic peoples kindled by the total separation between the profane and the sacred in orthodox theology and ritual. (It would be interesting to see how far these differences made it possible for Marx's thought to become deep-rooted in Russia but only marginally in the Western world, thereby resulting, even in its worldwide repercussions, in the most important confrontation of power of the entire 20th century.)

The clash between Christian Europeans and Muslim Arabs has a very different character. Boasting a level of scientific sophistication that the Europeans still had not attained, the Arabs had a deep influence on the geographical zones that they occupied. The so-called 'reconquest' by Europeans needed a religious motivation to finally achieve the first objective of its power struggles: the extension of territory and the appropriation of its wealth.

The confrontation between Christian Europeans and Muslim Arabs was not only found on the Iberian Peninsula. The occupation of Jerusalem by Muslims created an unprecedented

phenomenon – the dynamic of pilgrimages that led European peoples to engage in 'crusades' which, along with the goal of 'reaching Jerusalem' (the Messianic and eschatological theme par excellence), was seen by the most religious (e.g. Louis IX of France, who died on the way) as a form of penance and striving for eternal salvation. (Perhaps the religious intensity of this period of Jerusalem's history is not irrelevant to the Palestinian problem, still not fully resolved at the end of the millennium.)

The religious confrontation and the notion of the uniqueness of the Christian God added not only an evangelistic dimension to the expansion of Europe in other continents, often carried out without respect for the cultures of other peoples, but also transported rivalries to other latitudes where Christians were to be found. The persecutions of seventeenth-century Christians in Japan were the direct result of these rivalries, to which the reigning powers from whence the missionaries came were not irrelevant. China would also be the stage for doctrinal quarrels among different Christian tendencies.

It was in the first half of the millennium that the marginalisation of Jews intensified. As Freud so intensely studied and conveyed to us, the Jewish conflict with Christians lay in the Jews' conviction that Christians betrayed Hebrew monotheism to embark on a path still bearing elements of polytheism, in opposition to which Jews define their identity, though using the same sources. For their part, Christians, concentrating more on the crucifixion and death of Christ than on His Resurrection, saw the Jews as responsible for the death of Christ. The persecution of the Jews in the Iberian Peninsula and, in a less tragic way, in many European cities, did not leave even the Slav peoples unharmed. The horrors to which this violence led are written in letters of blood in the history of the last century of the millennium.

The second half of the millennium witnessed another great division among Christians and led to some of the longest and most violent clashes of the millennium. The Reformation, unleashed by Luther and, even more radically, by Calvin, would lead to religious wars. During this period the subordination of the people to temporal authority was accentuated. For less theological reasons, also in England there was the separation from the Church of Rome. Later, these movements would constitute the doctrinal mainstay of the American way of life and fostered the values of the New State. In Africa and Asia, the religious permutations born of the Reformation also had a marked influence on the division between various groups. It was only in Latin America, which remained linked to the countries of the Iberian Peninsula until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that the clashes had no religious characteristics. Only a small trial experiment in the Catholic Church itself, granting the Indians the dignity of human beings and entering into collective sharing with them, aroused persecution by temporal power.

Religious issues were again in question with the Zionist movement, which sought by all means to establish the state of Israel. Its creation in 1948, however, was secular in nature, with a separation between the secular and the religious. The same could not be said for the advent of Islamic fundamentalism, which inflamed fratricidal clashes especially in the Arab and Persian world, accentuating the cleavages that the possession of oil reserves had created among the different states.

While the great powers were involved in these struggles, also because of oil, changing sides as suited their material interests, they saw laicism gain strength, introduced by the French Revolution. The religious question – which had ultimately been the driving force of the millennium – seemingly became a minor issue in the industrialised world.

The final question remains: after this millennium, what next? The road to an answer follows on from what has just been said. In order to overcome the clashes of powers that have caused immense human devastation during the millennium, it is essential to find possible paths to peace. Thanks to the work of various groups and great thinkers – such as the theologian Hans Kung – a new search for God is being drawn up in the world that rests less on what divides religions than on the principles and values that are common to them. Immersed as they are in the civilisations and cultures where they originated, it is legitimate to expect that this interreligious pacification will lead to a more peaceful coexistence between different areas of the world.

At the same time, the path of political alternatives to the concepts that shaped this millennium is a requirement of all those who are driven by the desire to create new ways to sustainably improve Quality of Life for all. Not only new concepts but also new mechanisms and structures are needed. Politics in a peace-oriented world will no longer be based on the winner-loser paradigm, but on a new one in which everyone wins.

New generations will also gain as the threats to the planet's survival have to be overcome by a new understanding of the balance between human activities and the planet's capacity, by a sense of equitable justice that can guarantee all humans a dignified quality of life, for an ethic that serves not the interests of some but that becomes a global ethic in which new economic doctrines make the world a place of solidarity among all humans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

«Cuidar o futuro», Comissão Independente População e Qualidade de Vida, Trinova, 1998.

«L'Europe dans son histoire», under the direction of François Crouzet and François Furet, PUF, 1998».

«Third Millennium of Korean History», C. K. Yun, ed. Youl Hwa Dang Publisher, 1989.

«Japanese Society», Chie Nakane, ed. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.

«Christianity and Chinese religions», Hans Kung, ed. Doubleday, 1989.

«General History of Africa», UNESCO, 1990.

«Dans le château de Barbe-Bleue – Notes pour une redéfinition de la culture», (In Bluebeard's Castle : Some Notes Towards the Redefinition of Culture), Georges Steiner, Gallimard, 1973.

«L'identité de la France», «La naissance de la France», Fernand Braudel, Flammarion, 1990.

«A World Federation of Cultures», Ali A. Mazrui, The Free Press, 1976.

Inventing democracy[5]

In the course of our so-called 'democratic' path, I recognise that we have the advantage of having experienced several different stages as a generation. At a time when democracy is being questioned in new and old countries, it is a civilisational issue. It interests me – the question actually weighing on me – to know what in our experience has led democracy to implode not only in regards to the ethics that should lead it, but also in the effectiveness of its own mechanisms. As an immediate priority, I dearly wish to see if new concepts for democracy can be perceived in the ideas and achievements of the second half of the twentieth century.

For democracy to be viable in the twenty-first century, a new start is needed. But it's not about starting from scratch. On the contrary, the invention of democracy requires pre-paradigmatic moments to have been traversed and reflected upon. Only then is it possible to take a leap. And to discover, to see, to intuit new paradigms and thus, perhaps, to create democracy.

It is no longer just about formal democracy, even if it calls for the quality of its elected representatives and numerous adjustments in its constitutional provisions.

How can a member of parliament contribute to this decisive task if their nomination has been the subject of interactions and compromises and not necessarily the result of the choice between the best candidates?

Nor is it about participatory democracy, although some progress, incipient for sure, has occurred in the last twenty years.

But how can the travesty of participatory democracy be accepted in the kinds of public intervention of representatives of professions that have their own channels of making their aspirations or difficulties known to the State?

And even less is it a question of direct democracy, which has generally only taken simplistic forms (demonstrations, protests, etc.).

How can politicians think that the whirl at election time replaces direct democracy?

We have entered into other paradigms that lead us to systems and subsystems that have changed in nature. Although the social sciences do not emanate directly from natural sciences,

---

5   Article published in *Visão magazine, 07/03/2002, pp. 40-43.*

the principles of irreversibility, instability and uncertainty, as well as the self-organisation of complex systems range from physics to politics. New paradigms are born of the reflection on the world and all the changes that have taken place in the last 20 to 30 years.

IRREVERSIBILITY AND POLITICAL ACTION

I come to the notion of irreversibility in the political thinking of the philosopher Hannah Arendt for whom one's work and actions are woven into the historical narrative – impossible to recapitulate – of each person. In this context, *the exercise of politics is specifically expressed through action.*

It does not seem to me that the political analysis of certain politicians – be they members of government or parliamentarians – when exercising their mandate is in line with this. The same could be said when we see politicians who, having had the chance to do something themselves when exercising their elective functions, then come along and tell us what 'should be done'! Anyone who assumes political responsibilities does not waste this precious opportunity by just giving 'opinion' – they have the wherewithal to intervene through the state functions they are granted.

That is why governability today needs strong states, protagonists of political action that know reality from all angles and with a very clear notion of the opportunities and limits of political action. The new paradigms and theories emerging in science do not fall from the tree like Newton's apple! They rely on an in-depth knowledge of pre-paradigms, as Thomas Kuhn calls them, and the practice that accompanies theory. On multiple levels.

At the level of *decision-making*: confronted with the various possible choices, the decision to be made is simultaneously technical and political. It is technical because only what is technically irrefutable can be incorporated into the decision; and political because it abides by an orientation, a purpose, a lucid understanding of the present.

It is not at the moment when it is time to make up one's mind that one should go about forming committees to start from scratch and ignore all that has already been written on the subject or even the outcomes from other countries!

At the level of *cohesion*: confronted with the irrational forces of corporate pressures and the most humble common denominators that are the consensus, cohesion demands not only the truth but also the accessibility of that truth. Whatever the political decision and its legal integrity, it must be communicated immediately, in the most convincing ways possible to all citizens. The euro was, from this perspective, an example to follow. There can be no national unity and international solidarity without permanent *political literacy* for all citizens, whatever their status.

At the level of *action*: this is where the risk of unpredictability rears its head. Clarity of objectives, lucidity of motivations, the measure of the likely effectiveness of action, the proper solitude to ensure the impartiality of decision-makers as the action is set in motion, and a rigorously flexible time management, give the exact measure of one's commitment to action. Not acting is tantamount to negligence, because it breaks the links that connect

different aspects of life. A decision taken and announced only becomes politically real when it is translated into action.

At all these levels the public administration is indispensable, since it is the chain of direct execution of the government, constitutionally its superior body. In some European countries, including our own, the public administration is far from being, in fact, a public service, with the degree of autonomy and responsibility that befalls it. A study of the French public administration in January found that it was 15 years behind in the case of company management! In the last two decades the public administration has been emptied of its best staff to fill ministries' offices. Moreover, it is not uncommon for offices at all levels of state bodies to function as filters and screens, distancing politicians from their citizens.

I believe that the next legislature should begin with a joint session of the Directors-Generals and Government. There, each employee should bring a rundown of his/her area of the Government's action programme and an indication of its levels of execution. It would create a framework that would guarantee the dynamism of government action and be regularly shared with the entire population.

INSTABILITY AND UNCERTAINTY

The instability and uncertainty that characterise the material universe of beings and phenomena do not fail to have an impact on governability. All instability is still experienced as a threat, never as a challenge. Maybe this is the reason for the myth of absolute majorities, that hide the subliminal fear of the unknown. At the same time – and in theory – everyone who defends freedom of conscience fears the monolithism of partisan discipline in the face of any problem. But how can we reconcile these two positions?

Firstly, parliamentary institution must originate from civil society. For over 20 years, political scientists have warned of the dangers of professional politics. I also hope that one day parliament will find entirely new templates to deal with uncertainty. One will only feel loyal to the representativeness of the plural convictions of society and to the widening of knowledge in the information age if we abandon the automatic majorities dictated by parties to follow the path of the 'majority of ideas'.

Secondly, the greater the unpredictability, the more necessary is the concept that characterised political activity in the 50s to 70s and which is indispensable in today's scientific and business climate – planning. But politics has not yet been able to take ownership of it and make it operational, leading it to lose its moorings almost completely. With the end of the central planning economy in communist countries, the concept of planning has suffered a general collapse at the state level.

Planning is now much more difficult technically and even politically demanding. Just remember that short, medium and long term planning has different rules and actors.

The short term is the subject of daily government action and the tasks that, without any justification for being postponed, are the result of public administration. The medium term

(of a legislature, for example) is the order of priorities established, its continuous evalua-tion, clarification of its execution levels in time, the alchemy of local power with the central power. The long term is the ultimate horizon of political action that enables each decision to be put into perspective. In it, qualified bodies independent of the public administration can work effectively.

There can be no coherent action without the long term. Political action cannot be a patchwork blanket. It is the concretisation of a vision. It is the systemic implementation of a project. 'Profitability matters as much as long-term research', said Bill Gates in *Visão*. Now, if companies are increasingly dependent on long-term research, precisely because the future is unpredictable and uncertain, why is the political universe more like a fire station?

Of course, long-term planning in political life is difficult, but today there are mathematical tools, social science concepts and computer programmes that make possible the projections in which planning is expressed today and their rapid adaptation to possible turmoil. It is 'dynamic modelling' as referred to in his book *Exploring Complexity: An Introduction* by Ilya Prigogine. While safeguarding the epistemological differences between the natural sciences and human sciences, he shows how 'short-term planning based on past direct extrapolation threatens the fossilizing society', stating that dynamic modelling is essential if 'the possibility of adapting companies is the main source of their long-term survival and innovation'.

It is the unpredictable nature of the future that paradoxically intensifies the demands of ethics on the horizon of political life. When I speak of ethics, I am not referring to the deon-tology of each activity and thus also of political activity. This deontology is as important as any other specialised content of vocational training and at that level must be a crucial part of any curriculum. By speaking of ethics, I am posing the question on a different level, one that goes beyond a specific domain in order to have a decisive influence on the evolution and even the survival of humanity.

It is in my view indispensable for a democracy that lives through the problems of our time that the principle of 'not everything that is scientifically possible and technologically viable is socially acceptable' be permanently present. This principle translates into operational corollaries such as 'national bioethics councils', 'new technology assessment boards', 'ethics councils on the 'mixing' of energies '*media* regulatory councils', etc.

In all these cases, these should be groups of the most competent people in the country, regardless of any pressure from the state or the market.

COMPLEX SYSTEMS AND SELF-ORGANISATION

One of the ways in which the weakness of the state manifests itself is in the permanence of its irrational organisation with anachronistic departmental divisions that have existed for decades. Democracy is part of complex systems; to work in new ways you have to refer to systems theory for some of its fundamental principles.

Today's understanding of knowledge and action is necessarily systemic. If knowledge is interdisciplinary, the state organisation has to be inter-sectoral. Society does not manifest itself today in packages, rather, in structuring sectors where multiple subsystems are combined. The state cannot ignore that the conditions of its own organisation have a decisive impact on the effectiveness of its political practice. While the 1960s and 1970s were characterised by social ideals that were unambiguous, implicitly organic but intuitive, today the new social movements, an integral part of the third sector, present the same fluidity that is found in the market sector. They have an ad hoc nature, join and connect in groups of well-differentiated areas, reach a critical mass that gives them visibility and easily merge with new entities.

But they have acquired a new dimension: they are pillars of society around which other needs, interests and spheres are expressed and come together.

I consider it essential to distinguish at least two of these pillars: 'health', and 'education'. I call them pillars to try to indicate that they do not correspond to ministries in these areas or policy implementation measures. Rather, they correspond to complex systems that convey a holistic view of society.

Thus 'health' is at the same time the narrative of a population and the foundations of Quality of Life, the incorporation in people of their psychosomatic future, decisions on the location of social production of disease. It combines nutrition, habitability of living spaces, communion with nature, life-work balance and a transport network that makes it liveable, civility in anonymous relations, attention to others as part of an ethics of care.

'Education' is the process of a person's maturation, their conscious integration into a community, a history of facts and ideas, the mother tongue and languages that structure their spirit in otherness, acceptance of the other and, at its limit, of a culture of peace.

Seen in this way, education is a far cry from the first-degree problems of curricula, school terms and other minor aspects in which educational projects become watered down. It is the acquisition, after a person's localisation in time and space, of transferable qualifications, capable of serving in the most diverse of situations, of asserting themselves by their very flexibility on market fluctuations and thus establishing the conditions for personally happy, socially productive professional lives.

At this point, someone will naturally ask: what about the economy and social issues and the environment? To these questions I give an answer that covers all these concerns. I have often referred to the thinking of the 1998 Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor Amartya Sen, who has inspired me since the early 1980s. For him, in all books and articles, economics has to be regarded itself as an instrument that is, as Aristotle would say, in the service of Quality of Life.

It is this same notion of economics that undoes the myth of those who say they give 'priority to the social'. The social that is only redistributive can no longer respond to real needs and cannot be the basis of what economic growth is permitting. As many companies are already beginning to understand, social responsibility is part of the dynamics of the company because the economy today has to internalise social costs. Similarly, the environmental issue, due to its seriousness, must cease to be something that is penalised downstream of production and

consumption processes. There is no doubt today that it is urgent to incorporate the environment in the economy. It is therefore another economic model that we must contemplate.

I am convinced that the ability to grasp the historical time we live in, to perceive the paradigms that it incorporates, to investigate the consequences that can have repercussions on politics, is today the quality that is required for 21st century democracy to begin to awaken minds and wills. Utopia! – those who instinctively take refuge in their traditional cocoon will say. Edgar Morin responded in an interview with *Le Monde* newspaper at the end of last year: 'I distinguish between good and bad utopia. The bad utopia is the one that tries to bring universal harmony, total transparency.'

'A good utopia is something that is not achievable in the immediate moment but has a possibility of becoming real.' It is this utopia that excites me. And it is this utopia that is worth resorting to, to invent democracy.

Ethics, citizenship and politics[6]

The theme of today's session is at first glance an invitation to revisit a series of proven facts, played on several keys to the melody of the political universe. Apparently everything has already been said. But, if so, why does the theme recur like it does?

Why are we not happy to go back over the same old political speeches?. Why do we not stick to the thick manuals that give a clear definition of each term?

For two reasons that stem from the specificity of the guiding framework of this our age (Modern? Postmodern? Or already post-postmodern?) And of the vision of the world that is familiar to us from our scientific and technological education.

The first reason could be explained by Prigogine, from whom I shall borrow some ideas that he himself has used by way of analogy, in understanding the phenomena of the self-organisation of societies.

> Prigogine would tell us that
> any of the notions in our matrix
> are in transition
> or, to use the correct expression, the grouping of '
> ethics, citizenship and politics'
> is today an *unstable system.*
> Each of the terms needs to be defined
> in the framework that prevails at the beginning
> of this millennium.
> And the 'whole' that the matrix contains
> is already crisscrossed by *'forks'*
> of whose steady branches
> we can only guess where they lead.

---

6   Closing Conference of the Seminar on Ética *na Engenharia on complecomplexité*(Lisbon, Instituto Superior Técnico, July 13, 2002) [file version].
    Note: the text ends with a topic listing, which is likely to be developed in the oral intervention for which it was intended. No editorial changes were made.

(On a very local scale – that of our country – we had a period in which the macroscopic reading of the instability of the system and the discernment of its forks would have been possible and necessary for the political direction of our future that we now are living through in the present. I am naturally referring to the first 5-10 years after 25 April. It is common to hear and read assessments of this period in which terms such as troubled, disorganised and confused, etc, are used.

What we are not saying is that the work of the intellectuals in this period did not go far enough to make clear the nature of the phenomena which took place then, as 'natural' repercussions of unstable systems. Sparing in our enquiry, we downplayed the changes as mere assumptions from the ideological textbook. The political struggle, rather than a healthy showcase for new ideas ready to be put into practice, became rather an exercise in going through the motions of confrontation that made it seem more like a medieval tournament than the beginning of the innovative process of 'rebuilding the world', once the postmodern, deconstructive phase of its interpretation had passed.

It was all in the hands of professional politicians, almost all of them from the scientific realms that systematise what is already there instead of imagining what could be.

The second reason that justifies, in my eyes, today's reflection is furthermore that of our startling incomprehension of the consequences of the relativity required to understand the place of the human being in the world.

It is clear today what Prigogine says about this:

> *The fact that relativity is based on a constraint that only concerns physical observers, for beings who can only be in one place at a given moment and not everywhere simultaneously, makes this discipline a human physics, a physics subject to the intrinsic constraints that identify us as belonging to the physical world we describe. (...) Thus, our dialogue with nature takes place from within nature and nature responds positively only to those who explicitly recognise that they belong to it.*

Herein lies the repudiation of the frequent tendency to place us outside the world we live in, as if we were extra-terrestrial, or rather extra-universal observers.
And this idea, still common today,
along with other purposes that 'suited' us,
or in other words exonerated us, creating
the idea that science and technology are neutral.
Implicit in this notion one of the biggest inaccuracies that has
contaminated political action upstream took place:
that science and technology are only bad if we use them badly.

It is against this conviction that
the first ethical principle arises
which, more than any other kind,
it is up to scientists and engineers to defend:

Not everything that is scientifically accurate or technologically feasible is socially acceptable.

Many may speak of a liberalism
that makes possible and permissible
everything that science discovers and
technology invents; others may still believe that
science can always correct itself.

The question that awareness of citizenship necessarily
poses is this: what is the social cost of such convictions?
and what is the environmental cost?
Both costs pose the crucial question
of whether it is
the human being who is at the centre of concerns
and is the ultimate goal of decisions.
This is the norm that distinguishes what is politically good or bad,
right or wrong.

The human person is the first and last
purpose of any political decision.

To transform it into an instrument of scientific,
economic or financial objectives
is to break the foundation of politics and citizenship
that lies in the *inviolable character of human dignity*.
In it, everything is born and towards it, everything must lead.

1. SOME PROBABLE FORKS IN CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship that exhausted itself in the vote
every four or five years would be a sad example of a society
built without any influence of the contemporary sciences.

Prigogine entitled one of his last books *Exploring Complexity,*.
Also for at least three decades,

the thinker Edgar Morin
(and with him a whole group of sociologists, mathematicians, physicists
and philosophers –
Henri Atlan, Chico Varela, Kenneth Boulding)
have been exploring the theory of complexity,
with particular emphasis on the theory of self-organisation
and systems theory.

Prigogine says:

> *A dynamic model of human society begins by taking into account that the system, in addition to its internal structure, is closely integrated in an environment with which it exchanges matter, energy and information. (...) The evolution of such a system results from a subtle play between the behaviour of its actors and the constraints imposed by the environment. That is where the human system finds its unique specificity. Unlike molecules, the 'actors' of a physicochemical system, or even ants or other members of other societies, humans are constantly developing individual projects and desires. (...) one of the questions that arises is whether, in such circumstances, evolution is capable of leading to an overall optimum, or whether, on the contrary, each human system constitutes a single realisation of a complex stochastic process whose rules cannot in any way be assigned in advance. In other words, is past experience enough to predict the future, or is the limited ability to predict the future the very essence of the human adventure at the scale of the individual or at the scale of a community?*

Thus, in the city, the human being
is not only the more or less attentive observer, often sceptical and indifferent,
other times political analyst of occasion. The city (figure of the polis)
is the place where the human being emerges as subject.
Due to the diversity of their activity.
By the combination of purposes and means of action
with other human beings.
By constant attention to events.
Because of the importance of the action,
It always brings with it its own way
of knowing and of knowhow,
thus becoming, in the language of the great thinker Paulo Freire, an agent of culture.
For is culture not, and I use the words of this great Brazilian, 'the addition that man
makes to the world that he did not make'?

Therefore, in speaking of action,
I consciously follow the philosopher Hannah Arendt, that is to say,
not in the work that each person performs in his or her own domain
but in the action in which he or she is involved
in the construction of the city as an organised society.

In a burgeoning democratic practice, citizenship means
the expression of political and civic rights: the participation in electoral acts,
freedom of thought, expression and association, etc.

But the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
does not only proclaim these rights.
It also sets out social, economic and cultural rights.
The two rights groups have been set out
in two separate International Covenants,
albeit with a common preamble
in which the community of nations
stated that these two types of rights
are *interdependent and indivisible.*

One of the most beautiful texts that refers to this close interdependence, is found in a
famous speech of John Paul II at the General Assembly of the United Nations:

> *Permit me to enumerate some of the most important human rights that are universally*
> *recognized: the right to life, liberty and security of person; the right to food, clothing, housing,*
> *sufficient health care, rest and leisure; the right to freedom of expression, education and*
> *culture; the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the right to manifest*
> *one's religion either individually or in community, in private or in public; the right to choose a*
> *state of life, to found a family and to enjoy all conditions necessary for family life; the right to*
> *property and work, to adequate working conditions and a just wage; the right of assembly and*
> *association; the right to freedom of movement, to internal and external migration; the right*
> *to nationality and residence; the right to political participation and the right to participate*
> *in the free choice of the political system of the people to which one belongs.*

European citizenship, as enshrined in the Maastricht Treaty,
Did not go beyond a few civic and political rights.
They were timid and limited, even from an exclusively civic and political
point of view:
the right to freedom of movement in the states of the Union,
the right to elect the European Parliament directly (although still
according to national lists),

the right to vote in municipal elections in the country in which one lives, the right to diplomatic protection and representation in third countries by any State of the Union. The Treaty of Amsterdam tried to go a little further by incorporating some of the social rights that were part of the 1989 Social Charter of the workers,
but was still a long way from a coherent statement of social, economic and cultural rights.

This is the work being done by the convention for the Charter of Fundamental Rights with representatives of national parliaments in parallel with the Intergovernmental Conference.

And it is because there is no perception
in the political universe of systems
theory and its practical importance that
such proceedings are so irrational.
It is this mentality, particularly visible in the vast area
of the European Union, but also evident in many decisions
at national level, in any country,
which leads me to another ethical requirement:

> *Only serious politics can be done*
> *if we are contemporaries of our time*
> *and use the conceptual tools of this time.*

It was in this spirit that the French political scientist Pierre Rosanvallon wrote in his book *The Sacredness of the Person*:

... the growing plurality of the idea of citizenship refers
to the complexity of the forms of sovereignty that mark
the development of European integration.

In this context, citizenship,
which is the individual expression of one's own sovereignty,
requires the state to comply fully
with its threefold responsibility:
defend/protect/promote all rights.

We return to a new social
contract that is no longer based,
as in Locke and Rousseau,
on the assumption of a relationship of subordination
but rather on a community of equally free men and women,
whatever their roles in the social community.

In spite of the conditions prevailing at the time when the notion
of the social contract was imposed,
we still often see the attempt to depend on the state:
in companies, in universities, in the mentality of citizens.

The call for the formation of civil
society is nothing more than the need
for autonomy of social communities
in all areas where their rights are exercised.

Of course, in speaking of all rights, I must also refer to the so-called new rights, of which I highlight three that have a lot to do with engineers and scientists.

— Firstly, the right to a healthful environment, called into question, on the one hand, by the ravaging of natural species due to heightened consumerism and, on the other, the increasingly serious repercussions of the use of fossil fuels. I cannot neglect to mention the work being done at the IST Nuclear Fusion Centre headed by Professor Varanda.
— A second right springs directly and unequivocally from the IT age and the broad range of activities and possibilities brought about by the media revolution. The central right in this area, and the most often mentioned, is the right to privacy of individuals and the protection of both the patentable and information services whose purpose is to protect the security of the public. Make no mistake, this right demonstrates, more clearly than all the rights already enshrined, the paradox inherent in rights understood without corresponding obligations (to which I will refer later).
— Finally, the right to the permanence of the human species as we know it. The discussion on patents relating to the human genome is a turning point for ethics.
— The wantonness with which politics tends to mask its ineffectiveness in coping with the complexity of the modern world – visible in its relations with the *media* and sport, for example – has now reached a level which cannot leave the scientific community and conscientious citizens indifferent. The fact that the announcement of the discovery of almost complete human genome sequencing was made by President Clinton and Prime Minister Tony Blair is *a misappropriation by politics of an area belonging to the world of science, and therefore ethically inappropriate*.

This announcement opens the way to the subjection of achievements of science to the political-economic interests of the great powers. Competition appears on the horizon in a field that should in no way be part of this logic.

As the President of the CNECV, Professor Luís Archer has commented:

> *The truth is that science is losing its innocence of the candid pursuit of truth and the common good, and is being seduced by economic power. It is not by chance that the dossier on the human genome of the July 2000 issue of Scientific America is entitled 'The Human Genome Business'.*

Citizenship thus covers a very wide area of human life,
of activities, interests, and the safety of people.
It covers all the panoply of
'fundamental freedoms, rights and
guarantees' structuring all Constitutions.

But the human being is not only the subject of the guarantee
which the rule of law confers. Each right is coupled
with an obligation, duty and responsibility.
(At a global level, we have taken decades to understand
that individual and community ethics
always supposes these two sides exist. This happened,
in part, as one of the consequences
of the confrontation between the dominant philosophies in
the two materialisms that dominated the twentieth century.)

But some tenaciously persevere in trying to ensure responsibility be accepted as the other side of citizenship.

And yet this relationship is very simple...

2. POLITICS AT THE EXACT MEETING OF PERSONAL AND COLLECTIVE HISTORY

I started with citizenship because it is part of politics itself. As, in the 80s, I had occasion to say many times
    with the signatories of the Manifesto
    'For the deepening of democracy' and
    with many thousands of people:

> *'Politics is a matter for everyone and for every day.'*

The first place for the exercise of politics is our own place in the present moment.

I go back to the importance of the subject of which I spoke at the beginning.
For a more in-depth discussion of the importance of the subject I refer you to Heisenberg's
key book
The Part and the Whole – Talks about Atomic Physics
where we 'eavesdrop' on the passionate conversations of the great physicist with
his peers Otto Hahn and Wolfang Pauli, Niels Bohr and Paul Dirac (whom I had the
privilege to hear to when I represented Portugal at UNESCO).

I must confess that one of the great principles that I learned in this house and that had
an impact on
all aspects of my life
was constant in the dialogue of these great physicists
who changed our perception of the world:

«*The subject is always conveyed in the observation of the object.*»

Exit pure objectivity.
But enter, on the other hand,
a greater exigency of the subject
not only in relation to the object one observes,
whether it is material or conceptual,
but also in relation to oneself.

'*As important as the work on the object is the subject's work on oneself.*'

(I cannot fail to point out that, although this conviction is a framing principle of the psycho-
analytic science that the twentieth century has also built, it is no less certain that its diffusion
has in the last decades been to the merit of the theory and practice of women's movements
for whom 'everything that is personal is political and everything that is political is personal.')

By reinforcing the political dimension of all activity,
I am not avoiding the ethical issues of elective politics.
Rather, on the contrary, I am saying that it makes up a system
with the politics of all who constitute the social community.

Hence, for example, the inadequacy of the policies of the world's major credit
institutions for decades
and that has only improved on the face of it in recent years:

the idea of *trickle down policies* – what is decided at the top tumbles down the steps of the social structure until it reaches the base…
only that this policy, instead of having this apparently beneficial effect, caused in most countries
the destruction of their own base,
the closure of schools,
the lack of funds to pay teachers,
the inability to be covered by health services,
the lack of basic sanitation and clean water for more than two billion human beings. What else could we expect if half of mankind does not live, but endures the 'cruelty of mere survival' at about $2, or 400 escudos a day?

Here lies the fundamental ethical question of political governance.
As long as the world and each state exclude part of its citizens
from achieving a minimum Quality of Life, the ethics of political action is at stake.
The human dignity of the social whole cannot bear to be full of holes.

And affirming it is not only a problem of social orientation, a fruit of compassion.
It is at one and the same time the fruit of the science that is most evidently at stake – the economy –and fruit of the very understanding of the sciences and life in society.

Politicians tend to justify their decisions
based on the demands of the traditional economy:
it is about balancing the budget, no external debt,
inflation control.

All legitimate but incomplete objectives,
inadequate to the times in which we live.

In 1997, a group of 300 European economists declared,
 in a public statement,
the fallacy of an economy reduced to mere accounting
when today the economy contains,
at the same level of demand, three factors:
the factor of economic growth,
the social factor
and the environmental factor.

Also in the same period the foundation of social quality in Europe was created in which sociologists, philosophers and other scientists showed how the quantity paradigm

has to be replaced by the quality paradigm without which the planet could not guarantee conditions for the survival of future generations.

And if it is necessary to resort to the argument of experts on the economy I do not hesitate to mention the 1998 Nobel Prize for Economics,
Amartya Sen, who states in one of his last books:

> The more conventional criteria of economic success have to be evaluated only as means for achieving more profound end results. It would even be a mistake to see the goals of education, health care and other basic necessities only or primarily as the expansion of so-called 'human resources' equivalent to the accumulation of 'human capital' – as if people were the means for the production and not its ultimate end.

Further upstream in political action,
I tend to think that it is a problem of the 'understanding' of the phenomena that is in question.
We do not need to be a genius to work at their meeting points
but the uncertainty that characterises them frightens those who want to guarantee structures that are rigid and always identical to themselves.
Thus the interdepartmental perspective is lost
which not only allows a more adequate view of problems
but also – and no less important –
reduces public expenditure.

This tendency is fuelled by the absence of transdisciplinarity in tackling problems.
Heisenberg in the above book attributes to one of his companions in the dialogue this reflection:

> Understanding nature means this: to have a clear notion of the correlations that exist there; to be sure that its inner mechanism has been penetrated Such knowledge cannot be acquired solely thanks to the approach of a single phenomenon or a single group of phenomena, even if a certain internal order is discovered there; this knowledge happens only when a great number of experimental phenomena are recognised as connected to one another and one has managed to link them to a simple origin.

Many times, reading the philosophical work of Hannah Arendt,
I believe that therein there were conditions for coherent political action; because it is not this attitude that she reveals throughout her life and that leads her to say:
'The essential thing for me is to understand; I must understand.'

The need for understanding
does not lead only to intellectual satisfaction:
it is the beginning of coherent and effective action.

That is why ethics also calls for no surrender on the principles and guidelines of action in favour of what is considered possible and pragmatic.

Such an attitude implies, not only as a work method but as an ethical requirement, the constant evaluation of what, if necessary in terms of human dignity, must necessarily be viable.

If the act of political governance is born,
as I have tried to demonstrate,
in conjunction with the expressions of individual citizenship,
citizens' participation in original forms of decision-making is imperative.

It is strange that in the 21st century political power continues to designate as its social partners only those inherited from the frameworks in place at the beginning of industrialisation – trade unions and corporate groups.

It is my conviction that in each question the contributions to the solution of problems are always manifold and that, therefore, all groups organised around a given problem are the social partners with regard to this problem.

3. FOR A GLOBAL ETHICS

Throughout this discussion, I have set forth some ethical principles that are also required by our own scientific teachings.

But I want to leave us with some ideas for the third term of this unstable system, for the very notion of ethics itself.

An ethics of responsibility.

An ethics of care

An ethics of the future

A global ethics

GROUP III

DEVELOPMENT, POPULATION AND QUALITY OF LIFE

With deepest gratitude[1]

your Eminence,
Rectors, Minister,
Ambassadors,
Professors, Dear Students,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

1. I am deeply grateful for the honour bestowed on me today and I hope to be able to find a way to put it into words.

I receive this honour from the Board of Directors and the Academic Council, who have treated me so generously by welcoming me to the Catholic University of Louvain, renowned for its history, teaching and research.

And – if I may be so bold? – I see in their decision an invitation for female students, in the quest for their role as women, in society and within the Church, not to hesitate in following 'unconventional' paths. I am particularly happy for them.

How can we not think, on this occasion, of all those who have shaped the University and have contributed, over the centuries, to its scientific and spiritual influence? Are we not all begotten by those who have preceded us in the faith?

If I may also add that I share this honour with all those who, from different generations and different countries, have not ceased to give me the courage to pursue my personal quest for a committed faith.

2. John Paul II, in his message of January 1, spoke of the 'urgent moral need for a new solidarity'[2]. I would like to talk of the aspects that come from both my technical and political experience and my commitment as a Christian, in a world that is increasingly becoming 'a global village'.

---

1   Speech given at the acceptance ceremony of the *Honoris Causa* Doctorate awarded by the Catholic University of Louvain (Louvain-La-Neuve, February 2, 1990) [archive version].

2   John Paul II, *Peace with God the Creator, Peace with All Creation*, chap. IV, par. 10. *(Author's Note)*

The expression global solidarity is recent. From the 'international' solidarity of the 1950s to the 'global' solidarity sought after today as a moral value, it is a long road travelled. I have had the privilege of witnessing this journey.

Having been inspired to follow one field of activity after another, it has become clear to me how the same breath of life traverses all beings. From the least perceptible exchange of energy within the atom to the efforts that go into the most spiritual of human endeavours, there is an invisible mesh. I name this mesh, unbeholden to established hypotheses, solidarity.

I thus broaden the meaning of the word solidarity. Instead of narrowing it down to the social world of human relationships, I am drawn rather to the solidarity demanded by the complexity of the real – this concept whose ambition is 'to be aware of common ground between disciplines which has been broken down, between cognitive categories and between types of knowledge'[3].

Complexity relates to the world of systems. And yet, do not we say that a system consists of elements that are autonomous and interdependent? The system found in a crystal, in language, in the forests and seas and the air that surrounds them, in the organisation of each society and system, ultimately, in all the realms of rapport between peoples… Everywhere solidarity is the glue that allows us to say that 'everything fits'.

3. Whenever I changed the main focus of my activity, I time and again found unchanged the logical solidarity that unites the foundations of all disciplines.

To go from a physical concept to an interpretation of social phenomena, to perceive in the political sphere structures identical to those which make up living organisms and to grasp – in sheer wonder – this similarity, may be for the people of my generation the legacy of Einstein's dream of finding a single equation to explain the universe. Or perhaps it is also the echo of the two verses by the Portuguese poet Fernando Pessoa:

> *Newton's binomial is as beautiful as the Venus de Milo.*
> *The truth is few people notice it.*

This solidarity, which passes through all areas of knowledge, is not just an image or an analogy: in practical terms it is reflected in specific requirements. Firstly, that of interdisciplinarity in the tackling of any problem. Secondly, as a logical consequence, that of an intersectoral approach to the management of politics. Such perspectives are decisive today in order to address the vital question of the governability of societies.

Indeed, seeing the difficulty that economists of all kinds encounter at this moment in history in grafting the market economy over the structures of central planning economies, we can only conclude that there are still tools we lack. I favour a non-economic approach, more interdisciplinary and intersectoral.

---

3   Edgar Morin, *in On Complexity. (Author's Note)*

A similar situation, due to its topicality, is the apparent contradiction between the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of states and the new interdependencies created at all levels of the world order. I am convinced that input from other sources of knowledge and experience will be able to overcome the impasse and pave the way for new concepts and formulas in the organisation of connections between states.

And what of the impact of development/industrialization/pollution/cost factors upon the environment? John Paul II emphasises4 the responsibilities of states at different stages in their development: on the one hand, long-established industrialised states cannot ask NICs for restrictive measures for their industries if they do not apply them themselves; on the other, states that are embarking on industrialisation are not morally exempt from repeating the mistakes made by others in the past.

I do not raise these questions arbitrarily. They are by necessity integral to the fixed agenda of any international organisation that wishes to face the great demands of our time.

4. The search for connections between these different forms of solidarity is also a continuous process for me. Sometimes solidarity with my peers in social and political life requires the decompartmentalisation of my knowledge, and other times the pursuit of research, however interesting in itself, is diverted in order to respond to an urgent need in the community.

At the heart of this solidarity, which fits for all of us, and in particular for politicians, is the courage to decide and the capacity to implement our will. How do we otherwise find an explanation, if not the absence of this courage and will, for the existence of so many displaced persons, even in the welfare societies of the Northern Hemisphere? If it is also on our own doorsteps, in our hometowns, where can we draw enough individual courage and political will for these international structures to be an asset and not a liability in achieving a more ambitious solidarity, one that makes us take responsibility for the billion of unknown faces who live below the absolute poverty line? As a female MP of a southern hemisphere country recently said: 'We pay our debts with the lives of our children.'

Solidarity can only find its foundations in the moral principle of 'burden sharing', an expression of the dignity of the human person, of the respect for life as the supreme value. Did not Christ say of Himself: 'I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly'? – Would He have come only for a few?

5. Like any relationship in a structured system, human solidarity is at once a constraint and a contract, responsibility and reciprocity. It is woven into a specific canvas that assigns its limits. As a contract, it purely depends on the wills that are committed to it. As responsibility and reciprocity, it becomes the expression of the desire to be part of the destiny of others. It is thus open to broader horizons.

---

4   John Paul II, *idem*, chap. IV, par. 10 *(Author's Note)*

The moment of European and world history in which we are living puts solidarity to the test at all the levels I have just mentioned. Our continent – which we have believed for so long to be 'the old continent', because nothing seemed to budge there – is suddenly being rocked by huge changes with which we have trouble keeping up on a daily basis.

We have all anxiously followed the protests of the peoples of Central Europe. Now is a time for building, to bet on unprecedented solutions. As an Italian politician said a few weeks ago: 'We have to invent a new European order'. The same verbs constantly crop up in the discourse: to think, to imagine, to discover ... For this new order, if it is intended in a spirit of solidarity, will not only be a constraint and a contract of responsibility and reciprocity, but also of *imagination* and inventiveness.

In such a climate, we fall prey to uncertainty, turbulence, and even moments of apparent chaos. And it is all too tempting to wish to put everything back 'in order'. But it is exactly in the face of such conditions that the new idea, the unique institution, can be introduced. The social system is constantly being rebuilt. It is up to us to decide how it will be done: if it remains at the mercy of the entropy that distances itself from the hopes of the people, or whether, on the contrary, a new age of dynamism can be ushered in.

A major concern haunts me in this respect: I am very much afraid that, similarly to what has happened in my own country, the politicians of East and West think that it is a question of reshuffling what has already been lived through in Western Europe. Official economic aid to the Eastern countries was subject to one condition: that of the establishment of 'true democracies'. But what makes a 'true democracy' at the end of the 20th century?

What is at stake today is much more than a regime: it is the very structure of political power. Thanks to the two poles of change of the European continent, Eastern Europe and the EEC, the elements required for the 'furthering of democracy' have been set in motion. On the one hand, the mobilisation of the continent's new structures on ethnic and regional matters, reconstituting this mosaic which has never kept the same form for very long; on the other hand, the discovery of solidarity among political structures at all levels of state life, thus avoiding their annulment. The resulting democracy will be more complex and, paradoxically, simpler for each individual and each people. A new political culture is in the making.

Any worries about Europe cannot, however, cause us to fall into a new 'Eurocentrism'. We would slip back centuries if the other continents were considered 'peripheral'. The planning of Europe must go hand in hand with a true 'new international order'. It is at times like this that everything can be rethought and solutions born of global solidarity will be able to emerge.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The University celebration for which we are gathered here today has the patronage of Our Lady of Wisdom. What emblem could be more telling of the depth of the extreme bond between faith and commitment?

It is the quest for wisdom that drives our personal journey and brings us together as one.

May the Catholic University of Louvain become
ever more
a place of Wisdom,
a place where the feminine face of the Spirit of God is revealed,
a place where the alliance between knowledge and mystery is fulfilled.

On technology[5]

When I thought about what I was going to talk about this morning, I was reminded that, for most of the people here, it refers to a completely prehistoric event! It was the first (and only) United Nations Conference on the 'use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes' in 1955. There was a great deal of enthusiasm among the generation of physicists and engineers working in the nuclear field. With our convictions based on the research work already done, we thought that (among other equally useful uses) crops would multiply, everything would grow much faster, all the problems of hunger in the world would quickly be resolved...

However, some of us felt we were in systematic denial: is it really like this? Can this fragile domain be open to unlimited research?

The United Nations Conference had no sequel. At the end of the 1950s the space race began, which, because of the rivalry between the two superpowers, brought joint work on research into the use of nuclear for peaceful purposes to a halt (except for nuclear power plants which were already a reality).

The following year, in Vienna, the Pax Romana World Congress took place (the International Movement of Catholic Students and Intellectuals). It brought together many Christians who worked in the scientific field. The question then became more explicit: could one work in the preparation and production of technologies that are already intended for destructive purposes? I am reminded of some of the questions posed, for example, by those working in the explosives industry: would it be justifiable to try to perfect existing explosives? Others, coming from nuclear physics, raised the question: is it not the case that all the avenues we are exploring in the nuclear field can be adapted for military use? Would not the barrier between applications for peaceful and military purposes be too thin? Or to put it even more simply: is it not that our existing knowledge in the field of nuclear use in power plants goes hand in hand with the manufacture of atomic bombs? (Little did we know that this would prove to largely be the crux of the Gulf War...)

These questions were very much on the mark. I do not remember if we drew definitive conclusions, except that of the need to question oneself which continues to be a constant in

5   Paper presented probably in the early 1990s [archive version].

this generation and that throughout life would lead to reversals of opinion in each and every one of us. Now this questioning is more valid than ever when it comes to technology.

1. I will begin with a point that is sometimes considered controversial: the great change that has taken place in our time in the relationship between science and technology.

In fact, it seems to me increasingly difficult to distinguish between pure science on the one hand and applied science on the other.

Until a few years ago this separation seemed very clear. It corresponded to a completely internalised system of values. Science was always good, obeying its own rationale; if there was any problem, it was temporary and science would solve it. Auguste Comte said this quite clearly, in the assertion that science can always solve its contradictions, while technology could not. Technology could be 'good' or 'bad' (as we said at the time), depending on how it was applied. It could make sense one way, or another. This was the great moral burden placed upon the conscience of researchers and all those who were tasked with applying the technologies: humans had to always weigh the consequences of the technological progress they were making. In the field of science, on the contrary, the path was unlimited.

Nowadays we have begun to realise that the production of science immediately involves technology. It involves it in a conventional sense in terms of verifying the various stages of the creation of science itself. Even in an ambivalent case such as theoretical physics, we find that at decisive moments it does not disregard the need for experimental verification; and this experimental verification takes the form of increasingly sophisticated technologies.

Science, in its recent achievements, relates to technology inversely: not as a cause but as a consequence of technological advancement. Many of the discoveries of our time were made not by following a deductive path, from pure science that would later take shape and manifest itself using various technologies, but from the technological creation itself. Just think of the great transformation in the field of chemistry that took place with the discovery of large molecules – resulting from the research work of the Nylon Dupont Company, looking to improve its own products. Suddenly this new element – the large molecule – had to be taken into account, a chemical family that gave rise to this reign of plastics in which we live (it is a valid point to ask if this was a 'good' or 'bad' discovery!). It was thanks to this moment of technological confluence, as well as the desire for profit and competitiveness, that a scientific breakthrough came about.

But the mutual relationship between science and technology is not necessarily a dependent one. If we look at a country that we consider to be more technically developed, Japan, it is very interesting to note that the history of scientific and technological development (and hence of economic development) has been and continues to be interdependent between technology and science, to the extent that, on visiting a laboratory, it is difficult to know whether what we are seeing is a practical application that already has a strong theoretical foundation or if, on the contrary, it is mere experimentation that will later lead to a theoretical formula. The case of Japan, which is spreading to other countries in Asia, necessarily leads us to rethink the whole question of intermeshing between the science we used to consider 'pure' and the technology we would consider an 'application' of pure science.

We can say today, on the basis of human experience and what we know of the world, that there are clearly 'bad' technologies that are not subject to us asking naively whether or not their goodness depends on their use. Technologies that are intended for the selective destruction of human beings, the militarisation of space or the creation of programmed human beings are three such examples, all of which are the subject of research, all part of 'technological progress', and in the end, all 'bad' technologies at the outset.

Recently I was talking to a young friend, a researcher in Molecular Biology who is working on the habitability conditions of space at the European Space Agency, or to be more precise, how the life process happens, and what the metabolic process is. We discussed the importance of this research in solving the problem of hunger in the world. At one point he said: 'This investigation has a happy ending, I love what I do, but it is just one of the many discoveries taking place.' This case shows that what is happening in space is similar to nuclear energy in this regard.

So, looking at the three examples mentioned above (the selective destruction of human beings, arms race technologies and the militarisation of space, and the production of programmed human beings), we are inclined to say that yes, there are bad technologies, intrinsically bad. We must state this unequivocally: in the pursuit of knowledge of science and technology, nothing is neutral. Knowledge is not neutral and technology therefore already has meaning when it is born.

Notice the radical change in Einstein's attitude to the production of the atom bomb (recounted with extreme remorse). Einstein repeatedly urged the US president to create a project that, in its fullest extent, aimed at producing a very powerful weapon capable of unleashing a chain reaction. Between that moment, marking the birth of the Manhattan Project, and what began to be perceived as the potential consequences of the atom bomb (even before it was dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima), Einstein was gripped by panic at its toll on human life and a great feeling of guilt. He urged the American president to shut everything down immediately and not use the new technology. To put it another way, this dramatic rite of passage is part of our contemporary history, from scientific discovery that at the outset seems legitimate, to the onset of technological reality that ultimately proves to be intrinsically destructive.

This by necessity leads us to impose very important conditions of ethical behaviour. If science and technology are not neutral, neither are they omnipotent. Although knowledge has the potential to go even further, for us it is the Spirit that judges everything. And it not only judges our moral or societal attitudes, but also science and technology ... Sometimes I have the feeling that for certain mentalities, science and technology are like an idyllic garden where the Spirit has no call to judge...

2. My second point has to do with the society in which we live, a society where all is mediated by technology. In the most humdrum moments of our lives, everything is technical. If we look at our daily lives, all is managed by technical rules and little technical gadgets. Let me give you a curious, but practical example: the new layout of Lisbon airport! It is very interesting, because from an architectural point of view it is a colossal work. It is a huge airport built in a very small

area (something typically Portuguese!). What is more curious still is that we disembark from the plane to emerge into the jet bridge, and along it we go. We walk and walk, and we come out on exactly the same staircase that was fifty metres from the bus in the previous version! Moral of the story: although I use the airport often, I still don't know my way around! There is a technical procedure and this technical procedure is beyond me! (This example, which addresses a very concrete problem, spatial organisation, isn't even particularly high tech...)

Why choose this example? Because a society mediated by technology unleashes a new era of cognitive processes. And because this has not been clearly addressed, this leads to a new kind of illiteracy (not to call it analphabetism!). New swathes of ignorance become the norm. We all handle things ignorant of how they work, much less why they work that way (is it really the case or not?)! The consumption of electronic gadgets increases dramatically, and from what we can verify is widespread, the whole society being gradually flooded with new tools and procedures. Last summer I went to the Castelo do Bode dam, taking the tourist river boat. I had my old camera with me. When I looked around ... it was a completely anachronistic object, it looked like a dinosaur: everyone had video cameras. I was caught completely by surprise! As the market changes, and technology is updated, we immediately find ourselves using new mechanisms and instruments.

I am concerned that in a society mediated by technology, in which technology has increasingly played a decisive role, the inability of many to understand the codes and signs that are part of this new cultural environment is beginning to be abundantly clear.

Trying to cope with this environment leads to two kinds of mind-set. One is the magic explanation of all reality, based on the conviction that in science and technology, everything is possible. On the night of the first American attack on Iraq, we all blindly believed that only four per cent of Iraq's armament had been left undamaged, and that everything else had been destroyed, isn't that so? I don't know how many times we saw the crosshairs focusing and the bombs dropping. We all believed this – everyone, in every country in the world! And it was a colossal lie – most of the military arsenal was still intact! We are, after all ruled by these signs and codes which we have always taken to be the truth – if not, the systematic questioning of everyday life would lead to total paralysis. It would be very interesting to analyse the Gulf War and its broadcasting, not only from the point of view of 'why the media did this or that' or 'why the military prevented it from doing so' but as a magic explanation of reality.

Faced with a society mediated by technology, another mind-set takes increasing hold. It is the effort to seek refuge in any kind of religious or political fundamentalism.

On an individual level, we try to explain 'the other side' in the simplest of terms, dictated by certainties and clear rules.

At the level of entire countries, fundamentalism has emerged as a rejection of the civilising model. Language is the instrument; by marginalising entire groups and peoples, it is an expression of a type of development alien to the culture of these peoples. Hence the search for its cultural foundations, whether in the return to an extremely ritualistic and doctrinally rigid religiosity, simple and well defined codes, or in the sudden explosion of nationalisms as a demand for homogeneous spaces free from complex ethnic or linguistic multiplicity.

On the other hand, and concomitantly, there is an atomisation of the mechanisms of perception that are nudged in different directions by the instruments of high technology. The human being ends up fragmented.

I just heard Dr Paulo Bateira make reference to a unified human being, to that unity that is our fundamental aspiration. The contrast between this ultimate perspective and reality is glaring: what technology produces today is completely fragmented beings, sliced, compartmentalised, beings that only respond to stimuli that are programmed and encoded.

There is a growing gap in society between those who understand the codes and know how to interpret and manipulate them, and a mass totally ignorant of that language, and who are even afraid of it. It is, after all, the consequence of an old myth: that until a few years ago, knowledge was a source of great power in society (greater than political power even). It was to knowledge that we turned, a kind of ivory tower that no one dared touch, (from where our veneration comes when we talk about university professors). Implicit is the idea that knowledge is a source of power and is above us.

Today, the power of 'know-how', the power of technology itself, overlaps the power of knowing. The emphasis has shifted away from knowledge and towards new frames of reference. It is the experience of older people who have a problem using a computer or video, for which we call the youngsters in our circle to come solve our problem as if they were born knowing everything! This shows us how know-how and the power of know-how are today in a very different class to the holders of knowledge in the past.

What do I mean by all this? Something simple: for all those who are in the domain of 'knowing' and 'know-how', there is an engagement with scientific and technological literacy that is as important as the investigation of science and technology themselves. Only those who wish to hold onto power they no longer have are refusing to expose themselves to it; only they fear the risks of telling others what they think they know or think they know how to do. It is necessary to break down the walls that have enclosed the technical community in its own contemplation and contemplation of the objects it creates. To cope with the new illiteracy – and thereby liberate people from new servitudes – a constant process of scientific and technological literacy must be triggered to keep up with technological developments.

3. The two points I have just mentioned clearly indicate that technology in each society is a key element in the structuring of that society. And it is so on three levels: in terms of its own development, the understanding of phenomena in the world today and its own democratic evolution.

Directly, technology can contribute towards social and economic development – for this it has to be in line with the point of actual historic development of each society and not be imposed from the outside.

Indirectly, technology can create, if not the desire, then at least the need to interpret the phenomena that constitute contemporaneousness, and thus broaden the cultural horizons of our society.

Finally, to the extent that technology is accessible to all who live within a given society, it contributes decisively to the establishment of democratic norms in social life.

One consequence is imposed on our governments: the definition of scientific and technology policy is one of its imperatives.

Yesterday someone made a very interesting remark. How do you choose between working on something that is a medium-term or long-term research project, and something that meets an urgent need? It is a question that is very difficult to answer. On the one hand, critical mass is necessary, but on the other the human being is not an entity whose boundary ends with the contours of the body. The human being is part of an environment, and a wider reality; there is an extension of ourselves that we carry with us and that is our own environment. For this reason, it does not seem to me that technological research and the focus on this or that aspect of technology are only the fruit of individual interests, but also (or should be) of the social, cultural and historical environment in which each individual makes their choices.

I will give an example *a contrario* that placed me in an extremely embarrassing situation. In the late 1960s I spent time in France with an international team from the Catholic Movement to which I belong, the Grail. They often went to visit the team of three Portuguese from my generation who were doing their PhDs in Paris. Let me explain the work of our three compatriots: one was studying the influenza virus in monkey kidneys; another was researching the metabolism of scorpions, which consisted of giving scorpions a little bit of lettuce every day and weighing them throughout the day; the third was studying the tertiary evolution of lands in the Leiria region, weighing the pollen retained in the earth brought in sacks all the way to Paris. All these matters are of immense interest. But imagine an international team's reaction: 'It looks like Portugal is far more developed, there's no longer a hunger problem, nor in agriculture nor industrialisation, the Portuguese are on the cutting-edge of research!' What does one say to that? How to explain? These are very capable intelligent people, who have surely done a good job, but we could ask ourselves: Does this fit into a society like ours and how? It is a perfectly legitimate question.

The importance of scientific and technology policy is, moreover, very clear in the goals that the European Economic Community set itself with the Single Act of 1986. In tandem with the free movement of goods, services, capital and people, is a multi-annual research framework drawn up by working groups of scientists from the twelve countries.

That is why an initiative which took place in France some years ago seems to me to be important. In 1983 the 'Estates General of Scientific and Technological Research' were held. Scientists and researchers contributed to the answer to the questions: 'What is important in our country? Where do we focus research?'

Initiatives of this type are indispensable. They correspond, in my view, to an ethical requirement of the scientific community, in response to the technological advances of our time. I do not think that Portugal can evolve unless there is this joint reflection independent of all external pressures.

4. Technology is part of the fracture line between North and South. Some have called it 'technology – the Trojan horse of domination.' To a certain extent, it is so – through it the dependence of the South on the countries of the North, and inequality of access to knowledge and technological expertise is greatly accentuated, while at the same time traditional means of production and subsistence economies are devalued. At a time when we are trying to define policies aimed at the poor, we need to give value to traditional subsistence technologies such as those found, for example, in the Latin American worlds.

Technology transfer is a euphemism, for there is no 'transfer' at all – simply a commercial act of selling to the South what is obsolete and no longer of interest to the North. There is no 'transfer' of technology; there is the 'sale' of technologies, which are generally obsolete.

What, then, is the challenge to be met in this technological question of North-South fracture? It is the South's ability to jumpstart its development where the technologies to be used are decisive. Therefore, there is a fundamental ethical problem, which is the pursuit of these technologies as a priority – technologies that will be even beyond cutting-edge that bypass the entire circuit the North had to face.

Obviously the question of technology and the North-South divide poses a fundamental ethical problem. Do we not say with utmost sincerity that science is universal? Once something is discovered and understood, everyone should be aware, and all should have access to that knowledge. And what then about technology? If technology is wedded to science as I mentioned in the first point, why is technology protected by intellectual property as the greatest, most expensive asset in the world? Why is it exactly this point that is under discussion in the GATT negotiations at this moment? It is exactly regarding the question of intellectual property to which the peoples of the South say: 'Let's not go ahead with anything that benefits the North without the issue of intellectual property being seen much more humanistically than before, as far as technology is concerned.'

5. Technology today is a key point for the survival of the planet, and for the human species. I will mention just a few aspects of research that are fundamental:

In agriculture, the use of non-polluting soil technologies and the conservation of the underground water table; in industry, not only recycling technologies, but also production of technologies that actually make their products biodegradable (therefore, it is not just a downstream correction; it is the introduction of a new upstream factor during production). An absolute priority is research into new energy sources, particularly renewable energy.

What I have referred to and even my introduction to this brief talk, point to a transformation of the paradigm in scientific and technological research. Do we not all (and 'all' being the Northern Hemisphere, all industrialised countries) live based on a paradigm that is profoundly biblical, namely 'Subdue the Earth'? This 'Subdue the Earth' has justified and placed all scientific and technological conquests above reproach.

Today we realise that this 'subjugation of the Earth' has its limits. I dare to ask the following question: are we not now faced with another paradigm, a paradigm of limits that is also inscribed in our humanity?

It is so to such an extent, that even the process of psychoanalysis (which many people believe to be a process of liberation from all laws, moral codes and limits) seems to be nothing more than the process that leads to the discovery of the limits of our own consciousness. Once a man is released from all laws, he will find the Law. This is the great message of Antigone. There is an unwritten law, and this unwritten law is not only cultural and social, but is deeply personal, inscribed in each of us.

We are at a turning point, in a new perception of the fundamental paradigm. I wish we could also reinterpret the Genesis story from this exact standpoint. Adam and Eve's being forbidden 'from eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge' has had numerous interpretations, from the popular, in which sexual sin is suspected ('they saw that they were naked and were ashamed'), an interpretation confirmed by the presence of the serpent that appears in all mythologies as linked to a sexual metaphor… There are other interpretations that are much more satisfactory, for example, 'It is a matter of pride, man wanting to be God', etc.

And God said, 'You must not eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil.' And this is where I find the grounds for imposing limits. The tree of knowledge of good and evil is not an unlimited possibility. About six years ago, biologist Professor Testart had the courage to say: 'There is a logic of non-discovery and ethics of non-inquiry'. It is not a limit imposed from outside, but from the limit that Man, through his connection with History and other men, will discover as part of the self-censorship of 'thou shalt not eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil'. Who can guide us? Only the Spirit of God, because only He, within us, allows us to pass judgement upon the world'.

The great challenge
of the Rio Conference[6]

The great challenge of the Rio Conference is not only the difficulty of finding solutions or the contradictions between the positions of the North and the South. It is the fact that the Rio Conference *brings to an end one era* and has the ambition of *starting another*.

The outgoing age was envisioned from a *linear* perspective, a one-to-one relationship between *cause and effect*. It was a world governed by deterministic and immutable laws in which the culmination of all processes was *unlimited*. From the physical laws of the world one only saw *dialectical unity*, which at most involved two inputs whose confrontation would result in the synthesis of progress.

According to this logic, problems were isolated to one single *discipline*; the point of view was *sectoral*; national and international institutions were *compartmentalised*.

But the world in which we find ourselves is no longer like this. It is increasingly a world characterised not by *unity* of opposites but of *systems* that function simultaneously as cause and effect, that combine, annul or amplify themselves. Hence the requirement, at risk of the failure of its solutions or *insurmountable negotiating conflicts*, of:

— an *interdisciplinary* analysis of problems;
— an *intersectoral* treatment of societal issues;
— an *integrated* restructuring of institutions.

This requirement has been met at the Rio Conference. The *environmental/development* equation, which the Conference conclusively enshrines, forms part of a broader nexus which I do not hesitate to call a *'nexus of survival'*. Elements of this link are also:

— the *fight against poverty*, in the tragic awareness that one billion human beings live in absolute poverty;

— the *containment of population growth*, so as to ensure that all men and women are able to live a dignified life;
— the contribution of *science* and *technology* to the articulation of these four vectors in terms of their political, economic and geo-strategic consequences.

In this nexus, we are no longer faced with two but rather with *multiple inputs*. Any problem can only realistically be considered in the light of all the others. *In this case,* one can only call it 'development aid' when this aid is part of an integrated plan which addresses poverty, the environment, population and technological decision-making.

Similarly, environmental policies would be limited as strictly sectoral policies. They can only be forged at the crossroads of industrial, urban, anti-poverty and economic growth policies and their orientation, evaluation and control.

For its part, the direct fight against poverty is the very basis of sustained development. And for that, the indispensable factors of macroeconomic stabilisation and fiscal redistribution are no longer enough. Development policies alone cannot reabsorb the massive poverty of most societies. There is a need for both *social* and *economic strategies specifically* and *directly* targeted at poverty. It is these strategies that will decisively influence the environment, the population, and the overall development of society.

Finally, population growth – which results from the intensification of underdevelopment, absolute poverty and lack of schooling - in turn conditions all other vectors at their root. It may lead to the ecological explosion of the planet, render unfeasible a dignified human Quality of Life for all the inhabitants of the earth, increasing even more drastically the number of people living in absolute poverty and thus making under-development insurmountable.

As the linking factor behind all the major problems that make up the *nexus of survival'*, we realise it is the *technological choices* or *impositions* that characterise each society.

In the case of absolute poverty, technology only makes its presence felt in its most disastrous consequences: the marginality created by megacities or the accumulation of waste and refuse from large agglomerations and industries.

At the opposite end of the economic scale, technology constantly feeds us with *artificial needs*; subordinates interpersonal relationships to *technical mediations*, establishes the framework for a kind of *consumerism* that is always hungry for more and for sheer novelty.

Non-caring societies are built on these premises and do not accept more tax burdens, making it possible to channel to the South greater development aid. They tend to take refuge within their walls, through economic and social forms of *protectionism*.

Science and technology still intervene in this nexus in two other ways.

For the first time in history, science and technology have embraced their own limits. At the end of the century, as some such as Ilya Prigogine have reminded us, ever more of us think that a great number of fundamental processes that shape nature are *irreversible*. [...] The change is so profound that we can speak of a new dialogue between man and nature.

Thus, for example, the principle that 'the polluter pays', if considered to be a starting point for justice, is an *illusion* - it also reveals the continuing existence of a world in which phenomena are reversible.

Technology is also present through what we euphemistically call 'technology transfer' and which is really a market transaction like any other. If it is not, only stubbornness would justify the persistence of the problem of intellectual property in the Uruguay Round.

It is not acceptable to think, within the *ethics that presupposes a 'nexus of survival',* that the countries of the Southern Hemisphere will make do with *obsolete and polluting technologies* from the Northern Hemisphere.

On the contrary, a true understanding of the requirements of a new era will oblige us to rapidly seek to supply the Southern Hemisphere with the latest technologies, allowing 80% of the planet to take a 200-year short cut around *polluting industrialisation*.

One of the solutions would be, as Miguel de la Madrid proposed a few days ago at the Interaction Council of former heads of government, the combination of the *sale of technology* with an *adequate subsidy*, designed to make the purchase of new technology accessible to poorer countries.

From this perspective, the concern of some scientists about the effects of environmental protection on scientific progress is unfounded.

On the contrary, the complexity of interconnections and the resolution of societal issues with multiple inputs require a dynamic approach to scientific research and original formulas for problems involving multiple equations to multiple variables.

The principles set out in the draft Rio Declaration acquire their full meaning in this context. We now have to find the appropriate mechanisms for its implementation.

On the one hand, the *'nexus of survival'* demands a *global policy* not only at the national but also at the international level. At the international level, however, this lacks a *forum* which, at that level, can globally define the policy that the 'nexus of survival' requires. This forum will necessarily have to incorporate *supranational characteristics*, as the 22 heads of state said at the 1989 Hague meeting. (Which means not a loss of sovereignty but, on the contrary, a *broadened* and *reinforced* sovereignty.)

On the other hand, the Earth Summit *has begun a process of global awareness* that cannot stop. It involves not only government representatives but also the *active forces of civil society*.

The *sociological-political* novelty of the Rio Conference is that it is the first manifestation on a worldwide scale of the *multiplication of foci* and the *plurality of perspectives* that arise when societal problems are articulated through their interconnection.

At a time when many societies are addressing the question of identity and citizenship, the Rio Conference reaffirms the emergence of a global identity and consciousness.

Besides rising nationalism, we are witness to a human reality which Theillard de Chardin prophetically called 'the noosphere', this layer of human beings that, like the biosphere and the atmosphere, surrounds the planet's hard core and interacts with it. But unlike the biosphere

and the atmosphere, *consciousness* and *responsibility* lie in the noosphere. How are we going to respond to one and exercise the other?

The activities taking place on the other side of the city, at the Global *Forum*, have had a *massive response* from the most diverse groups to this *raising of awareness*.

It is up to us to exercise *responsible decision-making*, both at the level of political influence and in the *day-to-day choices of our citizens*.

The limits of science and technology, as well as the finite nature of the planet, require corresponding *self-discipline* from all of us, and a renewed loyalty to the great *spiritual traditions* that inhabit and unite us.

The responsibility we are thus assuming is to our commitment to future generations.

The problem of the population:
at the crossroads of complexity[7]

Statesmen who are concerned not only with the management of the current problems but also with long-term issues of a global nature are an inspiration. Such is the case with Chancellor Schmidt. His committed interest for the future generation who will face the consequences of a historically unique period of demographic transition has been unwavering. Under his leadership, the InterAction Council has given very early in its work a prominent place to the correlation between population, environment and development.

***

Since the beginning of the 19th century, humanity has embarked on a period of exponential demographic growth. And of a kind never seen in its long history! In less than 200 years – throughout the period of industrialisation and its impact upon infant mortality and life expectancy – the world's population has increased six-fold, from one billion in around 1800 to more than six billion by the end of this decade. Even if the demographic transition[8], first seen in the West but which has begun to appear - albeit at very different rates – in other regions of the world is confirmed and becomes widespread, the planet should be home to about 10 billion people by the middle of the next century, when the children born today will be in control of the society we bequeath to them. Such numbers already reflect harsh realities. Human activity exhausts with the indifference of a petulant child non-renewable resources that have been accumulated over centuries. Our material civilisation is developing by slashing the capital of future generations whose living conditions are at risk of no longer being assured.

Nevertheless, this worst-case scenario is stuck on a linear view of evolution, inherited from the scientific mentality forged at the end of the last century that gave birth to the myth

---

7   Article published in d'Orville, H. (ed.), *Perspectives of global Responsibility – In honour of Helmut Schmidt on the occasion of his 75th birthday*. New York, Interaction Council, 1993, pp. 434-439.

8   This being the transition from continuous growth towards a slowing down of growth, noticeable in a swing in the growth rate.

of unlimited progress. Can we understand the future of the human species differently? How do we take into account the multiple questions that arise within societies that are becoming more complex and interdependent each day? How can they be made more intelligible by cross-checks and formulas that reflect their complexity? This is what the analysis outlined below attempts to answer.

It seems wise to seek answers both at the level circumscribed by physical or cultural boundaries and at a global level to any questions we may have on the topic of population. Since it is a matter of the peoples – that is, of what humanises and humanly specifies the 'population' – the problem is not confined to the study of their reproductive behaviour, their movements in time or their migrations in space. It is more essential to examine how a given population adapts to the requirements of the social contract. Four essential requirements in this respect define the type of society that respects the tacit agreements on which the social contract is based: *a convivial society; an active society; an equal society; a society reconciling nature and culture.*

First and foremost, a need for *conviviality*. It must be established between all the constitutive elements of society, individuals, families, groups and communities, as well as between generations. At both extremities of the human life span, it is time to recognise that at the end of the second millennium, humanity has not yet been able to organise itself so that 'our little ones' are cared for and brought up in safety, avoiding in particular the premature severing of the essential link between mother and child, by remedying the absence or the insufficiency of community facilities capable of reinforcing the emotional framework of the family, or even to replace it in the case of abandoned children or street children. It is also incapable of providing the elderly with the necessary assistance to overcome their physical handicaps and help them to participate more effectively in their surroundings and society in general, however modest or symbolic their contribution may appear.

In industrialised countries, the existing measures, aside from their variable efficiency, leave much to be desired and fail to offer all the necessary support. In industrialising or poorly industrialised countries, old traditions are gradually breaking down under the double effect of the explosion caused by increasing urbanisation and the prevalence of 'models' imported from the northern hemisphere.

And yet, as life goes on, the company of children with their gifts, their expectations, their impatience, their naive lucidity is a stimulant that can enhance and revitalise a generation of those heading into the last stage of their lives. Reciprocally, the presence of the elderly in the daily life of the family and in the building of a community is a source of wisdom and experience that is particularly valuable and enriching for children, as well as being a vital touchstone to understand from the inside the suffering we endure in the course of our lives before our final demise.

Confronted, as are all living organisms, with this twofold journey of growth and decline, each human group must create the conditions necessary for childhood and old age to coexist in the most constructive way. The pyramid structure peculiar to the majority of industrial societies favoured the existence of networks of belonging or allegiance in which conviviality was

the natural form of human relationship. This was especially so since the very low average life expectancy avoided the deterioration of such relationships. Industrialised societies believed they could collectively guarantee the roles traditionally provided by the family, while primary community structures and patterns of behaviour were abruptly transformed by phenomena such as working parents, the multiplicity and lengthening of travel, the individualisation of leisure activities, cramped housing, and restrictions on personal privacy. It has become clear today, in the light of the experience of the last fifty years, that these collective solutions cannot be considered either psychologically satisfactory or anthropologically correct.

The concept of a *convivial society* as proposed by utopians, while the industrial society was at its peak, seems to me to be meaningful and rich in potentialities. It presupposes the renouncing of intergenerational responsibility in abstract terms. The rather disturbing increase in the number of street children, and children that have been mistreated, abandoned, exploited, deprived of future, or denied access to all institutionalised forms of education is an issue that challenges all of us. What transformations are necessary in the social infrastructure and functioning of institutions so that active solidarity between humans can be deployed and so that life, in all its manifestations, can freely circulate and be reciprocated between generations?

A convivial society is not turned towards the past, in search of a golden age that we know has never existed. On the contrary, it is a question of taking advantage of the new possibilities offered by the information and media age as it stands today to bring together old and young, adults and children, to lower the barriers born of the fragmentation of work and human activity generated by Taylorist society and to allow intimate relationships to develop beyond the nuclear family or its substitutes.

An active and participative society then. The anthropological deficiency manifested by an absence of conviviality and solidarity is coupled with another resulting from the hostility between generations provoked by the competition for employment, the supply of which is being reduced to a trickle.

In the Northern Hemisphere, structural unemployment is growing and affects both young and old alike, despite the measures taken to give the young the opportunity to build their future. In the South, the deterioration of the economic situation and the reduction of budgetary resources all too often deprive young people of all prospects of entering the labour market. Everywhere there is a gap between those who hold a job – particularly a stable and gratifying job – and those who are excluded. If it continues to expand, there is no doubt that it jeopardises intergenerational solidarity and eventually provokes real and tragic conflicts.

The globalisation of the economy, by favouring the relocation of production units to countries where labour is cheaper, with equal performances and qualifications, generates and feeds the rise in unemployment in the old industrialised societies and removes any hope of reducing it in the near future. At the same time, it does not seem capable of absorbing the younger generations of the underdeveloped nations at an age when their unemployed status risks setting in motion the psychological mechanisms of social disqualification that favour marginality.

Taking the concept of the market society which has been a constant throughout the industrialisation process, based on the optimal combination of two essential factors which are capital and work, is now not the time to seek to juxtapose it with the idea of the active society whose purpose is to satisfy the needs of one and all, not only by giving us things but also, and above all, in terms of amenities and intangible property? The field of services in contemporary societies is constantly widening and diversifying, leading to the creation of new jobs, while the production of non-durable material goods is stabilising, creating less and less employment under the dual effect of the relocation of companies and the introduction of new technologies based on robotisation and miniaturisation. However, services, if they respond to real needs, are not in themselves producers of added value. The construction of an active society will no doubt force a rethink of the relationship between its active and non-active elements by moving from a strictly economic to a sociological plane, in both individual and community terms.

Social cohesion would then depend on the establishment of structures that would favour diversity and the choice of 'non-market' activities that meet the needs of the non-active as well as those of the active elements of society, when they have to rely on others to complete modest but indispensable tasks that are not usually market-based.

In an active society, the relationship between its active and non-active elements will be a pivotal balancing act, as well as a means of engaging young people in socially useful activities and adding value to the non-market work done by women. Thus two-way solidarity based on mutual interdependence could be established, where each respects the activities of others, whatever their economic value. A gradual balance could be established between working and non-working people, the consequences of which would be absorbed at all levels of social reproduction.

Thirdly, there is the demand for *parity*. The social contract cannot ignore the importance of gender relations that are balanced, respectful of their respective identities and their sphere of autonomy, and intent on ensuring equality in the search for a partnership that is profitable to both. Despite the progress made in this regard in the majority of modern societies, equality between men and women is still far from being reached. The public, visible nature of men's work is a given, while that of women too often remains private and invisible, not only with regard to domestic tasks but also to professional and social activities. The invisibility of women's work has important consequences both individually and socially. It manifests itself in all the instruments of socialisation and in particular in the law, conceived and formulated more by and for men, where the woman drowns in a neutral acknowledgement of the human person, which ultimately enshrines the domination of females by males. How can one not mention the multiple forms of violence that women face? Violence favoured by the greater physical strength of man and which subjects the fertility of the body of one to the sexual appetite of the other.

It is now urgent to establish a society based on gender parity that recognises women according to their cultural and sexual identity and guarantees their participation as such in all spheres of political and social life. Such a society would certainly enshrine the inalienable right of women to determine the process of fertilisation and gestation that takes place in their

bodies. Any kind of forced interference – of which rape remains the ultimate and tragic meta-phor – is an attack on the freedom and fundamental rights of the human person. The same is true of any authoritarian policy – usually male-determined – aimed at stimulating or controlling the birth rate, like all forms of domination over women. Undoubtedly, the woman's right to self-determination is today, and tomorrow will be, largely influenced by many cultural and social factors, but ultimately, the choices of reproduction must remain the exclusive domain of her own will. Once the essential primacy of this right has been recognised, it is important to emphasise the need for men's access to full responsibility as joint decision-makers with respect to a couple's fertility. Instituting a veritable parity between men and women, embodied in the relationship in which the otherness of one is expressed in relation to the other, arises as an essential dimension of a new social contract.

Finally, it is important to conceive of and develop a society that is keen to reconcile *nature and culture*. For this purpose, the social contract deserves to be sealed by a natural pact enshrining this reconciliation. For the first time in the history of mankind, man has become aware of the limited resources he can draw from, including those which, until now, seemed to be renewed indefinitely by nature's simple flair for an encore. It is as if nature is awakening and revolting against the domination and exploitation it has been subjected to. As resources become scarce, the waste produced by accelerated urbanisation and intensive industriali-sation is accumulating, while its stowage and disposal is becoming more difficult, uncertain and costly, especially that of the most toxic waste that poses a risk to human health and the conservation of the natural environment. The production-consumption model gradually implemented for more than a century now faces the problem of having reached its limit at the same time as causing increasingly alarming pollution.

The natural contract should thus favour a reasonable and controlled exploitation of the resource base which determines the development and survival of living species, including humans. We can no longer act as nature's predators. The technological processes that we use must be subject to conditions guaranteeing the stability of the ecosystem, so as to allow the production of new commodities both by and for current generations and for the benefit of those who will succeed them.

How can we not realise, through the various questions that have just been outlined, that the great population challenge is to look for ways to establish a stable equilibrium between men and women, young people and the elderly, the active and the non-active, humans and things, the city and nature, and also, between the demands of today and the prospects for tomorrow. We must also recognise that the population problem, by the multiple interactions that it undergoes with the variety of sectoral issues, only makes even more complex a world marked by the seal of interdependence.

Unemployment, a threat
to a human society[9]

The Human Development Report 1994 is based on the concept of *human security*.

Lack of jobs and increase of unemployment are serious determinants of insecurity. There is a growing insecurity which now moves from individuals to large strata of society, from businessmen in small and medium enterprises to concerned politicians. As the number of unemployed reaches a threshold of tolerance (approximately ten per cent in most societies), insecurity ceases to be an individual condition of the unemployed and becomes a *collective insecurity*. Many social disturbances have in such a feeling their deepest root. The diversified phenomenon we call "unemployment" jeopardises the very equilibrium of each and every society, thus creating the threat of social unrest, followed soon by political instability. In this context the reassessment of public priorities imposes itself to the decision-makers.

Legitimate, however, as these concerns are, they should not obscure the intense *human individual dramas* that unemployment covers.

Indeed, it is not enough to see unemployment only as a dangerous factor in the picture of macro-economics. When considered in the cool perspective of science it appears as almost nothing more than another economic indicator alongside the inflation rate and the stability of currency. The important fact – to be always called to mind – is that behind the indicators there are *real people*. It is their situation that constitutes the most appalling trait of this end of the century.

It is true that in most of the industrialised countries (or, rather, those having inherited the social tradition of Europe) the situation of unemployment is accompanied by legal social measures incorporated since several decades in the legal terms of the social contract. But in most countries such tradition is alien and is unlikely, for economic reasons, to become possible. Moreover, important though as social welfare measures are, they are not the solution

---

9   Paper presented at *the Conference on the Politics and Economics of Global Employment* – UNU / WIDER (Helsinki, 17-18 June 1994) [archive version]. Partially included as a preface in Simai, Mihaly; M. Moghadam, Valentine and Kuddo, Arvo (eds). *Global Employment: An International Investigation into the Future of Work*. Vol. 1. London, New Jersey and Tokyo, UNU WIDER Publishers, 1995, pp. xi-xiv.

in the long-term. Indeed, «it is against our understanding of a *humane society* that growing numbers of people are reduced to the status of welfare recipients»[10]. We cannot accept that social/economic citizenship will be undermined by creating a structural dependence from the national State or from another State through «development aid» or «humanitarian relief». In a time when freedom is the guiding principle of all relationships in society this situation has to be denounced as a clear violation of personal freedom and dignity.

Moreover, we know now that high rates of unemployment «speak» about *massive poverty*. Together with *housing shortages*, unemployment constitutes a decisive ingredient of *exclusion* in society. And, again, exclusion is not just an abstract word but a social and psychological mechanism experienced by individual human beings.

Unemployment shakes *personal security* at its very core: it undermines *self-esteem*. It leads to a situation that is not only experienced as suffering and deprivation but is also the triggering element of an almost irreversible process of *social disqualification*. The unemployed – like the poor – start, after a time, to see themselves as «not worthy». They become more and more ashamed of the condition they find themselves in, as if they were responsible for the dejection in which they find themselves. The more so when society had previously given them value only in so far as they were able to define themselves in function of the work produced, of the job-status and –rank. In the end, even illiteracy (*illétrisme* in the French) expresses the de-learning process that undermines the self-image of the unemployed.

The terminology used to describe the most optimistic scenario (in the industrialised, newly industrialised or rapidly industrialising countries) for the conditions of macro-economy – namely «*jobless growth*» – is a striking sign of the *maladjustment of economy itself*.

If «growth» is not accompanied by the dignifying of individuals through their work, through the fulfilment of their rights, particularly the right to earn the income needed to sustain personal life and the lives of dependents – if growth doesn't lead to that legitimate aspiration, what is its destiny? A boost to the overconsumption?

Let us not fool ourselves. Time has come to face squarely the economic function in society: if it is not geared to the harmony of the economic rights and duties of all individuals, what is it for?

Is «scarcity» the guiding factor? If so, isn't the fight against scarcity of jobs a task for the economy?

UNEMPLOYMENT IN A PLURALITY OF CONTEXTS

As different countries have followed different stages (even cycles) of development, unemployment and job creation cover very diverse social situations and very different cultural means

---

10 *InterAction Council of Former Heads of Government*, Final Statement, 12th Session, Dresden, 7-10 June 1994 *(Author's note)*

to cope with them. They have different meanings and require diversified solutions in a mix which can only be found from within each society and taking into account all the dimensions of the problem.

The overwhelming lack of job opportunities in the Southern hemisphere, coupled with a very high percentage of young people (55% under 25 in Africa) can be analysed in a traditional way as «unemployment». But it can as well raise the question about the suitability of the concept of employment in situations where the industrialisation process has not taken place in a massive way and where the contract implicit in the term employment is non-existent.

In these countries, *most people work in agriculture* (58% against 15% in industry and 27% in services)[11]. It is clear then that there are some aspects of agricultural development which are known to be decisive in creating employment or even in preventing unemployment. Such are the repeated «solutions» enumerated at international level: reinforcement of agricultural productivity, widening and diversification of agricultural activities, determination of prices of basic commodities, improvement of agricultural techniques, rural activities besides agricultural ones, programs of environment safeguard, development of rural infrastructures[12].

And yet these solutions don't emerge as national clear-cut policies. Why is there not an implementation of this «simple» agenda? And, if developed countries subscribe as they have done in international organisations to these concrete goals, why is it that their protectionist measures oppose commercial barriers to the entry of agricultural products from developing countries?

Unlike the countries just referred to, a small group of countries (the NICs and the Rapidly Industrialising countries) in the Southern hemisphere are boosting with industrial activity and pursuing for several years a high economic growth. They are following the same pattern as the industrialised countries (alongside the policy often described as «from imitation to innovation»). Like in Northern countries at the beginning of industrialisation they succeed in the international com- petition by a mobilisation of all available labour force who doesn't exercise pressure for better work conditions. Unemployment – as it is known in the industrialised countries – is thus non-existent. But, as soon as the industrialisation will dispense manual skill and dedication to work as main ingredients in the level of competitivity, it is likely that the pattern we see now in the Northern hemisphere will appear there as well.

The worldwide competition which created new possibilities for the NICs contributed to unemployment in the highly industrialised countries (while, at the same time, most of the so-called developing world remained marginal to this new redistribution of job opportunities).

---

11   *Human Development Report,* 1994, UNDP. *(Author's Note)*

12   *Report of Secretary General,* UN. *(Author's Note)*

In the Northern hemisphere, unemployment, besides its obvious link with the general economic situation of every society, is at the crossroads of other social and economic factors, namely, *demographic changes* (which upset traditional equilibrium between active and non-active people), *increase of poverty* (spread out in the fabrics of society), *urban life-style* everywhere, as well as *a general trend of morosity preventing risks to be taken by the economic agents*.

At the root of unemployment in industrialised countries (or in countries rapidly reaching the same situation) we have to admit the responsibility of *the totally deregulated market economy* itself.

STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT – THE INDUSTRIAL EQUATION AT THE CROSSFIRE

The present crisis clearly shows the structural foundation of unemployment. Many causes are at stake. It is therefore important to analyse those causes in order to fight each one with adequate policies and institutions.

But, at the same time – and paradoxically – it has become clear that the problem of unemployment has *no solution* – at least in the framework created by the industrial revolution. Indeed, the equation at the basis of the industrial organisation has seen all its components changed. The preservation of rate of employment, in a given society, while all other components of the industrial equation have changed, appears to be totally unrealistic. Thus we have to analyse the different functions present in the industrial process.

In the input, four types of «resources» are decisive: raw materials, knowledge, capital, labour.

As to «*raw materials*», well known changes take place: a greater variety of «raw material» is available, many of the natural «raw materials» having been already replaced by man-made materials. We can speak of hyper-choice of materials. As barriers between different types of industries are falling down, many new «raw materials» which had been devised for a specific industrial goal (for instance, space industry) are then often utilized in the most common types of industries. When they come to these traditional sectors of industry, they convey, in their prices, the costs of the sophisticated research behind their very existence. This tendency is not likely to change. On the contrary, there will be a strong demand for replacement materials whenever the producers of traditional raw materials (mostly in the South) will be the decision-makers in the determination of the prices of their products.

«*Knowledge*» is a key question in terms of its availability and of the access different countries have to it. As the discussions on intellectual property during the Uruguay Round have clearly shown, there is not at the moment a consensual concept of how knowledge has to be weighted in the production equation. A deeper understanding of the meaning of knowledge today is decisive. Such an understanding has to cover the practical consequences of the

longstanding principle of the universality of science as well as the interconnectedness of science and technology in the edgy question of patents.

«*Capital*» is not anymore a one-man property but is divided among shareholders who are mobile and who are not all located in the same geographical area. Moreover, capital itself is mobile and can «emigrate» each time there is a need for better conditions. Contrarily to the Nation-State based capital of the 19th century, the capital is part of the financial flow of transactions which go on by hundreds of billions of dollars every day – it is a totally «free» resource. Though its role is fundamental for the process of production, it goes uncontrolled by the Nation-State or by the regional or world institutions dealing with financial stability.

«*Labour*», in this context, remains the most stable resource contributing to the input of the production equation. For each operation of the industrial process it is located in a given geographical place. It is part of a social fabric, characteristic of its Nation or Region and has a behaviour of «education-training-reaction to market fluctuation» which is well known in each society. No wonder then that labour is the most vulnerable and easy target in any economic adjustment of the production process.

In the transformation process itself three basic elements are encompassed: the technological process used, the energy needed, the degree of fragmentation of different individual operations.

Much has been said and written about the technological process. In fact, what is at stake is the way in which new technologies affect the relative importance of the four elements of the inputs. For instance, since a long time it was clear that automation would replace human labour. The «robotisation» level of some industries and some services brings this possibility of replacement of labour to an unforeseeable level of unemployment; the life expectancy of new technologies is also affected by the current acceleration of history, thus raising fundamental questions as to the advisability of continuous replacement of technologies by the last ones (the continuous presentation by the informatics market of always new generations of computers is a striking example of the obsolescence of technologies).

Equally important in the production process is the role of «energy». The degree of awareness brought by the ecological movement about the consequences of the fossil fuel has led to the continuous question about the replacement of coal and oil by renewable sources of energy. The evolution of the nuclear field since Chernobyl prevents also the replacement of the fossil fuel by nuclear-based power stations. Hence the research needed on the renewables as well as on the anticipation of the changes in technology, in order to accommodate the changes that will be brought by these types of energy.

Finally, the «fragmentation of the individualised operations» in the industrial process and the economic openness and boom of the East-Asian and Southeast- Asian countries have led to what is called in industrialised countries «delocalisation» of enterprises. In fact, what is at stake is a subcontracting scheme operating often thousands of miles away from headquarters, made possible through the globalisation of the economy.

In the output we get the *final product* as well as the wastes and the by-products. The question of the waste and by-products has been dealt with in all the ecological analysis of the production system. It does remain, however, a challenge: the fact that, in spite of evidence that waste and by-products are part of the production scheme, they are still considered as «externalities» to the production equation. Obviously, by-products and wastes as well as the possibility for their recycling or treatment have to be shifted into «internalities» and, therefore, incorporated in the cost/benefit evaluation.

The offer/demand balance concerning the final product is determined to a great extent by the different ingredients of the «marketing functions» and particularly by publicity.

This leads us to the need to give in the production equation a new role to the «consumption function» as this is so obviously affected by different forms of marketing. If within the same production process the human dimension of consumption and the human dimension of labour are put together, the balance must be obtained through adequate instruments which guarantee a true social and economic citizenship for all people.

It is obvious then that the labour function cannot be formulated in the traditional duality of labour/capital. There are new questions raised by each of the above changes which need to be answered before we can talk about «employment».

Economics has to think anew its functions. If scarcity is still leading the economic function, we can ask in a simplistic way:

— Can people be disposable?
— Do you tax «labour» or do you tax «wastes»?
— Do you tax «knowledge» or do you tax "delocalisation»?
— Do you tax «energy» or do you tax the «final product»?
— How can people be the subject – neither the object nor the victim – of the economic equation?

NEED FOR NEW ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES

At the outset of any concrete policy one guiding principle must be emphasised, namely the need to move towards a *people-centred economy*. Such option does not satisfy itself with aggregates – the understanding of the problem at *the individual level* is fundamental. It does not rest either on well-known economic recipes – it needs to open *new economic perspectives*.

One idea seems to impose itself: it is urgent to give priority to the sources of growth that are able, at the same time, to act as multipliers of other activities and to provide jobs. In order to do this, the state of «deregulation» has to be overcome. Indeed, as the examples of Central and Eastern Europe are so clearly showing, it is unthinkable to provide jobs in a totally deregulated economy. A precondition to face unemployment is thus the *regulation of the deregulated* economy.

But – we must warn ourselves – the question of combating unemployment cannot be equated only with creating jobs. What is also at stake is, in the words of Jacques Delors[13], «*systems of employment*» encompassing education and training, the functioning of the labour market, the management of enterprises. Therefore, true employment policy tackles at the same time the economic system and the «systems of employment».

«Systems of employment» don't speak only of universal economic conditions. They necessarily make room for the specific economic realities of different regions, for the way in which the organisation of society can lead to productive work for all, for the fundamental basis of general and specific education and training. What is at stake is then another outlook to the package economy/social policy. This outlook can be seen as another economic policy which «raises the possibility of employment, reinforces the qualifications of people and improves competitivity»[14].

It is most important that employment will be dealt with as *a decisive economic question*. If it is looked upon only as a social disease, a «social welfare» approach to unemployment is unavoidable. Compulsory as it was to look at conjunctural unemployment in periods of economic growth as part of the concerns of social policy, those times are over. Then the rules of economy could go on unchallenged. Today it becomes clear that social welfare in a situation of unemployment is not going to solve the problem at stake. We are then obliged to question some of the rules of economy itself.

Two contributions come from the two extreme situations in the diversified spectrum of development: the concept of *active society* in the highly industrialised countries; the concept of *informal sector* in the developing countries.

As all the terms of the industrial equation modify themselves in this post- industrial shaped world, there is the need to redefine anew the social contract. Hence, the move in the industrialised world towards a concept that is all-embracing: the concept of «active society»[15]. Elaborated by the OECD, the concept of active society provides a renewed intellectual frame for the questions at stake:

> *Enhancing «activity» goes beyond attempts to achieve full employment or increased labour participation. It means taking bold steps to encourage economic and social participation by recognising the multiple areas of activity – market and non-market – that individuals are engaged in, and acknowledging the growing interdependence between those areas of activity[16].*

---

13 Jacques Delors' intervention at the European Parliament, December 1993. *(Author's Note)*

14 Delors, *ibidem*

15 «Shaping Structural Change: The Role of Women», report by a high-level group of experts to the Secretary-General, OECD, Paris, 1991. (Author's Note)

16 «Shaping structural Change: The Role of Women», *ibidem. (Author's Note)*

At the same time, in the Southern Hemisphere, we encounter what has been called «informal sector». It covers a wide range of activities, focussing on the most basic needs of people and providing them with the elementary goods they need. It is labour intensive, feeds itself on traditional knowledge, serves the immediate market area with sometimes a possibility for export to neighbouring countries, is initiated by people themselves, does not figure in the national accounts, is equally «invisible» in the administrative scene of the country where it develops. In its most striking examples, the informal sector is one element pertaining to the *strategy of survival* of individuals or societies living in utter destitution.

If we want to speak about *global employment* it is necessary to see where these two trends meet and where are they diverging. It is a challenging task for scientists and activists alike to discover the possibilities open by these concepts. They have the most interesting feature of being born not from the outside but out of the functioning or rather dis-functioning of the economy itself.

«Burst with indignation against poverty!»[17]

INTRODUCTION

Last December the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life *initiated* a series of eight Regional Consultations with Public Hearings of groups and individuals.

The first one was in Harare, with English-speaking countries of the African continent.

When I heard that we were going to have *the testimony* of some *400 people*, coming from *all the NGOs* of Zimbabwe and from regional associations as well as representatives of State, academic and private institutions, I wondered about the outcome. Would it be possible to find a common language among such diversified groups? Would any message come out of it?

But as soon as we were in the building where the Hearings were conducted, there couldn't be any doubt.

On the wall, there it was, in huge red letters, their message:

«We deserve a better Quality of Life»

And then, one after the other, the groups explained, mimed, talked, sketched, sang *scenes of their lives*: (the old wondering why the land is not yielding as it used to, the women plotting about ways to cope with violence in the street and at home, the young without jobs, referring to sex as an escape, so eager to live a different life..) and experts gave context, and civil servants told about their attempts. and all the time, as a cry, the questions some of the young ones were repeating:

— is there anybody listening?
— is there *an echo*?
— to whom shall I speak *who will listen to me*?

---

17   Presentation within the framework of the conference *Change: Social Conflict or Harmony – UNDP, Development Study Programme* (Stockholm, July 24, 1994) [archive version].
Later published in Silk, L. & Kirdar, U. (eds.), *People: From Impoverishment to Empowerment,* New York, New York University Press, 1995, pp. 87-91.

Since then these questions are haunting me.

This is why I am so grateful for a meeting like this with so many personalities *who are listening* to the people, wherever their cry comes from…

Maybe by listening ever more attentively, «the reversal of logic», Juan Somavia pleaded for in the first morning, will happen by itself. People and *their voices* will be speaking.

CHANGE AND COMPLEXITY

This is not rhetoric.

It is affirming:

— the *first pre-condition for change* – that people themselves will take things in their hands and *speak up*;
— that they will refuse the fatalism and resignation of a magic thinking;
— and start imagining *how things could be*, searching for partners who will listen to them in this interconnected world of ours.

When we listen, we are urged to give answers.

This meeting shows how great is *the potential for change* in a group of committed human beings.

From the experts and the international leaders present here (as well as from many diversified places and institutions all over the world) come:

— the sharp analysis of obsolete tools, programs and mechanisms;
— the groping for new concepts;
— the proposals for new modes of operation.

Indeed, we are attempting to draw up a map of still unchartered landscapes. We are sharing ideas and building blocks for «well-ground intellectual framework».

But … what will happen next?

Of course, international conferences put together with the dedication and the intelligence of those who spoke here during these days, are *part* of the answer.

But not *all* the answer.

All that is said – if it is to be implemented – must be taken up, with equal weight of determination and imagination, into *political action*.

And I ask: how ready is political action for change?

for the jump needed?

What do we see: the *more urgent* action becomes, the *less* political action seems to cope.

Again and again in the last 20 years leaders met at the highest level in different *fora* and took important decisions from The Hague Declaration to Agenda 21.

What has happened to their decisions?

Which mechanisms stopped the process of implementation?

Why is it that *enforcement in the social and economic area* does not seem viable?

One striking example of the apparent *powerlessness-of-the-powerful* was described publicly last June by a member of the G7. There he was, theoretically one of the seven men at the highest level of political power, saying to an international audience just a few days before he went to Naples:

> *«We cannot anymore entrust the evolution of the world to the monetary regulations».*

And I ask: who is doing that if not *he*?

He went on saying:

> *«We have to refuse the disappearance of development aid from the agenda of the rich countries Summit».*

And I ask again: *who* is deciding that agenda if not *he*?

who is deciding?

who is responsible for implementation?

where is the authority for enforcement?

These are not new questions.

They gain momentum now as we are witnessing the *exponential complexity* of the interwoven fabrics of ideas/events/institutions.

Indeed in a situation defined by complexity, there are multiple causes and effects interacting among each other in unceasing movement.

Each fact, event, sector of activity, institution (national or international administration), each is at the same time autonomous and interdependent.

This is why any expression of *conceptual and programmatic inconsistency* has its counterpart in *institutional anarchy.*

Governance is at stake there. But the governance needed today cannot by-pass *the complexity of reality*.

POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

To cope with complexity, leaders have to know the facts and to learn *how to interrelate them*. They have to look at reality through lens taken from different types of knowledge and from different sectors of society.

Such are the conditions for the much needed *political vision*. It is only then, in the interplay between *a guiding vision* and *the multifaceted reality*, that true leadership can be exercised – a leadership that brings about answers not only for the *problems of today* but also – and maybe most of all – for the problems of *the coming decades*.

Indeed, demographers, among others, are pretty rigorous in establishing scenarios for tomorrow:

— how many young people to expect in every country and for whom education facilities have to be devised and, later on, jobs provided;
— equally, how many people will need old age protection from the community, in which circumstances and for how long.

It is not only «numbers» the political leaders are compelled to see:

— it is also the modification of population structures, the speed of the urbanization processes;
— the types of infra-structures needed;
— the big migratory movements.

Political action confines itself too often to *macro-economic management* while the accumulation of pressing problems is much nearer and requires another type of action.

It is time for leaders to hear what people are feeling and saying in very diverse social, economic and cultural situations. They do want *the fabrics of their lives* and what *really matters for them*, to be of concern to politicians.

One man, in a public hearing in South Asia, denounced with indignation the too easy replacement of *real problems* of *living people* by *indicators*. He said:

«The demographic indicators shouldn't be used to describe the lives of people!»

For him to do so was a scandal – he called it a «Numbergate» scandal.

There are however other questions at the core of today's governance. One seems fundamental to me:

Can democracy in its present form contribute *to the guiding vision* needed?

Is *our contemporary democratic culture* able to encompass the *questions of today's complex society*?

Indeed, in order to formulate and implement a vision which requires a profound transformation of accepted concepts and institutions *a long period of time* is needed.

And yet democratic rule can only tackle the long-term through discreet, fragmented units, corresponding to *the electoral cycles*. In this context, we ask:

Would there be a way in which *democratic rule may also be vision-oriented*?

Can democracy contemplate the expected trends of the future?

Or is it bound and tied to the unexpected events of the present?

How to combine the two?

This is decisive for the future and particularly in relation to the wide array of public policies connected with population.

Through the work of the Independent Commission I see very clearly that little progress is possible if these two perspectives are not there.

Population policies – implicit or, as in many cases, explicit – should embody a vision.

Indeed, *a vision* through which society, like the atom, may live in harmony because of a continuous process of «conflicts and exchanges» in its population composition.

Such a harmony is rooted in the *culture* of each society and in the *values* it cherishes. There *the vision* is one of a *dynamic population balance*:

— balance in the relationship men/women;

— balance in the relationship young/old;

— balance in the relationship between those who are autonomous, actively earning their living, and those who are entrusted to the care of the community;

— balance between society and nature.

And again, each of these balances conveys elements of culture, of history, of the way of relating to each other, to the world, to nature.

If vision is to be embodied in the *short-term*, *integrated policies* of social and economic areas are essential.

First and obviously, the crossroads between *health policy* and *education policy*. No population program can be carried out with efficiency if it is not part and parcel

— of an education program geared to men and women

— and of a network of primary health care services which include family planning, child and mother care.

In the short-term, these appear as a condition *sine qua non* of efficient policies and *humane* programs.

But *integrated policies* have to go further.

Other *sectoral fields* of political policy play a role. They also must be taken into account.

(The work done by Indian scholars from different disciplines in the book *Science, society and development* is for me one of the best examples of an integrated conceptual approach to population policies.)

If population policies are part and parcel of an integrated approach to society's living human forces, it is obvious that *the place for the decision is government itself* – not a council here

or there but in the mechanism and occasions where political will can redirect public policies and combine the different – and often opposed – demands.

Let us be clear on our aspiration though. If we mean strong political action, this means
more State,
more intervention,
more regulation,
more public initiative.

But then how to make this compatible with t*he total deregulation* proned by the current trend of free market?

In order to come to grips with the situation, as it is now and as it is foreseen in the coming years, to translate new ideas (for instance, human security as dynamic population balance) into feasible policies and operational measures, it is impossible to count on the market as a starter or as a regulator.

Whatever «natural laws» may be guiding the market, its instincts are not enough to address the need
for more jobs,
for a direct fight against poverty,
for stopping the degradation of the environment,
for developing basic infra-structures of health and education.

Social sectors are *not*, should *not* be the corrective factors of the consequences of hardship coming from economic rules. They embody societal goals and have absolute primacy.

In order to take seriously social development, it is impossible to go on with a *deregulated economy*. If political leadership has a vision it has to intervene and to create conditions for the *regulation of the deregulated economy*.

Let me single out one important element of political action. No political leader can work democratically in isolation or only within the circle of his colleagues and friends. The industrial society provided us with the concept and practice of the *social partners* in the questions of production, namely the trade unions.

In our time, no policy of social development can be elaborated or made effective without the participation of those who are the *main actors.*

The concept of *social partner* should be elaborated so as to involve in decision making those who are directly concerned with the questions at stake.

Comprehensive population policies require dialogue with those who are the subjects of their destinies. When I hear in one Regional Consultation somebody who says:

> *«By putting family planning as mere technology we miss the boat*
> *... what we need are packages of development with family planning»*

...When I heard this, if I am at the national level I have to pursue the dialogue: what does she include in the package of development, how can that be managed with resources available, to whom, to which region to give priority, etc., etc....

This dialogue is indispensable. It is also the sign that political leadership is contributing to empowerment of people and particularly of women.

As one woman said in the Regional Consultation in Mali:

> *If you don't have an enabling environment, there is no sense in enabling women to decide, to make choices.*

CONCERTED INTERNATIONAL ACTION

In many different ways, we have been illustrating (in this conference) the need for *concerted international action*.

But what then of the *huge array* of organisations, institutes, organs, agencies?

How can they serve *integrated policies*?

Let us not fool ourselves.

What we are dealing with is not only *the absence of coordination*. It is also the fact that it is impossible to coordinate what *is not even a system*. Again, in a system, different elements are autonomous indeed but *interdependent*.

Any reform has to take into account that in these so unique 50 years, the change in knowledge and in technology went far beyond any other period in history.

But those *radical* changes were encompassed by changes in international institutions which came into being through successive adjustments of the *same pattern* created immediately after World War II and which had nothing of the same *radical zest*.

The split in institutions within the international machineries

has led to *serious inconsistencies*,

in problems addressed,

in strategies defined,

in actions undertaken.

This is notorious in the so much claimed concern with population matters.

First one obvious difficulty.

In all regions but especially in countries with structural adjustment programs, the inconsistencies reach the level of the absurd.

Indeed, how is it possible to carry on any population policy

when the SAP demand a reduction/control of public expenses

and this means automatically *a substantial cut in health and education*?

Secondly, even with the best intentions, different international agencies and also representatives of bi-lateral agreements of cooperation do pull in all directions the sector of the national machinery to which cooperation is offered.

Let us say it honestly: it is totally *unmanageable* a situation where a director- general or even a minister have to listen to different perspectives and to different conditionalities.

Why not an integrated approach in the field? In substance and in machinery? Can the international organisations and bilateral cooperation work towards that?

We are trying to find a way for getting *fresh resources.* (The Independent Commission has started a process of consultation with leading financial experts to determine the feasibility and the concrete modalities of the Tobin's tax.)

Of course, a new rationale will be needed for the management of such resources.

But also, as international institutions are modern tools of governance, they must be submitted *to democratic control* by organs with political legitimacy.

PARADIGM

Important as they are, institutional reforms don't solve everything. We need *conceptual breakthroughs* into new theoretical perspectives.

The most important one concerns the end of the limitless horizon.

It is easy to verify that the 60's/70's were the climax of a vertiginous «always more».

It is easy to demonstrate that resources are limited, that the planet, the land, the cities, the organisation of society cannot proceed anymore along the expectation of endless growth.

It is even easy to appeal to the acknowledgement that life is a learning process about the acceptance of our own personal limits.

But it is difficult to establish a paradigm which includes limits; a paradigm has entropy at its core.

We need soon to move towards the formulation of the paradigm: we are dealing in the most acute way with the question of *production and consumption patterns.*

In the preparation for the Cairo Conference – as well as in all the literature in the line of «another development» – it is an acquired fact that, in terms of the threat to the ecosystem and to future generations, *population and consumption go together*.

Only apparently is this a North/South divide. Twenty years ago, the community of nations was voting the new international economic order declaration, culturally based on the concept of *endogenous development*. What a change since then! To the aspiration for autonomous models proper to each culture, which characterised part of the discourse at the international and even national levels, succeeded the slogan spread in East Asia and particularly in South Korea: «from initiation to innovation».

All countries are by choice or by necessity following the same path – using the same pattern. Hence, the need to tackle scientifically this overwhelming tendency to consumption. (But that is a major difficulty).

The open question on production and consumption patterns is an illustration of a basic fact.

For new ideas and concepts on social development to be effective, there is an urgent need for *new economic tools, for new economic theories*, capable of incorporating a factor of *flexibility*.

Paradoxically, at the moment when freedom in the economic field is the line of the day, economic science itself is still caught in the *monolithical economic perceptions* that characterised the Cold War period. Liberalism has become ever more dogmatic, unable to adjust itself to different sociological situations.

Flexibility in economic theories is particularly in demand when the social development agenda assumes as its own *the fight against poverty,* a whole set of actions through which «freedom from want» is pursued.

Running contrarily to the monolithical perception of economies, the fight against poverty implies *specific economic and social strategies* aimed *at the eradication of extreme poverty*.

This is a field where contribution of all disciplines will be necessary. But most of all, this can only come about if, having burst with indignation against colonialism, against dictatorship, against apartheid, we are sensitive enough *to burst with indignation against poverty.*

A final personal note.
This morning I noticed a coincidence that has a great meaning for me.

Here we are trying to see how change can come about, so that people – all people – may enjoy human security and Quality of Life.

It does happen that today in my religious tradition, Christianity, two stories are read from the Bible:
— one several centuries before Christ when *a prophet* shares with a hundred people the wheat he had been given – they all eat and there was still plenty;
— the other about the other *prophet*, Christ, distributing to a multitude the five loaves of bread and two fishes His disciples had brought and the astonishing fact that everybody ate and there were still several baskets of leftovers.

Just two ideas:

— in both cases, *a prophet*, somebody who speaks out of a *vision* he has about how things are and how they should be, is able to answer the material needs of people;
— in both cases, there is also more:
— the prophet of the first story is a man who in several occasions was moved by an immediate *compassion*;

— in the case of Christ, the text says that He looked at the people and had a great *compassion*.

Maybe this is a metaphor for our action: *vision* and *compassion*.
And we will be able to change the world.

An improved quality of life:
statement by the independent commission
for population and quality of life[18]

I. POPULATION/DEVELOPMENT/ENVIRONMENT

Population: the human factor

The reason why we are gathered here in Cairo is not to control population, but to enhance the lives of the people of the world.

The ultimate goal of population and development, the central theme of this conference, is to accord an improved Quality of Life to the people of the world. The aim is not to count people but to ensure that people count in development; that *both their material and non-material security must be the first priority of development*. The Commission has held consultations across all the major regions of the globe to ask the people their views on Quality of Life, and this has been the message that they have strongly conveyed to us.

We must recognise that we cannot write one simple equation which encapsulates population and Quality of Life for all the world's people. Clearly, Quality of Life is a subjective notion, as all individuals have different characteristics and their own dreams and aspirations, determined by their life experiences and their socio-economic circumstances, which are seldom directly comparable. That said, in the same way that the international community today accepts the existence of universal and basic Human Rights, we have to recognise that Quality of Life can also be measured by objective and universal characteristics.

These objective characteristics are not just the material, basic needs to which we paid a great deal of attention in past decades, but also include the essentials of human resource development: improved education and health, and, for the young adults in particular, better employment opportunities. The concept «Quality of Life» also embraces a wider awareness

---

of, and better measures to combat, the widespread uncertainties and insecurities that many people feel unable to banish from their lives.

Material progress to date has typically been achieved by a more and more intense exploitation of nature, thereby making the problems of development even more complex. Today, the evidence of environmental deterioration throws into disrepute any paradigm based on the unlimited exploitation of natural resources.

The planet's frontiers are finite.

Modes of production and consumption are currently leading to a significant reduction in the world's fertile zones, in the water reserves in aquifers, in biodiversity and in non-renewable resources. Beyond this, human activities have resulted in environmental pressures leading to toxic emissions, and to changes in the atmosphere. Given the current rate of exploitation of natural resources, both the ecological balance and the survival of the most vulnerable populations have already been put at risk.

For at least thirty years, however, the international community has been attempting to formulate policies which would permit a full scale attack on what is a complex problem: how to permit the world to develop, yet to protect its environment, and at the same time to improve the Quality of Life of its population. The emphases to date, however, have been on programmes directed towards achieving economic growth, rather than towards the improvement of the Quality of Life of people. To allow people the development they need and to respect the environment requires a holistic approach, yet one which is also focused.

These attempts have been made more difficult because they have been introduced at a time when the world has grown from 3 billion to 5.5 billion; a further 3 billion will have to be cared for, as we try to make room for another human world. It should be remembered, however, that proportionately the growth of the world's population will come more and more from the huge generations already born and living among us. The distribution of these cohorts is far from even. In 1990, with less than a quarter of the world's population, the North was the home of almost half the globe's elderly. Against that, four fifths of the world's children were in the South.

These constitute an interlinked series of problems which are central to this conference. To address them in a focused way, we must review three issues.

— The urgent questions of population and Quality of Life to which we must seek solutions.
— The scope and coherence of the policies which may provide these solutions.
— The structural and ethical questions surrounding the immediate issues we are dealing with here.

THE URGENT QUESTIONS OF POPULATION BALANCES

This conference has most appropriately emphasised the urgent issue of population growth. In its draft plan, it has also provided a detailed set of strategies with which to address these questions, which very much relate to Quality of Life.

This emphasis on population growth may, however, have masked other population changes which could well be equally – if not more – important for Quality of Life in the longer run. In particular, radical changes in population composition are now becoming evident, and are impinging seriously on the quality of people's lives.

Some of the changes in composition have been produced, among other things, artificially by the misapplication of new technologies. In some countries the sex ratio at birth has been grossly distorted by such means, a state of affairs this conference must deplore.

There are other changes that are due to more natural processes, most notably the fact that women out-survive men. There is a need, of course, to ensure that women maintain and improve their levels of survival, but at the same time we must attempt to decrease the sex imbalances at older ages by improving male survival.

Perhaps most importantly there are other major shifts in age structure which are due to past successes with family planning and health programmes. Most notably among these shifts is the fact that the world is currently facing what might be termed a «youth wave»; one-fifth of the world's people are within the narrow range of ages between 15 and 24 years. The impact of this wave is not evenly distributed; it is currently falling most heavily on the Asian and Latin American countries that have already seen significant fertility declines. More than 22 per cent of Mexicans and Thais were at these ages in 1990. But the pressure on these countries will start to diminish within a decade or so, by which stage the proportion at these ages will have dropped by almost 20 per cent.

The heaviest pressures will then be felt, instead, by those countries with continuing high fertility, often the very poorest, as in sub-Saharan Africa, whose continuing high proportions at these ages will actually increase early next century. In 2010, 21 per cent of all Nigerians will be at the youth ages, seeking employment and starting their families.

By contrast, early next century, the rest of the world, much of Asia, Latin America and the developed countries, will then see a process of middle-ageing.

As we leave Cairo, we must implement policies and programmes which relate to three urgent but more or less sequential sets of problems. In order of urgency, these are:

— first, *growth*, which the ICPD programme of action already addresses.
— second, *the youth wave*, this decade and next.
— third, *middle ageing* which will follow on from the youth wave.
— (*Real ageing* is in fact a distant fourth, which will become critical two or three decades into the next century.)

Interacting with all of these shifts are other compositional changes. Among these are the divisions between those people who are economically active and those who are dependent on them, a distinction extending even to people of working ages, and today, made more apparent in the North by the erosion of the welfare state. There are also other cultural and ethnic differ-ences, including those produced by the large-scale migrations we are seeing today. *For policy*

makers, these increasingly complex population dynamics must be taken into account in all aspects of planning for improvements in Quality of Life.

II. POPULATION POLICIES

In order to address these urgent issues, and particularly the youth wave, and middle ageing, we must first develop a new approach to population policy. In the past, population policies have often been viewed as singular interventions to limit growth or population movement. This was a mistaken view of what population policies should be.

Today it is accepted that they must also deal with issues which are less directly related to demographic change: the labour market, education, health, social security, and the like. Moreover, they must also deal with responses which relate to adjustments to demographic change, notably to the youth wave, to middle ageing, to ageing and to the integration of immigrants.

The role of individual attitudes and choices

Fortunately, in the Cairo document, we have passed well beyond the stage of seeing population policy simply as some form of population control. Instead it addresses issues of Quality of Life. *The Cairo Conference constitutes a landmark in another sense: its underlining of the importance of individual rights.*

In fact, as is evident in the Cairo Draft Programme of Action, what is critical to population policies is the issue of individual attitudes and choices. The women's movements deserve a great deal of the credit for raising these issues. Many of those involved with population activities realised that they had to become more responsive to people's needs; that enabling people to have better choices is the best means of achieving the ends they were seeking.

The Cairo Programme of Action is at its best in stressing people's choices as the central concern in relation to fertility, reproduction and sexuality. But it is misleading to talk of «people's choices», and not at the same time to recognise the pervasive and persisting discrimination against women throughout the world. For many, such discrimination has been life-long, from the cradle to the grave.

The term «people's choices» in relation to reproduction and fertility, above all, has to mean that women should be able to realize their choices. Here gender equity is not the same as equality. There are circumstances where women's reproductive choices should count for more than those of men. These concern in particular the health and social risks which women, and only women, encounter as a result of childbearing.

Empowering women in relation to their reproductive choices cannot be viewed in isolation from the rest of their lives. The «enabling environment» – as a woman at the Commission's second consultation in Mali called it – has to be much broader and deeper. This requires addressing the

customary and other laws that determine a woman's property and inheritance; the social rules that shape what she can, and cannot, aspire to achieve in her life; the manner in which she is treated in the community, and by governments and other service providers; the employment opportunities she can seek; the help – if any – she can call on in caring for her children. There is a need to move from rhetoric to reality in implementing the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. Of course, the international community must realize that its implementation implies virtually a political and social revolution in many, indeed most, societies.

Reproductive choices is one example, perhaps a rare example, where *individual attitudes, values and decisions have been accorded a central role in a paradigm of development which sees the Quality of Life of the people as its prime focus.* The issue is to find a balance between the private nature of reproduction and its public consequences. For too many couples in the world today, reproductive choice is not an option (their only hope is that «God will provide»). It is the duty of this conference to provide mechanisms by which to make choice a possibility.

Unfortunately, all too frequently today our inability to deliver effective means of contraception has a terrible consequence: too many women are forced to seek an abortion, too often at the hands of some backstreet dealer in unhygienic and illegal abortions. It is this traffic which must be stopped, but the key question is how? Certainly, attempts to abolish illegal abortion have failed, even when enforced through the imposition of horrific punishments directed at the victims, the women themselves.

Carrying capacity and caring capacity as the frame for population policies

We are, however, addressing other issues which go far beyond questions of reproduction. For these we must develop a fresh vision. What we now need are policies which start from two substantive problems: from the carrying capacity of the world's natural resources, and from the caring capacity of the world's human communities. By caring capacity we mean not only socio-economic development, but something more. It is a process which mobilises the state, the classical agent of public policy, plus the other social actors in these domains, the family, the community, the voluntary agencies and the private sector. We must assess global carrying and caring burdens, and then mobilise to respond to these burdens.

Because of the declarations produced at the Rio Summit, we are more aware of the limits of economic growth and some of the problems of carrying capacity. Indeed policies directed exclusively to economic growth have been shown to have eroded the carrying capacity of the eco-system.

Unfortunately, we are less aware of the problems of caring capacity. One must hope that the Copenhagen Summit will bring these issues as firmly to the attention of the World community, as the Rio Summit did for environmental questions. In the meantime, however, the macro-economic policies put in place to overcome the financial costs of many development programmes have placed stresses on the caring capacities of both the state and its prime partner, the family.

Some of the carrying and caring burdens come from rapid population growth. But increasingly, it is the change in composition, along with jobless economic growth, which will shape caring burdens. Most immediately, it is the burdens associated with the youth wave which are emerging this decade.

Both caring burdens and carrying burdens have direct implications for Quality of Life, which must be the most central goal of development. The capacity to respond to these burdens is the role of public policy.

Our singular concern until now has been over growth, over the fact that we have had «more and more mouths to feed», a demographic factor which has threatened both carrying and caring capacity. Today, however, not only are we facing the prospect of a series of waves, but even growth itself is increasingly coming from the progress of huge birth cohorts through the age structure. As these massive birth cohorts reach critical life cycle phases they will place heavy burdens on those areas of public policy which address these stages – education is directed at the young, employment policies at youth entering the labour market, housing at parents, and so on. The problem is, however, that because of the waves, public policy will itself have to be very flexible in order to respond to the fluctuating levels of need these imply. To add to this, the profile of waves is going to change from one decade to the next. The old planning models of more and more of the same thing must be retired and a rolling plan approach introduced.

Formulation and implementation of public policy should not be the preserve of the state alone. In many countries, in fact, much of caring capacity is provided by the family or the local community. Good public policies focused at particular sectors should aim at either providing this caring capacity, or facilitating other agencies, such as the family, to perform this role. Equally well, good public policy must ensure that strategies being implemented in narrowly economic domains do not undermine the caring capacity of the family and the local community.

At the same time, we must re-activate and re-energise public policies, which care for people: housing, jobs, health, education and security, in all their physical and material manifestations. The pursuit of such integrated social policies has to be valued in its own right – and not as a counter-balance, or afterthought, to macro- economic stabilisation programmes. As a result of the decreasing child dependency we are facing, but before age-dependency becomes a major issue, the youth wave effect, and the follow-on of middle ageing, offer us a valuable breathing space. The opportunity has to be taken, above all, to upgrade education and health services.

Population policies as integrated policies

To attend to the massive tasks involved in implementing efficient policies, directed at improving Quality of Life, we must attempt, once again, to formulate and implement integrated policies. But integrating population policies into the wider development context forces us to face two major challenges:

— at a technical level with the problems of developing a *holistic approach* – but one with coherent goals, strategies, and planning across sectors – and with people as the central focus of development;

— changing political processes in order to gain *political commitment.*

The ICPD, like UNCED before it, has been notable for the nature of participation of many disparate groups, which have helped to shape political commitment.

The way in which such groups outside government have been able to have their voices heard has been a significant factor in developing the programme of action. The women's movements have made an especially vital contribution.

Turning to the more technical level, the integration of policies and programmes has proved extremely difficult everywhere. Perhaps in the past we were too ambitious, our planning too comprehensive and centralized; perhaps recent shifts in planning perspectives towards more flexible approaches afford us some possibilities for a reinvigorated attempt to have population integrated into planning.

Facing us is a demographic challenge, which also provides us with the opportunity to overcome some of the past problems. As a result of the youth wave, there is an urgent need to develop an integrated policy package for youth. These young people present three interrelated major challenges, all of which place burdens on the world's caring capacity, and are central to the Quality of Life of future generations. As a result, an integrated policy approach is required spanning three inter- related areas of their lives: (a) most immediately, employment – this rich human capital resource must be directed constructively towards general development; (b) young people's geographical mobility, for, above all, this is the dislocated generation, the major component of the world's floating populations; (c) parenting, for facing us is the fact that, at 15-24 years, most of these young people are entering the key reproductive ages; they are the parents of the future, although, let it be said, by 15 years many young women may already be wives and mothers.

Each of the issues of employment, migration and parenting is the responsibility of a different sector. But a substantive focus on youth forces us to attempt to integrate across the sectors to provide the caring capacity to meet their needs. Until now we have viewed the problems of youth, their mobility, parenting and unemployment, very much as either social pathologies or fiscal burdens. Even their contribution to the economy through their work has been viewed mainly from the perspective of demand for labour, not the supply. But across the different sectors that deal with youth, there is one factor in common: that they deal with people, not some abstract construct such as the economy.

What is required is a new view of public policies, one in which population policies are not seen as exogenous or even relating to a marginal sector, the concern only of family planning or health professionals, but one in which *the central aim of public policy is to create the context for, but not to command, a better Quality of Life for all the population.* For the integration of population in public policies, an essential start is to recognise that if population is a macro-economic variable, then it is the most important. It is the people and not the economic

system, who save, invest, consume, and produce. But that logic has perversely been reversed. In structural adjustment programmes people have become the vehicles by which economic systems can be stabilised. Instead, it must be the economic system which is the servant of the population, not its master.

Placing people, that is population, at the centre of the development agenda requires a holistic inter-disciplinary response. It demands action at multiple levels, taking full advantage of cultural diversity. To give just a few examples: employment policies cannot be dissociated from education, training and social welfare. Public health must be linked with housing and urbanization. The fight against poverty is a problem of redistributive justice and land reform at the national level. Internationally, the terms and structures of trade and financial flows need to be transformed, in addition to development assistance.

Equally well, the integration of population into public policy must take account of sub-national diversity: regional, cultural, religious. We must be able to think and plan nationally, but with such a degree of flexibility that we can rethink and reformulate locally. Of course, this has the advantage that much of the on-the-ground implementation will be local. But it also has the advantage that it is more efficient, as it draws on the rich diversity of experiences and aptitudes present in a country or region, and more effective, as it is more likely to be accepted by minorities than would a national-level policy, which applies the same formula across the board, willy-nilly.

Co-ordination locally, and at both state and intergovernmental levels, will depend on planning and implementing the different sectoral approaches, in a coherent and democratic way, in order to achieve the improvement in Quality of Life we are all seeking.

Development co-operation and population policies

What then has been the response of the international community? The last decade of development co-operation can at best claim limited success. In many of the poorest countries, poverty has deepened or become more widespread. The reasons for this lack of success are well known and need not be rehearsed here. One could quote, for instance, the low level of contribution to development by the North and a lack of co-ordination between agencies both at the national and international level.

The inequalities between rich and poor have widened. This includes both inequalities in wealth and income, and in opportunities and choices. It has been the poor who have arguably lost the most by way of room for manoeuvre – and the rich who have made least of their greater scope for leadership and action.

International development co-operation has been pre-occupied with getting the macroeconomics right – forgetting that the real purpose of development is to enable people to attain an improved Quality of Life.

History may well judge this era as «the decade of missed opportunities». The most efficient and effective sphere of international development assistance is aid for the social sectors – education, health and family planning. There are the results which bear testament to this

in the form of the improvements in survivorship across the entire world, and the widespread adoption of family planning throughout much of Asia and Latin America. And yet; it is these sectors which have suffered gravely from the undue emphasis on macro-economics.

This in the longer term may be the real tragedy of debt and structural adjustments. By seemingly casually jeopardizing the fabric of society, these have diminished what are often already very low levels of confidence that people have in the political leadership and other institutions, including the international development agencies – thereby lessening in turn what policies can achieve.

The Bretton Woods institutions have a special responsibility before this conference; that is to assure all present that future structural adjustment programmes will be pursued in such a way as to enhance the attainment of the aims collectively agreed here. This is absolutely essential to establish the right basis of security for future actions.

Imagine if, rather than highlighting issues such as debt, there was an increased focusing of aid on other population concerns through the integration of population into public policies. *International development co-operation could take as its prime emphasis the responsibility of providing and nurturing the enabling mechanisms to allow states and communities to meet population and Quality of Life goals.* It would also probably assess more realistically the utility of large scale capital projects which have dominated assistance programs in the past, and were responsible for much of the incurring of current debt.

III. REVERSING THE LOGIC

Underlying all the issues raised above is another set of more profound ethical problems, which in turn have very significant political implications. Essentially, we have to reverse the logic which has been propelling human interactions and development over the past decades. No one should pretend that this is an easy task or that the implications are anything less than fundamental to our survival as a race. But the Commission is calling here for a revolution which is even more pro- found; we are calling for a plan of action to improve caring capacity so that human Quality of Life can be vastly enhanced. This is the message the Commission will also be carrying to Copenhagen and to Beijing, and accompanying that will be the simple point which is central to this conference and to the Commission's work: that *the key to development which can enhance Quality of Life is the integration of population into development.*

SPECIFIC STRATEGIES AGAINST POVERTY

As we know, whatever efforts are being made to reduce world population growth, the number of people on earth will increase dramatically over the next 30 years. They will have to be fed, housed, educated, cared for, and brought into the labour market; their modes of production and consumption will have an impact on the planetary environment.

No-one can predict the outcomes of these changes or the socio-political and institutional responses that will be made to the challenges they would seem to pose. We have to assume, however, that in order for humanity to survive they will be accompanied by far reaching transformations in modes of production and consumption, and hence in lifestyles.

In this massive reversal of the logic of development we do have some advantages. Today we understand better that *the improvement of material well-being through economic growth is not the sole aim of development, but also important is the Quality of Life of the people.* This is a process requiring socio-cultural conditions which permit the full development of human creativity. In the present circumstances, specific strategies against poverty, which are aimed at the actual existence of 1,3 billion human beings, are an absolute priority for development.

Specific strategies against poverty are not only a necessity in an ethical sense, but are also a must politically. Hunger, limited access to drinking water, to sanitation and health services, and the deterioration of hygiene and of housing, constitute the lot for a growing proportion of people living in most of the regions of the world, notably in the mega-cities. It is not just the fact of appalling misery and deprivation for fellow humans which we must recognise here, but the continuing threat to the economic and political evolution of those societies.

Many of the specific strategies have already been spelt out and even tried in various places: strategies such as the political and institutional recognition of the role of the informal sector, land distribution, or credit for small-scale enterprises. What we need now is the political commitment to make these work, or the elimination of bureaucratic restraints to allow such initiatives to work. Let us be clear about these strategies. They are central to the entire question of population and development.

The extension of the long-term aims of development to encompass objectives which go beyond the purely material, and which are not incorporated in simplistic notions of economic growth, as are measured by increases in GNP, also forces us to focus on strategies against poverty. These latter strategies must integrate inherent social factors, such as the youth wave, into the desired outcomes of development.

To reach out to youth, and to plan for a better Quality of Life for all, we have first to search for more efficient alternatives to the current development ideologies, which favour macro-management over social policies, which are prepared to risk social and political stability in order to achieve financial stabilisation, and which see a role for money, but no role for people – and especially young people – in the macro-economy. *We must redesign macro-management policies by recognising that it is population rather than capital which is the central macro- economic variable.*

We seem to have forgotten that it is the population which supplies the work- force, which produces fiscal burdens, which furnishes fiscal capacity to meet these, and that it is not money, but people who save, invest, produce, consume, and require caring services; in short, it is people who create the market, money merely one of its instruments. In our macro-economic development strategies, we seem to have given precedence to the instruments over the objectives.

In doing so, we appear to have lost sight of the central objective of development, to improve the Quality of Life of people. Instead, all too often, its results degrade rather than enhance it.

But, increasingly, people are reacting to misconceived and mismanaged development strategies, and as a result, this path to under-development has had severe political repercussions. Instead, social policy reforms must be considered as productive investments. After all, they improve the quality of the urban environment, they create jobs, they involve investment in the fields of education and training, and they create and recreate the mechanisms for material and non-material security.

Education and training are critical public investments. Modern production systems have more and more need for a well-qualified work force, having at its disposal a background of education and training which permits it to adapt continually to the constant transformations in these systems. As a result, social polarization reflects more and more disparities in access to education and training. Access to knowledge-bases has become the principal comparative advantage of individuals, institutions and nations.

Over the last decades it has been argued that market forces, and by implication the discipline of the free market, would provide the most efficient mechanisms by which to manage development. But, for a market to be truly free there has to be equal access to knowledge and information. Where then are the companion programmes to structural adjustments providing access to the information essential for real development? And does this imply, in fact, that we must argue strongly for a return to crash programmes of education, so that there is equity in terms of capacity to absorb and use this information? Today the youth of the poorest countries are educationally pauperised. In Africa, for instance, it is only a small minority of women aged 15-19 years who have any secondary education at all, let alone the training to exploit information technologies.

New patterns of production and consumption

There are other areas of our life which involve a massive reversal of logic. As the depletion of resources and the accumulation of wastes are a result of the combined effect of population and consumption growths, production and consumption patterns have to be shifted in new directions. It is now fully obvious that «more of the same won't do».

Even though humanity seems to progress along a path marked by scientific and technical breakthroughs, we know that our patterns of production and consumption are incompatible with the limits imposed by the globe's environment. The dream of unceasing material progress has been shown to be a false Utopia.

To put economy, in all its dimensions, at the service of human beings is obviously a task for economists and politicians. But it is also a challenge for all citizens, as it requires self-assertive, value-based lifestyles. It means initiative to think and to act in new ways and to run the risks entailed. It means breaking the conformism of the «always more» pattern. It means for those who have nothing, to take matters into their hands and to make themselves visible in their efforts; for those who have more than enough, to cope honestly with the question, «Can I do with less?»

Even in developing countries there are already enormous numbers of consumers demanding the sorts of goods people in developed countries typically enjoy. This form of consumption has important consequences: the contribution of developing countries to global pollution is growing fast. We thus have a double problem, that of population, well known to us, and that of consumption. The Commission does not think we can, or should, attempt to stop the consumption explosion in the South, but we must influence technology through new economic measures. We must also ensure the transfer of clean technology to the South, as well as imposing environmental regulations and green trade restrictions worldwide, though none of these will be politically easy to put in place.

Neither the market nor infinite growth in the production of material goods can resolve these contradictions. In determining the end products of development, it is necessary to ensure that inherent social factors are integrated in a coherent manner. The creation of employment and increases in productivity are obviously central elements of development. The achievements of these objectives require broad scale institutional and cultural changes.

The dominant economic paradigm no longer works. It has emphasised production; it has treated the exploitation of natural resources as if it were a form of income backed by an inexhaustible investment fund, whereas the appropriate metaphor is that of drawing on capital reserves; it failed to account for environmental degradation by reflecting its costs in pricing structures; and it assumed that higher consumption implied proportionately enhanced welfare. This model has been uncritically adopted by newly-industrialising countries. The main error arises out of the simplistic belief that GNP is an adequate index of welfare, whereas it is merely a measure of the total goods and services produced in a country, and material goods do not automatically signify Quality of Life. It could be argued, that growth of GNP may actually lead to a lower Quality of Life. This in turn requires increasing diversion of resources to the so-called «defensive expenditures» (pollution control, repairing the damage caused by our consumption patterns), which are a paradoxical by-product resulting from affluence. By implication, a re-direction of efforts away from materialism and towards service and non-material aspects is indicated.

The argument will be raised, and justly so, that this is a critique that does not lead to a set of constructive recommendations. However, throughout the Commission's consultations we have attempted to solicit answers to this central question from economists and others: «*How do we formulate a new, social and economic paradigm which truly addresses the major problems of population and Quality of Life?*» We are now convinced that we need to recommend the *convocation of a multi-disciplinary task-force* to respond to this question.

IV. TOWARDS A CONCLUSION

Our work at this conference is to confront a number of major challenges with realistic solutions. The Commission has presented you with a number of urgent issues, but only one major solution – we must leave Cairo determined that the Quality of Life of the population be the

focus of development. Those of you who were at Bucharest will argue that this was exactly the message which came from that meeting, and you would be right. The problem was that we quickly forgot that declaration – at least in deed, if not in hollow word – and the eighties were essentially a lost decade in which people were pushed far back, behind the development issues of that decade which revolved around macro-economic stabilisation. What the Commission is calling for is a return to the cry that came from Bucharest, abandoning the naive hopes and avoiding the cynical implementation of population and development programmes. Since then, while we have frittered away our opportunities, we have gained another 1,8 billion people on earth; ten years from now we will have another billion. The hope of the Commission is that their Quality of Life will be much better than ours today.

Bioethics and developing countries[19]

Bioethics is both universal and of its moment. The values that guide it are vital in all societies. But in each one they are confronted with a culturally, socially and economically differentiated milieu that generates ethical problems with new and specific contours. Developing countries reveal problems in the relationship between society and the life sciences that the conditions of economic affluence and of scientific hegemony of the industrialised countries have made it possible to gloss over. At the same time, global frontiers are issues that are also experienced in these countries, although not with the same acuity or in the same terms as in industrialised nations.

Ethical reflection in developing countries thus covers equally diverse issues such as medically assisted procreation and the enrichment of agricultural species, conditions of access to the health system and preservation of the planet's genetic wealth and biodiversity[20].

BIOTECHNOLOGIES IN THE ERADICATION OF HUNGER

In developing countries, 1.3 billion people live in absolute poverty, of which 1 billion are in rural areas and among those about 192 million are children under the age of five[21]. It is human suffering on a scale that the world had never known. It is a staggering assault on the dignity of human life, constituting in itself the greatest, most evident and most radical violation of ethical principles. Moreover, due to the vicious circle created, poverty becomes an additional factor in the development issue, leading to a growing impasse in the survival capacity of future generations.

---

19 Article published in the magazine *Brotéria: Cultura e Informação*, vol. 140 (January 1995), pp. 122-130.

20 «Biotechnologies in perspective». Edited by Albert Sasson and Vivien Costarini, in *Future-oriented studies*, UNESCO, 1991. *(Author's Note)*

21 *Relatório do Desenvolvimento Humano 1994, Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento*, Tricontinental Editora, Lisbon, 1994, p. 135. *(Author's Note)*

The great ethical problem here is, to put it bluntly, the absolute priority of human life – the urgency of responding to this suffering to try to save from decay and destruction the human richness of each of these million people. It is the preservation of the human species that is at stake not only regarding the materiality of its existence but also the ultimate dignity of a reflective and creative consciousness. We are led to wonder how individuals, society and the state act to accelerate the disappearance of poverty.

Biotechnology is a decisive strategic tool on the frontline of the fight against poverty. In agriculture and the agri-food industry, biotechnology has had such an effect that it is possible to imagine that hunger could be eradicated by its use.

With this aim in mind, two lines of research and development are favoured: the enrichment of the traditional crops constituting the food base of the region so that they have a higher content in proteins and amino acids, thus increasing their nutritional value; and increasing the resistance of basic crops to pests, viruses and, above all, drought.

As a result of the work already done, there has been an extraordinary transformation in the agricultural capacity of most developing countries in recent decades. Agricultural production has diversified and reasonable macroeconomic self-sufficiency in foodstuffs has been achieved in many cases. However, on numerous occasions the 'green revolution' – the first stage of the biotechnological revolution – has not been adequately accompanied by measures to ensure an equitable distribution of food resources and access of the entire population to agricultural products.

While it is true that Asian countries have achieved significant results, especially in relation to species enrichment, Latin America, and particularly Africa, still need adequate investment and infrastructures (and, in the case of Africa, the necessary critical mass of researchers) to take the maximum advantage of biotechnology.

In this context, ethical questions are raised by two types of problems.

On the one hand, those concerning the effects of biotechnological intervention on the plant or animal species themselves:

What is the 'price' paid for the homogenisation of crops in hybrids? What traditional species are lost? What is the breakdown of natural evolution caused by the genetic modification of crops? How can we intervene in time without harming the diversity essential to life systems? To what extent does the enrichment of certain plant and animal species eventually lead to the impoverishment of biological diversity and the neutralisation of the natural evolution of species, leading to the negation of the very purpose for which they are intended?

If biotechnologies are intended to improve crop yields and their nutritional value, would it be legitimate to introduce them into a country without a massive development initiative, with the purpose of transforming the rural population? Will the new technologies benefit the approximately 60% of the population of the southern hemisphere who live mainly from agriculture? Can biotechnology be an instrument in the hands of small farmers? Or will it make them even more marginalised by benefiting mainly large farms in the hands of a select group, often largely foreign-ran?

BIOTECHNOLOGIES AND GENETIC WEALTH

The world has been alerted to the importance of conservation of the planet's biological heritage. Biodiversity in the complex interdependence of the countless equilibriums that dynamically constitute it functions analogously to a DNA of living systems as we know it. It plays a key role in balancing the subsystems of life. Any disturbance in this arrangement can compromise life, in its biological, aesthetic and symbolic manifestation. Hence the need for clear ethical guidelines for biotechnologies using the genetic material available in Nature.

It is in the tropical regions of the planet – and therefore exclusively in developing countries – that the broader spectrum of biological diversity is concentrated. This biological wealth is theoretically in the hands of developing countries, by virtue of the principle of sovereignty over the raw materials existing within the borders of the nation-state. But since the developing countries have neither capital, nor technologies, nor sufficient numbers of scientists, it is the industrialised countries (which are far from possessing the same genetic wealth) that have had free access to the genetic materials of the South. That is why, in practice, it is the industrialised countries that have the capacity to exploit such wealth.

Genetic resources abundant in tropical regions (and in other areas with different characteristics that generate other types of genetic material capable, for example, of resisting in arid zones in the absence of water) are an indispensable raw material in many sectors of human activity, constituting the 'raw material' specific to genetic engineering. In recent years, the field of biotechnology has become one of the fastest-growing industrial areas. Thus, for example, sectors where biotechnology has a direct impact represent 9% of value added in the European Union and about 8% of their employment capacity[22]. If we measure innovative activity in this field by the number of patents registered in the USA, growth in the EU and Japan increased from 1100/year in the early 1980s to 3500/year, 10 years later[23].

Under the new GATT rules, however, such technologies will only with great difficulty be accessible to developing countries even when the genetic material used as raw material originated in those countries. As in other stages of the industrialisation process, products that arise as a result of Northern Hemisphere intervention are 'returned' to the Southern Hemisphere subject to international market pricing. This is why the attitude of intellectuals and opposition forces in developing countries that denounce Western countries as 'trying to block the powers of multiplication and the regeneration of nature' tends to be reinforced[24]. For them 'it is a spiritual matter – it is an assault on the abundance of creation by the forces of commerce'.

---

22 *European Commission, White Paper on 'growth, competitiveness and employment'*, European Commission, Brussels, 1994, p. 116. *(Author's Note)*

23 *Ibidem*, p. 117. *(Author's Note)*

24 *The Tablet*, april 23, 1994. *(Author's Note)*

Here again we find fundamental ethical principles – respect for creation, which translates into the safeguarding of its biological diversity as the foundation of life itself; the principle of equality of all human beings in the face of the riches of creation and its universal destiny.

It is in these more general principles that the specific ethical requirements of this field are inscribed. They can be grouped around two questions with reciprocal but different effects.

The first question concerns the preservation of life: under what technical framework can the harvesting of genetic resources be made without affecting our biogenetic assets? The answer to this point may eventually call into question the rampant exploitation of rare timbers (in the case of Malaysia), mining in particularly rich areas (in the case of the Amazonia), the transformation of forests into agricultural areas (as has already happened in Central America and Indonesia), of unregimented urbanisation - activities that, combined, destroy the genetic assets of tropical areas to the detriment of local populations and the balance of life systems. A rigorous study is needed to determine the cases in which the intervention of the public authorities is necessary to ensure their protection. Only joint action by individuals, communities and the State can ensure effective long-term action.

The second requirement concerns the legal conditionality necessary for populations in tropical areas (or others possessing genetic material with characteristics important to genetic engineering) to be the first to benefit from the genetic assets they possess.

Old and new problems of the health/biotechnology equation

The overview of the state of healthcare in developing countries already points to a fundamental ethical problem. In fact, what can be added when the numbers say everything? In 1992, about one billion people did not have access to health services: 1.3 billion did not have access to drinking water; 1.9 billion had no medical facilities![25] The average number of 6,670 people per doctor for all developing countries (and about 36,000 people per doctor for sub-Saharan Africa) only accentuates the near 'futility' of the medical act in this context.

The fundamental health problem of developing countries is therefore far removed from the types of technologies used in diagnosis and therapy: the existence of coherent health policies capable of addressing primary health care. It is true that some very important health outcomes have been achieved - in particular the protection of children from infectious and epidemic diseases as well as a healthcare package which in spite of everything allows for greater longevity. But health policies are still weak and extremely vulnerable in developing countries not only to different forms of policy management but also to international financial interventions and the conditionality that accompanies external programmes for financial austerity – proposed by international credit agencies and accepted by national governments – affects, in developing countries, first and foremost the directly social sectors, i.e. health and education.

---

25 *Relatório do Desenvolvimento Humano 1994, Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento*, Tricontinental Editora, Lisbon, 1994, p. 132. *(Author's Note)*

In countries where the healthcare budget is drastically reduced, there is almost no point in talking about biotechnology as there are no health structures or health workers to make these technologies socially useful. This question is not separable from the question of pharmaceuticals which, already scarce in developing countries, will see a catastrophic increase in their prices after the GATT agreement. In countries with no health policy resources, there are many problems in this area: ranging from the question of whether pharmacopoeia should be limited in all developing countries to 200 basic medicines to the elaboration of priority criteria between research needs, hospital care and primary health care.

The most urgent issue is the allocation of financial resources to healthcare policies, as well as the distribution and use of healthcare services, agents and institutions. In addition, there are moves at an international level in favour of development aid that targets the health policy sector, contributing towards ensuring a reduction in the military expenditure of the target country, leading the beneficiary's authorities to allocate these financial resources to healthcare needs.

PARADOXES OF THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES

Science was born and developed according to a fundamental social presupposition: its destiny is universal. All people and all peoples have the right to access the new perspectives of knowledge. New biotechnologies are part of this knowledge and, as such, nothing can prevent their use by all countries. If one tried to limit the access of developing countries to new technologies, it would only reinforce the profound injustices already being suffered by these nations. But is it justified to focus technical, financial and human resources on sophisticated technologies when the basic conditions of health services are far from being met?

It is no longer possible to find cultures in their pure state, uncontaminated by other values coming from other cultures. The subjugation of information, in transmitting concepts and facts interpreted in the light of these concepts, homogenises cultural models, representations and, most extremely, values themselves. Even more dramatically, the industrial and economic model, which at this stage of history all countries aspire to, implies a logic of behaviour and decision-making that tends to ride roughshod over existing cultures. An appetite for making scientific progress can be found in every single country. The model of life, of consumption and production that characterises the market economy tends to favour a unipolar universe in which there is only one model. Developing countries not only do not escape this model but also contribute to it, accepting and desiring the forms of organisation of production and consumption that have been established in the northern hemisphere, importing technologies that at first glance would be assumed to be alien to their culture.

Concrete examples serve to highlight the question of the indeterminacy and paradox of using new biotechnologies in developing countries, where a more nuanced analysis would necessarily place it. The following example was recently observed in India and concerns medically assisted procreation.

Let us remember that India has a life expectancy of 59.7 years, a literacy rate of 50% and a *per capita* income of $1150 in a population of 880 million people[26]. At the same time, India has potential to be a nuclear force, has a space programme and became food self-sufficient a few years ago. Medically assisted procreation is practiced frequently in India. In the city of New Delhi alone (with about eight million inhabitants) there are monthly between 500 and 600 cases of artificial insemination with a donor[27]. Such a demand is undoubtedly culturally motivated: male sterility (which has increased due to pollution, some experts think) is an anathema that men seek at all costs to overcome.

In the context of this immense country, what do the new technologies of medically assisted procreation mean? What is the adequacy of such a technology in a society where health system needs are still gigantic (in the actual process of artificial insemination several clinics use fresh semen – thus untested for HIV – because they do not have the freezing technology!) and where children without families exceed 16 million (in the city of Bombay alone, there are 100,000 children on the streets).

Only an ethical system forged from within the cultures of the Southern Hemisphere will be able to correctly tally the use of new biotechnologies to the context of their own cultural values and prevailing economic and social conditions.

BIOTECHNOLOGIES IN THE SCIENCE / ECONOMY INTERFACE

Biotechnology takes advantage of the large number of products that exist as biomass, transforming them into organic chemicals for various areas of agricultural, industrial and social activity. In addition to the affordability of the raw materials, biotechnology implies low energy consumption. Hence its economic interest.

The most pragmatic issue in the economic management of biotechnologies vis-à-vis developing countries is granting them access to new scientific breakthroughs and the technologies that emerge from them.

This is fine in principle. But what about in practice? For centuries, the issue was not even addressed, given Europe's dominance over other continents. The advent of industrialisation introduced new parameters. The technical breakthroughs precipitated by science needed to be protected for the 'added value' the corresponding technical process entailed. The author would in principle enjoy the benefit of such protection. Soon, however, the technology became totally autonomous and the author was no longer afforded the benefits of protection to focus on the company that owned the new process. Patents have become market factors, governed by fierce laws of competition and protectionism.

---

26   *Human Development Report 1994*, pp. 137-175. *(Author's Note)*

27   *Indian Express*, New Delhi, April 30, 1994. *(Author's Note)*

When they fall into the public domain, patents are no longer regarded as commercially 'interesting' – the interim period allowed, however, for those who already had the means and the financial resources to buy patents to enjoy the profits such technologies could offer.

This interim period is tragic for developing countries. It places them in total dependence on the political-economic powers of industrialised countries. All technological advances are subject to staunch protectionism, which prevents developing countries from making the most of science breakthroughs.

The issue of the universality of science and technology that this entails is the most obvious challenge for biotechnologies when it comes to developing countries. All other ethical imperatives in this field are basically no different from those that guide the social viability of scientific advances in any other field of knowledge. I state only the most obvious:

— to accept in their entirety the consequences of opposition to the myth of the intrinsic neutrality of science;
— to understand that biotechnologies provide a possible framework for 'inequality' that has only been paralleled in this century by nuclear technology during the Cold War;
— to establish a critical stance on the effects of new organisms on the physical and social environment, being prepared for the costs of negative consequences and establishing social controls to determine the limits of technical, economic and social viability;
— to calculate the implementation of biotechnologies into the cost analysis/benefits for the community where the implementation will take place;
— to not permit that the mirage of 'more foreign investment' becomes a pretext for extracting developing countries' biological assets in order to industrialise them on behalf of developed countries, and to oblige developing countries to buy back products which originated from their own resources at international market prices;
— to contribute to the full transparency of science in areas that involve biotechnologies by creating greater circulation of information and full reciprocity of benefits between developed and developing countries.

Bioethics cannot become a new Trojan horse imposing the Western way of thinking and view of the world upon others. But at the same time, the issues bioethics raises, stemming from the evolution of science originated in the West, cannot be considered of secondary importance to the means of production and use of biotechnologies in developing countries.

World summit for social development[28]

Dear Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

The Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life shares *the core vision* for social development conveyed by this Conference. And it does so with a tremendous sense of urgency and responsibility towards the future.

Indeed, if the international community is not able to cope with the social development of *all the people* on this planet *today*; if it has in its midst 1.3 billion people living in *absolute poverty* and millions, portrayed in a poignant way in the NGO Forum, with an undue share of suffering; if it has generated in the very hub of the rich countries *decline in work opportunities* and *marginalisation* of growing sectors of the population; *how* can it cope with the expected increase in population during the coming decades – from 2.5 billion according to the low estimates (equivalent to two more Chinas) to 4.1 billion, according to the medium estimate (the equivalent of the whole world of 75 on top of today's world?

The Rio and the Cairo Conference have clearly shown that *the factors* that *create threats* for human life on the planet, that shake *human security* and may endanger collective *survival and security*, are the result of the combined effect of *population growth* and *poverty* with *wasteful patterns of consumption* and with *damaging technologies*.

Social development *cannot ignore* those factors.

On the contrary. A realistic programme of action for social development has to go to the roots of the problems at stake.

The Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life is unanimously convinced that this is *only possible* if the international community is ready to *challenge the unspoken and implicit social contract* underlying such problems. We welcome the reference made by the Secretary General to *a new social contract*.

---

28   Speech delivered as Chairman of the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life at the *United Nations World Summit for Social Development* (Copenhagen, 6-12 March 1995) [archive version].

We believe firmly that the social contract in societies where people will be *empowered*, *free* and *participative* will find a *new dynamic balance* between *different social groups*, very specially between men and women; and will give a *more humane face* to *the system of production*.

Such a new social contract will provide the coherent frame within which poverty, unemployment and exclusion can be effectively fought.

A decisive element of this new social contract is, in the eyes of the Commission, a *reshaped gender contract.* New possibilities of participation both in *family responsibilities* and in *professional and civic responsibilities* will then be open to *men and women alike*.

If discrimination against women does not end and if women do not assume an active role at all levels of decision-making, the problems confronting humankind today *won't be solved*.

Only a social contract where women and men will be free from the patriarchal distribution of roles and power between the sexes will allow women *to contribute fully* to an improved *Quality of Life* for all, and will empower women in such a way that we can then *realistically* plan for *the eradication of poverty*.

In this context, we consider:

— that *specific strategies* against poverty, worked out with concrete targets at the national level, *must* aim, without hesitation, at women as their central focus;
— that social policies answering the basic needs of women and, particularly, addressing their unmet needs in *health and education*, should be the cornerstone of social development in the coming decade. In this context, the Commission strongly supports the 20/20 proposal as a decisive tool for progress on this path.

The social contract must also be transformed in the assumptions underlying its *production and consumption scheme*. Most of all, it must include a radical shift in what has been already called *the natural contract*.

This is what the women's movement, represented in hundreds of NGOs, has been saying during these days at the Forum and at this tribune.

New costs deriving from *choice of technologies, production of wastes, requirements of marketing* have to be internalised.

The consequences of such a process of clarification will be far fetched. Policies concerning *price-formation* and *fiscal charges* will arise. *Patterns of consumption* will change and will move nearer to conditions of a dignified Quality of Life for all. *Trade,* which is blind to the needs of humans and of nature, will be regulated and its gains redistributed with equity.

Likewise the nature and number of *work opportunities* will change and be enriched.

It is an urgent task *to draw up a new understanding and definition of work*, as it evolves specially from *women's manifold experiences* – ranging from the meaning and conditions of the *informal sector* in so many countries of the South *to the* consequences of the concept of *active society* evolving in the industrialised countries of the North.

As a consequence of the changes in social contract, the economy will have *to redirect its goals*. From the current dominant approach, it will have to evolve towards an economy *always geared to people's Quality of Life.*

This is why the Commission considers that the appraisal of decisions made at the international level and concerning directly the *basis of the social contract* needs to be channelled into *a new international agreement* and put into open discussion and negotiation between governments and civil society.

The social contract, seen in these different dimensions, is not a far away optional scenario or; even less, an Utopian dream. It is an *imperative* of *ethical responsibilit*y if we want to reach a minimum level of *equity and justice* at a *global scale*.

Mr. President,

To make all this effective, the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life is convinced that there is a strong need for an all-encompassing *concept and attitude* to respond to *the urgency* of the steps to be made.

We «borrow» from the women's movement the concept of the *politics of care* as the frame for the political decision-making required at this stage of humankind's history.

In this way, *responsible attentiveness* will be created.

Commitment will go beyond words and will be channelled into *concerned, competent* and *compassionate* action.

The *politics of care*, we are firmly convinced, will help to create «the *enabling environment*» by which life can be *sustained, nourished* and *strengthened*.

Choices in reproduction[29]

The choices in reproduction do not happen in an isolated manner. We are here at the heart of the chain of humankind throughout the ages. How one individual partakes in that chain is at the same time *a highly personal choice* and a *strongly conditioned decision*. It is clear now that in many instances of the last 30-40 years' history of «population programmes» the complexity of the personal act has been overlooked.

> *Saying that population growth is the result of women's failure to regulate their childbearing because of an absence of appropriate means also frees the women of responsibility for their actions. High fertility, in short, is no one's fault. (...) Defining the population problem in terms of a lack of contraceptive supplies enabled the United States to intervene quickly, cheaply, and without much attention to local circumstances[30].*

In most traditions the *heritage of name and land* played an important role in deciding child-bearing. The tribute to ancestors was a motivation in many civilisations. As survival capacity of born children was hazardous, the need for many pregnancies was a security against loss of children.

The link to *future generations* was less evident, though an agrarian society, like the Jewish one in the time of King David, would measure the achievement of a personal life in terms of the capacity for a man to see his third and fourth generation.

In recent years many people have become aware that future generations may not be able to live a life of quality in the conditions of the world we leave to them. This is obviously a concern of post-industrial mentality when one can assess the negative side of over-industrialisation. Hence a presence of future quite distinct from the one felt in past periods.

At the crossroads of past and future, *the individual has «to decide».* It has been abundantly argued that desire for more children is a result of the need for extra labour force (to collect

---

29   Article dated 24 May 1995 [archive version].

30   Peter Donaldson, *Nature against us*, 1990, Chapel Hill and London, page 55. *(Author's Note)*

water and wood, to work in the fields), a guarantee of security in old age. But most crucial is the inner desire «to see one's children's children».

Indeed, the question of pregnancy and childbirth cannot be seen only in a hyper-aseptic, technical way. If we do so, we are back under the dominant patriarchal system, mechanicist and promethean. Pregnancy and childbirth, though wrapped up in hazards and even pain, are for humans «the luminous face» of their participation in the story of creation.

It is exactly because the child who is born has the right to be lovingly expected and welcome that mastering the moment of pregnancy is a fundamental human responsibility. Deciding to have or not to have a child is an act of profound philosophical implications. Before we decide on «techniques» and «policies» we have to make it explicit.

In this context one can ask how free is the «free choice» or even if «choice» is there. In such fundamental matters choice is neither neutral nor discretionary. Women have always to weigh the options open in the context of their own conditions and of the conditions of those for whose well-being they are responsible, including the child to be born[31].

Childbearing cannot, should not, be dealt with apart from the understanding of *sexuality* in human life. Every individual has to understand his own existence in terms of all the dimensions of her/his being. Sexuality is one of them. It is clear that the high rate of adolescent girls who are pregnant is in close connection with a distorted education of girls as sexual beings.

A healthy sexual life is a condition of a free choice. But the frantic obsession with sexuality that is pervading the international scene (media, tourism) is probably not alien to the early sexual activity and to the downgrading of sexuality.

Family is in all civilisations the first milieu for the child socialisation. However diversified may be the tasks assigned to wife and husband in relation to the child, in all cultures the family is the milieu through which the child can be prepared to reach adulthood. The understanding of family is thus a very important factor in a *reconstruction of family* as community of purpose and affection.

The massive participation of women in professional and social activities creates a new type of problem counting very strongly in the decision about childbearing: the question of *compatibility between family and professional (and other) responsibilities*. This is a key-question in OECD countries (for instance, OECD High-level expert group on structural adjustment, 1991) and begins to be so among highly professional women in the South (for instance, in 1991 among 12 young women in Lagos/Nigeria, aged 26-36, with heavy professional responsibility, none had more than one child).

Though this fact «serves» the deceleration of population growth, we have to be aware that it often does so because of a heavy double burden on women. The low fertility rate of women in developed countries shouldn't fool us in the naive conviction that they have reached «full happiness». This represents still a transition period in the struggle of women for their full participation in social life and personal fulfilment.

---

31 Rosemary Ruether, «Reflexions on the word «free» in free choice», in *Conscience*, Catholics for a free choice, Summer 1994. *(Author's Note)*

In fact, the «free choice» carries with it socially constructed expectations. The family in which the person is born creates a fundamental context through which the labour division between the sexes is reinforced and perpetuated. The very experience of the family of origin gives the first socially constructed expectation about family life, childbearing, may it be by mimesis or by reaction.

In most societies, reasons of *self-esteem*, working in different ways for men and women, are important factors in the decisions about childbearing. In some cultures, men cannot acknowledge their infertility as they would soon become outcasts. Women are not free not to have children. In a subtle way, everything points out to their worth as depending on their having children. Women are still seen in our time, even at the hub of industrial society and even in zones where their participation in professional and social life is accepted and promoted, as being defined by the fact of *having children*.

Society produces as well expectations in more complex ways, giving a spread out rationale for maintaining the *statu quo* in economic and social life. The relation individuals maintain with childbearing is part of the hidden social contract. The process by which the person becomes autonomous – his/her individuation is decisive in order to be able «to choose freely» in the midst of socially constructed expectations. Hence, the importance of parenting and of the education of parents and future parents. If socialisation reinforces those expectations, it may also question them.

Reproductive rights are the result of rights of a different nature, some first, some second generation. In several national Constitutions such rights are spelled out: «right to constitute a family»; «right and duty to educate and to support their children», «right to physical and moral inviolability of all people»; «right to special protection during and after pregnancy»; «right to protection of family, for instance, family planning»; «right to health»; «motherhood and fatherhood as eminent social values».

Thus reproductive rights are at the cornerstone of respect and safeguard of Human Rights of women in what concerns their aptitude to childbearing. They are not new rights, but an *integrated way of looking at acknowledged rights*, enshrined in international documents. They give legal support to safe motherhood. As such, they can be considered *basic rights*, out of which other rights flow, and with which other rights interact.

We should not go around the bush in what concerns the state of affairs of «promoting population programmes» which did not respect the reproductive rights of women. In such instances, it is a violation of basic Human Rights that is at stake. There has been coercion – spoken and unspoken. Some governments and some international agencies cannot be excluded, as they were among the decisive factors of the «chain of coercion».

The interdependence of different rights is particularly relevant in the articulation of reproductive rights with the *right to education* and the *right to health*. But reproductive rights are in direct interplay with other rights, namely, health of the family, housing, water and sanitation, social environment in working community, overall physical environment, etc.

[In the following paragraphs we are going to concentrate only on the context of the right to health. We do so because «many health risks incurred by women are not incurred by men:

for instance, domestic violence, female genital mutilation, lesser attention to women's health in medical research, problems in reproductive health, lack of education for family planning, and special health risks for women at work.][32]

The right to reproductive health care cannot be isolated from the broader question of *the status of the social, economic and cultural rights as full Human Rights*. The world is at the beginning in all this, but this is the deep underneath current that we need to pursue[33].

However, the right to health – of which the right to reproductive health is a part – is still very far from being universal.

It is striking to see the «WHO'S historically rooted ambivalence about defining health in terms of a right»[34]. This expresses the conflicting views on the right to health.

In the international documents concerned with the right to health there are the provisions by which human beings are entitled to the means necessary for the protection and safeguard of their health. The most important normative text in terms of the right to reproductive health is the Declaration of Alma Ata on «primary health care» which states, within the eight elements of primary health care, maternal and child health care including family planning[35].

Of course, the frame for the right to health is given by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) in its Article 12 which reads as follows:

1) The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of *the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.*
2) The steps to be taken by the States Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include those necessary for:
a) *the provision for the reduction of stillbirth-rate and of infant mortality and for the healthy development of the child;*
b) the improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene;
c) the prevention, treatment and control of epidemic, endemic, occupational and other diseases;
d) the creation of conditions which would assure to all medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

This has led to the WHO'$_S$ goals and targets which «serve to ensure the survival and healthy development of special groups of the population»:

---

32 Virginia Leary, «The right to health in international human rights law», in *Health and Human Rights*, 1994, vol.1, no.I, page 50. *(Author's Note)*

33 Virginia Leary, ibid, pages 24-56. *(Author's Note)*

34 Aart Hendriks in *The Right to Health*, *European Journal of Health Law*, vol. 1, no.2, 1994, page 188. *(Author's Note)*

35 «WHO Position Paper – Health in Social Development», presented at the *World Summit for Social Development.* Copenhagen, March 1995, page 23. *(Author's Note)*

Goal   To ensure survival and health development of children

Target   The infant mortality rate will not exceed 50 per 1000 live births

Target   The mortality rate among children under five years of age will not exceed 70 per 1000 live births

Target   The proportion of low birth weight (less than 2.5 kg) will be reduced to less than 10%

Target   At least 90% of the children under one year of age will be immunised against these six diseases: diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus, measles, poliomyelitis and tuberculosis.

Goal   To improve the health and well-being of women

Target   The maternal mortality rate will be reduced by 50%

Target   All pregnant women will have protection with tetanus toxoid, access to prenatal care, trained attendants during childbirth and referral facilities for high-risk pregnancies and obstetrical emergencies

Target   Disability-free life expectancy at birth will increase by 15% in all populations[36].

It is the task of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (established in 1987) to contribute to *the enforcement of Economic, Social, Cultural Rights*. It has confirmed the view that «individual and collective interests are in direct line with each other». The Committee investigated regularly (E/C.12/1987/SR.8) «infant mortality rate, health care facilities for pregnant women». «The right to health can only be implemented in freedom and in the absence of any constraint that might prejudice personal well-being»[37].

As the analysis made by the Council of Europe has shown, «... the elevation of these values to Human Rights status must, as an absolute minimum, mean that they, and whatever measures are necessary to secure their realisation, are not negotiable»[38]. Though this is the path to go through in consistency with the generalized acceptance at Cairo of the concept of reproductive rights as basic rights, there is no doubt that the general political atmosphere is far from accepting all the consequences. As long as these difficulties prevail, there is no way to make the 20/20 proposal operative.

The question at stake is at the heart of establishing priorities in public policies today. The fundamental reason is that

> *the proposition that minimum core economic and social rights ought to be accorded to every individual is still almost automatically made subject by decision-makers to an economic calculus which will often culminate in various economically compelling reasons as to why such rights can simply not be recognised*[39].

---

36   «WHO Position Paper», *ibidem*, page 21. *(Author's Note)*

37   Aart Hendriks, *ibidem*, page 190. *(Author's Note)*

38   «Human rights at the dawn of the 21st century». Proceedings of the Interregional meeting organised by the Council of Europe in advance of the World Conference on Human Rights, Palais de l'Europe, Strasbourg, 28-30 January 1993, page 66, par. 26. *(Author's Note)*

39   «Human rights at the dawn of the 21st», *ibidem*, Page 66, par. 26. *(Author's Note)*

From numbers to
quality of life[40]

There was a revolution at the Cairo Conference. People – with their lives, feelings, needs, aspirations and expectations – have taken their place at the centre of the discussion of population development. There is no science, technology, policy or development program that can replace your right and ability to decide your own destiny.

In the years leading up to the Conference, the inadequacy of the approaches followed by many 'population programmes' had already made itself felt. The alarm bells the demographics set off regarding population growth, composition, and mobility, given their relevance, made the allocation of integrated policies for this area insufficient. Failure to take into account other aspects interrelated with people's quality of life could even lead to a distortion of the broader objectives of development. This became more evident in the many situations in which those behind the 'population programmes' and 'development projects' had similar objectives. Moreover, the balanced, well-thought-out decisions of previous Population Conferences, especially the Bucharest Action Plan, were far from being implemented at a national level or taken into account in the International Development Strategies.

In the Public Hearings, led by the Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life, particularly in South Asia and Latin America, there were loud and clear voices about the 'social cost' of unilateral and non-integrated 'population programmes'. The analysis was very acute: 'Viewing the population situation as a problem of numbers has seriously damaged the quality of life of peoples living in countries where population control programs are promoted'. Dissenting voices became even louder: 'The obsession with numbers, percentages and *ratios* has to be abandoned if people's interests are to come first'. Women felt more than anyone the consequences of programmes that were merely quantitative, without having a voice and therefore feeling left out. As one young woman from Bangladesh put it,

> *'Women have children, they don't have a population!'*

---

40 Article published in *Do serviço social*. Journal of the Association of Social Service Professionals, special issue (1995), pp. 24-27.

New concepts and new approaches, as well as a more integrated formulation of the population question, have become essential. A 'context of alternative policies'[41] such as 'fresh analyses of the population-development ratio'[42] have become the cornerstones of effective population policies.

What was at stake was more than simply reinforcing the existing 'population initiatives'. Rather, it was a redefinition of the population problem by a reformulation that took into account the many dimensions of this issue.

The Cairo Conference contributed decisively to this redefinition, mainly because the question of the global population was raised to the level of a challenge for the entire world community. And it did so not as an extension of the Malthusian concepts of the past but as a courageous commitment to the future.

Indeed, if we are incapable, as we seem to be at a global level, of pooling resources and organising our institutions to include 1.3 billion human beings living in total deprivation, how will we then in the next 30 years, take care of the three billion that will be born from the generations currently of reproductive age?

An important step in Cairo took place – the consensual recognition of the crucial role of women at all levels of the population problem. By prioritising women's decision-making autonomy in relation to the human reproduction chain, the international community has expressed the political will to do more than eliminate discrimination against women, and even more than reaffirm their rights. It has committed itself to ensuring state policies capable of supporting a coherent population policy. This is particularly evident in decisions on the implementation of social policies.

Of course, these are not easy to implement, because we still lack the general understanding that social policies are an important guarantor of the primacy of democracy over market dictates. With the notion that social rights are merely indicative and do not imply an immediate accountability of state policies, most Governments often fail to define and implement social policies. At best, they are considered correctives of economic deficits in times of crisis and are seldom recognised as crucial in government programmes.

In this context, it is urgent to acquire new perspectives on the role of social policies in the effectiveness of the realistic objectives for the population and Quality of Life. If we want to respond to the new demands of the population issue, there is no alternative: social policies will have to become the focus of political action. Educated and healthy human beings should be able to make informed choices in all aspects of their lives, to care for others and the environment, and thus to build their own society.

Among social policies, women's education and health are recognised as decisive elements in women's ability to determine their reproductive life. In fact, how can we launch family planning programmes that respect the quality of life of women when we look at the

41   T.K. Sundary Ravindran, 'Women and the Politics of Population and Development in India," in 'Reproductive Health Matters," No. 1, 1993, pp. 26-38. *(Author's Note)*

42   Paul Demeny, 'Population and development", IUSSP Distinguished Lecture Series, 1994. (Author's Note)

statistics that reveal a total neglect? How can new technologies be introduced that require medical supervision in countries (in the case of nations south of the Sahara) where there is just one single doctor for 36 000 inhabitants? Where there are no toilets and no access to safe water? How can we grant women their reproductive rights if schooling still reaches less than 20% of them in countries like Mali?

There are enormous difficulties in this area. Some decades of development effort have not yet eliminated illiteracy among women. Awareness of the terrible consequences lack of schooling has on fertility rates should be enough of an incentive to boost educational programs. It obliges governments to forcibly move towards innovative multimedia solutions to guarantee women everywhere the basic education to which they are entitled. It can even mean an indispensable turning point in the universal right of access to education.

Equally, reproduction rights require new approaches to safeguarding and protecting reproductive health. As part of the panoply of human rights and fundamental guarantees (the right to inviolability of the human body, the right to safeguarding the family and the right to health), reproductive rights are inseparable from the right to primary health care. Once again, full exercise of reproductive rights, under satisfactory conditions, gives the opportunity to reformulate government health policies and provides fresh perspectives on the difficult ethical choices to be made in setting health policy priorities.

In addition to the importance of health and education, other social policies must be reconsidered – housing, urbanism, transport and even energy, each in its own way, a decisive factor in determining balanced population dynamics and in consolidating the quality of life of populations. The next few years require urgent research for the firm establishment of these relationships as well as for obtaining a political vision that allows us to implement the policies no less firmly.

Thus, when it comes to population issues, the aim is to implement clear priorities for social development and direct the goals of economic growth towards Quality of Life for all. At the end of the twentieth century, these priorities are driven by the fundamental concern of how to place human beings at the centre, so that Quality of Life is available to all. The human aspect of the population-development (and environment) binomial is unparalleled. Humans cannot be dispensed with or merely be left on standby in the acknowledged battle of wills between population, development and the environment. They are the subject and ultimate goal of all social processes.

The upcoming UN Conferences are opportunities to deepen these convictions and to reaffirm the commitment of all countries to the policies that will guarantee the quality of life of future generations.

On the threshold of the
third millennium[43]

INTRODUCTION – A WORLD IN TRANSITION

The global process of moving from accelerated population growth to a slower pace of growth calls such a demography the *'demographic transition'*. The move to lower relative growth does not mean immediate stabilisation; the population will continue to grow in absolute numbers over several decades to come.

It thus appears as a probability, far exceeding a mere quantitative evaluation of the population. During the demographic transition, other transitional processes in its orbit lend it a certain unpredictability. But being an unavoidable reality of the evolution of humans on the planet, *it is endowed with the metaphorical character of the other transitions that characterise our time.*

From 1989 onwards, countries with central planning economies opened up to the market economy and were henceforth called *'countries of economies in transition'*. The difficulties encountered in this process, as well as the acceleration of the globalisation of economic concerns, have led to a gigantic process of economic transition. It is true that national economies already included foreign participation in production, trade or investment, but these were contained within national borders. Today we are moving towards a *total globalisation in the economic-financial domain*. As this globalisation does not yet have global mechanisms capable of controlling it, the resulting transition process is an open road towards a totally unknown future.

At the same time, in little more than 20 years, the impact of production and consumption methods on the quality of the environment is becoming perceptible on a global scale. The difficulty in recognising, in practice, that environmental problems – air quality, water, soil, climatic conditions necessary for the survival of human beings – know no boundaries and must be dealt with globally, is inexorably leading us towards major global ecological catastrophes. It is another transition process that unfolds before us and with us – *the transition from a nature unaffected by history to a nature that is part of history and an expression of the technological legacy of humanity.*

---

43   Talk presented in Évora on June 13, 1996 [archive version].

As a backdrop and as a sought after – if not yet effective – engine driving the conceptual, technical and political transformations taking place in the world, we have embarked upon another transitional process of immense complexity – that of the transition to democratic regimes in the newest countries or those that have emerged from totalitarian regimes. But it is also *the transition to democracy where, in fact, power arises from the people, is there for the people to use, is shared by the people.* New conditions of citizenship are yet to be discovered, although here and there some concrete experiences point to the potential scope of this citizenship, responding to the need for transition to societies and a global world where new forms of democracy are possible.

The global transition of which only some elements are described here has features common to all areas. Thus, the myth of linear growth, of so-called progress, with the correlative notion of success, as well as competitiveness as the natural order of things, is being called into question. What appears to us on the horizon is a slow evolution or growth, the need to stabilise key factors, the interaction of what exists and is practiced with the new data.

The myth of a vertical ascent of history has been blurred to give way to a degree of horizontality pointing in all sorts of directions. As we cross it, we come face-to-face with the principle of uncertainty: everything is probable, nothing is completely predictable. As Paulo Freire said, transition is a reality in transit, in passing, emptying itself of a known model and plunging into an as yet unknown situation.

The moment of time we are currently experiencing is thus felt as indeterminacy, conflict, and insecurity.

I. A CONSIDERABLE POPULATION OF A CERTAIN AGE AND GEOGRAPHICAL CONCENTRATION

The human blueprint for the Third Millennium – how many of us there are, who we are, where we live, how we live – reveals to us *a transitional process* that, while already unfolding before our eyes, is sure to become ever more noticeable.

The *world's population* will continue to grow. The speed of growth over the last seven decades has achieved a *momentum* the effect of which will be felt for a few more decades, without a doubt into the next century to come – and this despite the fact that this 'speed' (more properly called the population growth rate) has been slowly declining since the 1960s.

The population of 'today' (year 2000) is (will be) six billion people, while in 1930 it was two billion. This number tripled in just 70 years. Previous growth used to me much slower – to get from one to two billion, it took more than a century. Even so, growth is around 88 million people a year – roughly equivalent *grosso modo* to ten Swedens a year or one Latin America every five years!

Even if the pace is decreasing, the world population will increase by the year of 2050 to an additional 4.1 billion. This number corresponds to the totality of the inhabitants of the planet in 1975!

But *who* will these nearly 10 billion people be? The physiognomy of the Northern Hemisphere – where today 16% of the world population lives – will have changed little since just 1% of this population increase will have come from there. On the other hand, most countries in the Southern Hemisphere will see their population increase to such an extent that no economic upturn, however well managed, will be able to keep pace with this population growth.

About 45% of the population of the South is less than 15 years old; this proportion will increase even further in countries with higher fertility rates. The elderly population will also increase across the board and, paradoxically, in countries where the education and health services assure the stability of the population, this increase will be even greater, amounting to a new problem of *population structure*, as is already happening in the Northern Hemisphere.

About 40% of the population will live in large cities (with more than eight million inhabitants), of which only two are in the Northern Hemisphere.

The above numbers and conditions are only probable estimates, taking into account projections made by the United Nations.

II. GROWING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL INEQUALITIES

We find, in economic transition, a fundamental paradox: *the wealth of the world increases, but economic disparities between people, social groups, and countries also increase.* New perspectives are therefore needed to make it possible to use wealth to guarantee a minimum income for all human beings.

Let us look at some numbers that make the irrationality of the economy blatant. Since World War II, economic growth numbers speak for themselves. Such as the following:

— product growth: four times in real terms;
— growth of industrial production: 40 times;
— growth of energy consumption: 20 times;
— cereal production growth: three times;
— growth in foreign trade: seven times[44].

These numbers, which play off one another, would lead one to imagine greater wealth for the entire planet. But, at the same time, other factors contradict the beneficial effects of such growth and reveal their ambiguity in a world not yet prepared to manage the complexity of a globalised economy and not yet aware of the ontological solidarity that imposes, in terms of values, the choices needed for a better Quality of Life for all.

It is, from the outset, the reality of the transition that we used as a metaphor: the population has grown faster than economic growth. Even in the case of a fair distribution of wealth (a

---

44 These data are also found in the text 'The revolt of nature".

purely virtual exercise since the economic conditions of each country are closely linked to its history), *the available money is not enough to cope with population growth over the last five decades.*

Secondly, the Cold War – which coincided with the period of greatest economic growth – diverted primarily towards military investment the benefits of economic growth and prevented a harmonious development of all societies. During the Cold War, one of the frequent proposals called for military industrial complexes to be converted into production units of goods indispensable to meet basic needs. Now that the Cold War is over, this proposal has proved difficult to put into practice. *Production has expanded in almost all countries to other domains, but its own makeup has since changed thanks to the IT revolution, and this changeover has not proved to be workable.* It is a complex and difficult operation.

In addition, *in almost all countries of the Southern Hemisphere, priority is given to military expenditure*, relegating spending on the basic needs of populations to a secondary level. At the same time, *most Western countries (notably those with a permanent seat on the Security Council) continue to make arms sales one of their most important sources of revenue.*

In addition to these factors, the *end of the Cold War revealed tensions that had been dormant* and were yet to flare up because of the detente between the two superpowers. The erosion of this equilibrium, which kept each country within their respective zones of influence, has given rise to conflicts that have amounted to some 80 wars since 1989. The new conflicts lead to the localised destruction of a country's wealth, impede development, while cutting a whole people off from world trade.

The major economic and social objectives that led to the creation of the United Nations were put to one side: *the swords were not transformed into ploughs.*

Even the ploughs have become inefficient: there are no longer the conditions available for everyone to have enough to eat. The UN had committed itself to eliminating hunger. In spite of this, the number of those who bear 'the cruelty of the simple burden of survival' increases. *Throughout these decades, development has been talked about and in the end, misery has increased.* The numbers clearly state this injustice rooted in the evolution of the history of our time:

— in 1970: there were 944 million poor;
— in 1985: this number is 1.156 billion;
— in 1994, reaching 1.3 billion[45].

This blatant growth of inequalities between human beings is at the same time a quantitative and qualitative phenomenon.

I speak in numbers because, even if one poor person deserves to improve his or her life, I want all to see the many faces of the poverty we know today. But the quantitative is nonetheless *a qualitative analysis of poverty*. We know that it is *cumulative*: to low incomes we should add instability and precariousness; to such an extent that several stages of failure lead to a

---

45   These data are also found in the text 'The Revolt of Nature'.

level of chronic malnutrition that will inevitably result in a health breakdown; limited access to education and health services prevents any improvement in the short or medium term.

This set of material conditions will determine *the existence of qualitative factors that exacerbate the poverty situation:* the precariousness of existence leads to a lack of control over one's life and dependence on others; and so begins the inexorable process of humiliation of the powerless, with the corrosive effects of despair, cynicism in the face of everything, and lack of faith in the future. Poverty is not a chapter in the story but a tangle of causes and consequences.

Thus, *development did not 'absorb' poverty*. It, which had been viewed as a global process of society – 'the capacity of society to confront its own history with its very own cultural evolution', became restrictive and ended up being nothing but development in an economic sense.

It is not irrelevant, in this unmooring of such an important concept for human well-being, the paradox, on the one hand, of the UN speaking, over four decades, of the 'participation' of all citizens in development as a global process and, on the other hand, other bodies born of the United Nations system – the World Bank and the IMF – making the economy the ultimate goal of social processes and development itself.

Symptomatic of the despair of the peoples, it is significant to note the radical transformation from the aspiration for an *endogenous kind of development* – still pronounced in the first half of the 1970s – to the unconditional adherence to a *single model*, one that, by increasing the disparity between North and South, has even led us to the point where we can see a North in the South and a South in the North.

The transition to a necessarily qualitative tendency – which does not abandon the quantitative goals that guarantee survival – has led the Independent World Commission on Population and Quality of Life to use and set as its standard *the sustained improvement in 'Quality of Life' resulting from the systematic application of fundamental Human Rights,* contained in the two International Covenants on Rights.

The practical application of this guideline involves: pressure on the international community to make its decisions effective; pressure on the European continent, as the beginning of the recognition of social rights; contributing to the coordination of the poorest to help them find their own solutions. In this perspective, *in addition to social policies oriented towards the whole population, it is imperative to establish national strategies to eradicate poverty,* involving specific credit conditions, promoting and supporting their coordination, stimulating the IT sector and micro-enterprises, bringing people's services closer together.

V. CONCLUSION: IN THE COURSE OF TRANSITION, AN ETHICS OF 'RESPONSIBILITY'

Faced with the demands of the spectacular increase in population of the planet; with the massive violation of Human Rights poverty constitutes in a world of growing global wealth where inequalities are becoming ever more acute; with the violation of Nature and the obsolete and

inhumane character of the economic system that legitimises it – thanks to production and consumer trends oriented towards the cravings and greed of the few, while the many lack the essential conditions for Quality of Life – an ethical principle for humanity is required without compromise: *the principle of responsibility.*

Contrary to the conviction that freedom is the starting point of life in society – yes, as a statute of the individual human being – another conviction is also making itself felt that freedom has a deeper foundation: it has its roots in responsibility. It is not a simple feeling, but a way of behaving that characterises all parts of life. Nothing is neutral. Everything is geared.

Knowledge and the rise in technology and wealth have made us more aware of the intrinsic vulnerability of humanity, of nature, of each being in its own individuality. This vulnerability not only responds to the principle of justice, but also to our concern for the other, for the natural world. *Compassion goes hand in hand with competency.* Compassion restores the paths of integrity. And *in it lies in the strength of responsibility that does not retreat, that interacts, that takes the risk of living with others and for others.*

The revolt of nature[46]

Globalisation has manifested itself, seemingly, in the revolt of Nature.

History has always been based on the assumption that nature constantly renewed itself and provided all that was needed for human life and activity. Nature was a contextual part of history, something that 'was there', separate from us and the Promethean dreams that guided mankind.

Unwritten millennial rules guided agricultural, forestry and fishing activity, ensuring respect for the richness of nature, in the certainty that there resided the source of sustenance for all the human race. Harmony between men and nature reigned supreme, disturbed solely by 'natural catastrophes' which men feared but knew they were not responsible for.

Admittedly, this harmony was not innocent. In all civilisations there was the assumption that nature served humankind, and it was our prerogative to dominate it.

But mercantile society already understood that it was possible to create wealth with new forms of dominion over nature. This dominion, introducing a different qualitative relationship between men and the natural world, has occurred gradually and in tucked away corners of the planet, often veiled behind the colonialist logic of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

In the last 150 years, there has been a radical transformation.

In the first place, industrialisation has come to see nature as an inexhaustible source of 'raw materials'. Nature is no longer a historical context and a pacific source of sustenance. It becomes a 'thing' to be exploited by industrialisation.

Urbanisation accentuates this dominion over nature which men suppose has no will of its own. The city spreads out, occupying the space that belonged to nature, often its best terrain. In order to make the city viable for modern transportation, small watercourses, already subject to alternating maximum flow and drought, are covered with cement; in periods of great rainfall, precipitation has nowhere to drain, only this very cement, and thus flooding the city. Urbanisation also creates a mass of waste that turns nature into a vast cemetery of 'stuff'.

A third factor reinforces the effects of industrialisation and urbanisation: the world population in 1830 (shortly after Brazil's independence) is estimated to have been about one

---

46   Talk presented at the end of the 1990s (probably in 1997, in Brazil) [archive version].

billion people; a century later, in 1930, it had doubled; 70 years later, in the year 2000, this population will have tripled, reaching six billion people.

Although growth is slowing (the turning point occurring between 1965 and 1970), the *momentum* continues to be around 88 million people per year, which is equivalent to one Latin America every five years! By 2050, give or take a couple of decades, a total of 4.1 billion will have been added to today's six billion which was the size of the world's population in 1975! As only 1% of this growth will be in the Northern Hemisphere, this means that upon the tormented Southern Hemisphere incalculable repercussions will take their toll.

These three phenomena, in themselves and their interactions, transform nature into an integral part of society and history.

There is no doubt today that most of what has happened is irreversible. It is not only first-hand experience that tells us this when, throughout our very lives, we have seen the farmland or forests near us 'disappear'. It is physics itself, in the words of, among others, Nobel Laureate Ilya Prygogine, who tells us that Lavoisier is definitely dead and gone: it is not true that nothing is created, and nothing is lost. The losses of physical, chemical, biological phenomena will never be ours again – if anything they will be heading, in the form of dissipative energy, to the nearest black hole in the universe!

It is not possible, therefore, to devise any economic or social policy today without taking this new reality into account. It must be a determining factor in choosing the location of motorways and railways, lead to informed decision-making on means of transport, establish the conditions for implementation and operation of industry, and intervene in the regulation of urban space.

The 'revolt of nature' today explicitly politicises all technical decisions and obliges us to place concrete limits on the dominion of man over nature. If only because nature's revolt does not manifest itself in one place alone.

Air, flowing freely over countries and continents, transports radioactivity, as we have already seen with Chernobyl, to regions thousands of kilometres away; it inundates Southeast Asia with toxic gases following the fires in the Indonesian or Sarawak forests; it covers whole countries with toxic gases (especially CO_2) that result from the use of fossil fuels in transport, domestic life and industry.

Water, whether from rivers or oceans, has lost its marvellous freshness and purity. For example, Belgium does not have a single unpolluted source: fertiliser nitrates have polluted all water. The oceans are getting to be much the same. On the European side of the Atlantic the situation is disastrous (South West England and the coast of Bordeaux: 2,000 non-degradable objects per square metre on the continental shelf, the eventual disappearance of marine fauna and flora).

The land is hit by droughts and floods that make human livelihoods increasingly problematic.

When nature called to arms, the ecologists rallied. But its cause can no longer be just that of a handful of people considered 'idealistic.' This time represents the very core of citizenship that is called to face what could mean the end of human life on the planet. And who

is making their voice heard? It is, to the astonishment of many, the World Bank, which, in its report this year, notes that 'concern is emerging that only a major ecological disaster will be able to incite countries to take concerted action'.

It is up to citizens to keep in mind some governing ethical principles.

In the first place, not everything scientifically and technically possible is humanly and socially acceptable. As it is, we belong to a civilisation that considers limits a condition of human existence.

Secondly, penalisation does not remove its effects; it is at its source that we must staunch the factors that are sure to make the planet uninhabitable.

And here is the inconsistency of the prevailing principle – 'the polluter pays' – or the total immorality of the American proposal for Kyoto in seeking to open globally 'a market for pollution allowances'.

Two words about these two mechanisms. The 'polluter pays' principle, in the European Union for example, is seen as little but a short-term perspective that bears the illusion of reparable damage. No doubt, claims for immediate compensation are made and reimbursed without delay. But most of the effects of pollution are diffuse, difficult to prove, and border-less. The principle is nothing more than an attempt to adapt obsolete concepts to productive processes in place at the present time.

The 'pollution allowance market' principle is unacceptable in all respects, be they moral or economic. This comes down essentially to the following: taking into account that the need to cut greenhouse gas emissions, particularly those that contribute to the greenhouse effect, would have a harmful effect on the US and consequently the world economy, the US has proposed that pollution levels be bought and sold worldwide. Industrial ventures in countries lacking strong capital reserves and abundant in cheap labour, without the constraints imposed upon the United States, would be able to sell their share of pollution rights thus allowing industrialised countries to continue on the same path and pump dollars through developing countries.

The very presuppositions of this reasoning amount to a declaration of war: that poor countries, with their population on the increase, unable to respond to basic needs, remain poor! As for us, we prop up, well off and with increasing purchasing power, the world economy!

But who is the global economy intended for? Just industrialised nations? I would not be surprised if nature's revolt was a portent of all the world's poor taking a stand! And I have no doubt this is the trap down which our time will surely fall.

II. A THIRD INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

It has become clear that nature's revolt was clearly connected to the second element of globalisation: the beginning of a third industrial revolution.

Let's be quite clear. What is at stake in globalisation is not industry itself, the production of the goods we need and the adding of value to the goods from which we start. What is

at stake is the recognition of the existence of a new 'industrial equation' resulting from the transformation of the production process.

Such an equation is spatially fragmented, to such an extent that the decision to produce something and the final product cross countries and continents. Just one example in a low-complexity industry: a women's garment company is based in Grenoble, France; the *design* comes from Italy; fabric production and quality control takes place in China; manufacturing in Hong Kong and Thailand; the finishing of the final product in the Philippines; *marketing* is back in Grenoble. The complexity of this fragmentation speaks for itself. Not only are traditional industrial management categories insufficient, not one single country can solve the production equation on its own.

In the equation itself, these categories have changed in scale and essential composition, each of them carrying their own weight of globalisation and making production a phenomenon so marked by globalisation that we need to see it as an entirely new means of production.

Upstream, we continue to find the capital invested or there to invest. The profound change that capital manifests is its ability to move instantaneously across the globe through financial transactions that are exempt from state regulation and over which there is no global control at all. The volume of such transactions is of such magnitude that a minimum charge of 0.01% per transaction would create a saving sufficient to eradicate world poverty.

The labour factor is dispersed across the various units and subunits of production; this dispersion makes it even more vulnerable than it was at the beginning of industrialisation, since it has acquired an unprecedented volatility that is difficult to manage. And it is the former that will be penalised if the results are not as expected. The unions have not yet found a way to deal with the new problems that this massive displacement brings.

Upstream, knowledge, subject to a patent regime that has totally perverted the logic that led to its creation, has gained new importance. It was intended at the outset to protect the one who had an operational idea or to guarantee intellectual property. Patents today twist the concept of the universality of knowledge – which I imagine is dear to this Academy – to make it a thing, an asset to be exploited, subject, therefore, to the laws of a market that is particularly ruthless and imperialist. It is enough to remember that, in one of the branches of industry, which has grown proportionately in recent years, that is, biotechnology-focused industries, patents are recognised not by the mandate of an international body but by the patent-granting body in the US! We are faced with a cover-up of globalisation that affects one of the deepest values of civilisation – the universal character of knowledge.

At the heart of the industrial equation, two factors are dominant: new technologies and energy. Apart from the question of knowledge, which is also present in the new technologies, the question of energy is today a global problem. The growth of economies is largely based on the available energy base. It has been widely demonstrated that the perpetuation of the use of fossil fuels in industrialised countries and the spread to new geographical areas (i.e. the Southern Hemisphere) will contribute decisively to the greenhouse effect, the consequences of which will be catastrophic with the disappearance of coastal areas such as Bangladesh, the Pacific Islands, the Netherlands (and I cite just obvious examples chosen at random).

Globalisation imposes global strategies on the dominion of energy sources. How? There is research on new non-polluting and renewable energies. Already in 1989 at a conference of international experts on renewable energies, it was unanimous that the viability of these energies at competitive cost would be confirmed within a few years, provided States made a joint effort, pooling available human and financial resources for what would be a new 'Manhattan Project', designed to produce results in a very short time. In work carried out between 1992 and 1995 by the Independent World Commission on Population and Quality of Life, the same recommendation was made. In the face of the inertia or isolationism of governments, it is the citizens who play a decisive role.

The new citizenship has, in the formation of a common will on energy, a moral duty that cannot be delayed, since the increase of energy consumption with the fossil fuels directly places in jeopardy the survival of future generations.

But the industrial equation still has two important vectors at the global scale. I am referring not only to the final product but also to by-products and waste. I don't really believe that any industrial activity whose by-products or waste affect or will affect human life is justifiable. That is why the need for transparency on the industrial policies of each country also appears to me as an integral part of citizenship. (I am moved whenever I see – in my own small and poor country – resistance to the installation of landfills or even incinerators by rural populations with a very low level of education. And when the president of the municipality or even the smallest of territorial districts, the parish council, allow themselves to be tempted by the paybacks offered to the locality by central government, the population reacts, blocking the road and preventing entry to the chosen venue, until the political establishment is forced to negotiate.)

In every technical or conceptual component of the production process, globalisation demands the protection, conservation and rehabilitation of Nature, along with the unequivocal intention to respect and support Human Rights, not only for those whom the goods produced are intended but also those who play their part in the various locations in which production nowadays unfolds. And I do not wish to brush aside, as if they were just a triviality, the ethics of respect, reverence, harmony, and care for nature.

I see this set of attitudes going hand-in-hand with a notion of citizenship that, far from being limited to basic civil and political rights, grants social, economic and cultural rights equal dignity and importance. And furthermore: it is a notion of citizenship that brings into line with these rights the responsibilities that are correlative to them.

The productive process is not self-sufficient. It is always in a complementary relationship with consumption. The entire structure of production is now embedded in *marketing* – to the point where one can legitimately ask where the starting point is.

If the structures of production require a new approach and, at the individual political level, a new kind of citizenship, what about the patterns of consumption that have engulfed the entire planet and leave more than a quarter of humanity at the door? The burden of consumer habits can be summed up in few words: the impact of a child born in the USA on its life-support systems is twice that of a child born in Sweden, three times that of Italy, 13 times that of Brazil, 35 times India, 140 times Bangladesh!

These numbers represent the immense disparity between different peoples in spite of economic growth. At its foundation, the United Nations thought that it could end hunger, illiteracy, everything that was then thought to be essentially attributable to the existing colonial order. Nowadays, it must be acknowledged that 'swords did not turn into ploughs'.

However, there has been a radical transformation in the aspirations of the peoples and their leaders. In the 1970s, endogenous development paths were sought, taking into account the cultural matrix of each people. After the fall of communism, a 'winner-takes-all' mentality became the norm: only one model shapes political decision-making. This model seems to be only a part of globalisation – in reality it is a path leading to uniformity.

The notion of citizenship, in particular for those scientists who deal most directly with the impact of economic and social factors, as well as the activists who are dedicated to improving the Quality of Life of the poorest, is ripe for investigation and intervention.

III. THE GLOBALISATION OF INFORMATION

The third area in which globalization manifests itself is a non-place within the material space of things.

When we meet here in this prestigious setting, in this country where emotions generate thought and thought infuses our emotions, when we are here, we are occupying a space crossed by a thousand information highways; we have at our fingertips what is happening on the Tokyo or Frankfurt Stock Exchanges; we just have to reach out and 'grasp' with the other senses at our disposal the information that confirms or invalidates what I have been saying.

Communication is instantaneous and global. We have an example of this in the rapidity with which the financial catastrophe of the Asian Tigers had an impact on Brazil. (Regardless of the analysis of each of the measures adopted, the rapidity with which the Brazilian President and Government reacted to this phenomenon goes to show what kind of leadership the world needs.)

We recently were given an example of a very different nature. Simultaneously all over the world, we watched holding back the tears the funeral of a young princess who, thanks to her beauty and charisma, had captivated us all without our knowing it. On that day – and every time the BBC mentioned the probable number of those tuning in to watch the event – I knew I had clear proof how the globalisation of information makes real and understandable what Teilhard de Chardin had called the noosphere, this layer of humanity linked by invisible threads of reality, which involves, without interruption, the planet and thus interacts with the atmosphere and biosphere.

There are of course many questions still to be answered:

— What to do with so much, and such frequent, contradictory information?

— How to deal with the emotional overload it represents?
— Is selective indifference the only way to deal with the abundance of information?

Moreover, all this information is given to us mainly in one language – the lingua franca of our time, English. On the one hand, thanks to the omnipresence of this language, being part of the noosphere is reinforced, since we do not need to have our words interpreted; but on the other we undergo the perverse effect of using one single language to subordinate thought to a single template of conceptualisation.

I cannot separate the globalisation of information from its underlying premises:

— freedom of expression as the founder of a democratic spirit, no longer limited to select nations, but truly an integral part of a democratic spirit demanded of the whole world;
— the existence of a global civil society that filters information, which acts with the instruments it provides and which creates new entities of political power without territorial support;
— the ability to discover in each particular situation, conveyed by information, what is universal.

Just a brief word about each of these points – are we in a democratic world?
— What does representative democracy mean, on a global scale?
— Who represents who?
— Is there a contradiction between representative democracy, as we know it, and the project that addresses the globalised world?
— And will it make sense to talk about such a project at a national level?
— Is it still in the monolithism of political parties that the alternatives to the single model lie?
— Where can the legitimacy of government be found – in the dynamics of political partisanship or in public opinion, as suggested some time ago by Michel Rocard? But given the erratic nature of public opinion, can one say that the opinion of the masses is a sign of political will, as Jean Baudrillard claimed?

In a globalised and interconnected world, I believe that the project emerges from the conditions that guarantee a better Quality of Life in the short, medium and long term and for every group of human beings, within the framework of the nation-state.

It seems to me that it is in the continuous back and forth between the global and the national that the global civil society must make itself felt. Only it can guarantee the mobilisation of social actors which can also be consciously present in the globalised world.

It is civil society, as a whole, that has to kick off the process of awareness that implicates the world we live in. It can also lead not only to intervention in the founding institutions of caring societies but also stimulate the formation of partnerships, alliances and coalitions.

This constant interaction between what is happening around us and the vastness of the world is not easy. It presupposes the formation of a citizenship capable of discovering the universal in the individual.

Because we do not experience the globalised world as a whole, in some kind of demiurgic illusion of self-perception. Contrary to a connected, evident universality, as we always live it (when we live it) we seek another kind of universality to build the necessary bridges between our local reality and our conception of the global.

CONCLUSION

The revolt of nature, the third industrial revolution, instantaneous information, as they constitute some of the most evident manifestations of a globalised world, require a new learning of citizenship, freed from the 'contagion of vulgarity'.

Citizenship must respond to the consequences of the tendency towards fragmentation and individualism that are clearly the counterpoint of globalisation.

To act as our guide I think we need to bear in mind the attitudes and values that a whole philosophical train of thought – from Hannah Arendt to Hans Jonas and Emmanuel Lévinas – considers as forming part of the 'responsibility principle'.

That is born of the personal awareness of being part of a noosphere to which only the era of globalisation lends material support.

That, while acknowledging the status of freedom of each individual, it imposes this freedom of responsibility as the ontic basis of being, which endows us with a set of values which make us conscious, contemporary citizens of our time.

This responsibility of citizenship is neither given nor spontaneous, in which 'the metaphysical importance of the smallest gesture' reveals itself.

It requires us to plunge into the heart of the matter and of ourselves; a journey to other faraway places and around our own room; a journey of which we are only vaguely aware and a voyage of discovery with our intelligence, our sensations, our emotions. That is why Bernardo Soares says:

> *There are great journeys to be made*
> *if only we had soul enough*
> *to take those first steps.*

Do we have a soul?

If we do – and how could we believe we don't – then the steps are ours to take.

And so, in the here and now, in this globalised world that is ours, citizenship is fulfilled in its entirety.

Poverty and economic
and social rights[47]

INTRODUCTION

Two words of introduction: one on the unprecedented nature of what is happening and the other a clarification on the idea of poverty.

The topics covered here this morning are *a first* for Europe and for international institutions such as this.

Ten to fifteen years ago, it was impossible for the traditional political class to accept the principle of the indivisibility of rights. In the 1986 presidential elections in my country, I was beaten fundamentally because my competitors did not accept this principle and, as this was one of the key aspects of my programme, they managed to arouse the suspicion that I was 'idealistic', or 'utopian'...

Some other politicians have had similar problems. After the dismantling of communism, at a meeting in 1991 of former government leaders, Pierre Elliot Trudeau exclaimed: "I am finally free to say that social rights are as imperative as civil rights without people suspecting me of being a communist".

In the ten years since we have, at least conceptually if it is not yet in practice, taken a decisive step. And of this change we must take note.

It also seems important to stress that poverty, as we call it here (and, in particular, in Europe) is not a pole that dichotomously opposes wealth. This type of binary thinking does not account for the immense variety of situations and makes of some easy scapegoats. Moreover, it would forever shackle the poor to a world from which they could not escape. For their emancipation process to be viable, *there must be bridges to attainable levels of Quality of Life*.

The poor, when they lift themselves out of poverty, join *the world of the non-poor*. Admittedly, this world also includes the 'rich' (as much in the southern hemisphere as in the northern hemisphere). The exit from poverty is made by crossing successive thresholds because *the*

non-poor are a continuum where successive levels of satisfaction meet the basic needs of human beings.

Until we understand this succession of steps as levels of satisfaction of rights that contribute to strengthening the conditions for a better Quality of Life, we will keep the poor in their place and our conscience will be clear. But the state of the world – and of this continent – is such that the misery mentioned by President Badinter and speakers this morning, makes us, the non-poor, accomplices *in a new kind of holocaust* – one where poverty is nothing but a 'final solution'.

II. INDIVISIBILITY OF RIGHTS

Following what Mr Lemaresquier said in his spot-on, radical speech on the transparency of figures, it is social rights that have very recently gained acceptance. This may be enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is true, but at the stages which followed – in anticipation of a convention which was to make the Declaration legally binding – the gap between, on the one hand, civil and political rights, and on the other social, economic and cultural rights, has made social rights a marginal concern as far as the process of governance goes. Institutions and ideas have developed without questioning this framework.

Europe is no exception. When the Comité des Sages was commissioned by the European Commission to rethink the Social Charter, it met with the current mentality that we have seen on three fronts:

1) firstly, civil and political rights are the only ones calling for immediate application, while we continue to await the economic and political conditions able to facilitate the implementation of social rights;
2) secondly, social rights refer to 'workers' rights', leaving other persons subject to just secondary rights obtained thanks to 'workers' who are responsible for them;
3) finally, the economy is the framework that enables the consummation of these social rights and it is these laws that must prevail.

However, in recent years renewed attention has been paid to the fact that the preambles of the two international pacts are identical. It was almost a revelation! An important step has been taken.

Our rights, despite being parcelled off in two separate pacts, are affirmed as being interdependent and indivisible. Which means that *there is no democracy without respect for social and economic rights* just like *"there is no good economy without democracy"* (as recently written by the Nobel Prize for Economics, Amartya Sen, in *Le Monde*).

This interdependence and indivisibility, even if not applied to the governing process, are, at least, part of the political way of thinking. And yes, I said: "the way of thinking" – because the emphasis placed on social policy in the Amsterdam Treaty shows that there is no practical

experience on this issue at the level of the Council of the European Union. But, on the other hand – and most fortunately – in the Comité des Sages and in the many meetings that took place in almost all 15 countries, as well as in the European Parliament (and also among some members of the Commission), we had found *the will and ambition* to give social and economic rights the urgency that in the second half of the twentieth century characterised "The defence of human rights". In all, I have encountered *the same determination* and *the rise of an immense indignation*, capable of being mobilised if it finds a strong and decisive political environment.

III. THE HEGEMONY OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Why are our public policies still powerless to overcome poverty?

What is happening so that we cannot understand that poverty that affects entire sections of the population is *also a massive violation of human rights?*

The first telling fact is that governance (both of national and international institutions) is fixed on the myth of "economic growth". It is this myth that in 1989 we imposed on countries that had just come out of communism. It is this myth that we thought we saw reinforced with the growth of the countries of East and Southeast Asia.

So far, governance has worked with the tools it has inherited from *the nation-state and a logic that goes back to the early days of industrialisation*.

However, a radical transition is taking place. On the one hand, at the end of this century, we see the culmination of ten years of *the most profound scientific and technological transformation.* All problems, by changing scale, have changed in nature. On the other hand, *globalisation* and its consequences have rendered the existing instruments obsolete, but there is no consensus on the concepts, mechanisms and institutions that can make governance possible. No country alone can bring new ideas and new global instruments to the table. But several countries together will be able to start a coordinated effort.

The evolution of the concept of development in Europe can help us understand the stalemate in which we find ourselves.

Europe, which uses the concept of 'development' mainly as a recipe for foreign policy, has adopted *ad intra* the predominant characteristics. It is true that in the 1950s, two forms of looking at development were popular. One was formulated by PÉ Lebret, from the 'Economie et Humanisme' group: 'Development is the ability of each country to respond, with its own cultural means, to its historical evolution'. The other, from the Anglo-Saxon world, focused on almost exclusively economic and quantitative aspects. It quickly became the standard. International credit institutions have played their part. In the following years, a humanist approach sometimes resurfaced with 'the cultural dimension of development' (Paul-Marc Henry) or with 'endogenous development' (UNESCO). Only in the 1980s did the concept of 'sustainable development' emerge due to the threat of environmental degradation (Brundtland Report 1987, *Earth Summit* 1992). Since the 1990s, UNDP has been working every year on the issue of 'human development' by improving the indicators each time.

These two breakthroughs have had significant impact in Europe. Last year, sociologists, economists and researchers in political science made an impressive statement on 'social quality' in Europe. At the same time, some 300 economists across the continent were unequivocally asserting that "the issues of 'economic growth', 'social factors' and 'environmental factors' are all part of the economy. Recently, in a public statement, ecological economists reinforced this position. The terrible failure of the market in communist countries, in particular, in Russia, is not unrelated to all these events.

Such a movement shows that we must *unburden ourselves from the domination of the economy over social rights.* The satisfaction of social rights has been considered for too long as dependent on economic conditions. In the wake of recent signs, we must point out, among other things, the Council of Europe's assertion that we find not only a natural evolution of the Council's work but also taking into account the paradox of ex-communist countries:

> *Raising to the status of Human Rights the goals of feeding those who are hungry, educating those who are illiterate, providing primary health care to the sick and vulnerable, must be understood, at a minimum, as acknowledging that such rights are not open to discussion on the basis of economic rationality.*

In other words, social rights have ceased to be negotiable. They have become imperative as are civil and political rights. *Innovation*, as Prime Minister Pierre Mauroy said, is called for.

IV. TOWARDS QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL

But this innovation necessarily has an impact on our old habits.

At the beginning of the '90s, *a lone voice* made itself heard, expressed by one of the incumbent leaders of government, Gro Brundtland, then Prime Minister of Norway, as she declared at an international seminar in Oslo: "*We need to transition from quantity to quality.*"

This has three implications:

— the absence of quantity that does not allow people to escape poverty deprives the human person of quality and undermines his dignity;
— the accumulation of quantity beyond certain ceilings (pollution from fossil fuels, change of nature, waste disposal sites) destroys quality;
— quality must be able to become concrete and measurable in order to bring the governance out of the tyranny of quantity.

Indeed, Quality of Life is perhaps the missing link of modern life. For civilisation to progress, Quality of Life must become *the future of humankind.* That is why, in the next century, an essential task must be that of making an intense effort to define and *bring real Quality of Life* (Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life) up to national statistics and accounts.

NGOs, European activists and researchers are convinced of it. They must be recognised as social partners in their own right so that their voices can resonate in the entire social community. Indeed, how can this conviction be brought to the level of decision-making necessary at the highest level of our European institutions?

While some express the fear of losing their sovereignty in favour of regional or international bodies, I see, for my part, *sovereignty being reinforced by the requirement to express oneself in the collective responsibility capable of finding adequate instruments* that grant substance, establish standards, create mechanisms, translate rights and responsibilities into reality, thereby making social rights attainable for all – and Quality of Life a shared ideal. This is the political dimension of *global solidarity* mentioned by Mr. Azcueta from Peru.

All those who are affected by poverty have recently gained a strong ally – the Nobel Prize in economics, Professor Amartya Sen.

It is because the *human person is central to his argument* that he has new things to say about the role of the economy in governance. In one of his most recent books (from 1997), he writes about India:

> *On the eve of Independence in August 1947, Nehru reminded the country that the task ahead included the ending of poverty and ignorance, illiteracy, preventable disease, and of inequalities in opportunities. This means that these tasks must be seen as objectives that are valued for their own sake. While they can and do contribute to economic growth, their value does not lie only in these instrumental contributions. Economic growth is, of course, important, but it is valuable precisely because it helps to eradicate deprivation and to improve the Quality of Life of ordinary people.*

The Comité des Sages at this time is so convinced of the importance of social rights that it has proposed that a broad consultation of Europeans in all countries of the European Union reach a consensus on a minimum base of social rights to be built in the European Union. This would be equivalent in our minds with a refoundation of the European Union. We again stand by the argument of Amartya Sen:

> *The more conventional criteria of economic success (such as a high growth rate, a sound balance of payments and so forth) are to be valued only as a means to deeper ends. It would, therefore, be a mistake to see the development of education, health, care, and other basic achievements only or primarily as 'human resources'... as if people were just the means of production and not its ultimate end. The bettering of human life does not have to be justified by showing that a person with a better Quality of Life is also a better producer.*

We are here on the eve of a *necessary revolution*, one which makes it possible to speak realistically of the elimination of poverty. It also leads us along a path that is not a middle ground between neo-liberalism and social democracy. *The "third way" is not in the reshuffling of the models of the past but in those that the future unveils before us.*

The tasks awaiting us cannot be the result of the logic of today; we need new social structures, created by new movements of ideas, aspirations, values, norms. If we engage together in this tide we will have reached the threshold of the democratic will necessary to make social rights the rights of all, without exception.

On one condition, however; that, whenever we think of poverty, we think of the poor, of real people, of flesh and blood. May Gandhi's counsel be imperative for us:

> *Whenever you are in doubt, recall the face of the poorest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. If the answer is yes, take it without hesitation.*

Priorities of development
in Portugal[48]

1. REVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT

I view this conference as a chance to address what the economist-prophet Manuela Silva considers should be the responsibility of civil society: seek *'Alternative diagnoses'*.

I will use the word development because it is a word that has become common. But I have no doubt that another expression is needed that points to a more holistic and complete reality than that to which development refers today.

I won't beat around the bush: *this expression is Quality of Life*.

There has been a semantic and sociological shift that has seriously distorted the word and concept of development.

(It turns out that my adult life has run parallel to the various stages that have been marked by the notion of development. It is from experience that I can assess the history of the practices that led to this concept of development.)

I will quickly go over the 1950s and '60s.

Development then had a sense of global progress contributing to the wellbeing of people. In the words of Fr. Lebret, the figurehead of the 'Economics and Humanism' group which contributed greatly to the education of my generation, development was "the capacity of each society to make use of its own cultural milieu to cope with its own historical evolution".

It was a deeply humanistic concept.

Later on, for the Bretton Woods Institutions, especially the World Bank, the concept of development corresponded to *the satisfaction of basic needs*, although in practice the Bank's guidelines did not match what was implied in the concepts.

Along with the acquisition of independence by colonised nations, through the accomplishments of the various liberation movements, development was also seen throughout the '60s and '70s *as a process of liberation of individuals and nations*.

---

48   Presentation on 14 October 2000 [archive version].

In this context, the aspiration, already formulated by some leaders of the recently-independent countries, was to strive for a development that was not the reproduction of the then existing models, whose hegemonic character was beginning to be denounced.

This was when the discussion of *endogenous development* was on the table, based on the material and cultural wealth of each society.

The Declaration of the Economic Rights and Duties of States at the UN General Assembly in 1974 pointed to *a new international order* in which various paths to development coexisted. These were the great ideals of the 1970s.

In the 1980s, informed by a growing awareness of the very survival of the planet came the notion of *sustainable development*, which was mainly focused on the "Our Common Future" report of the UN Commission on Environment and Development.

This perspective reached its apogee at the Rio Conference in 1992. There was a commitment of the great majority of states to do everything to maintain the planet's biodiversity, to reduce the production of greenhouse gases as well as those that cause the gradual disappearance of the ozone layer.

At the same time, in the early 1990s, the work of reformulating the concept of development took place through one of the organs of the United Nations system itself, the UNDP. Thus began a very definite and elaborate attempt to develop the concept of *human development*.

In this sequence of events, it seemed we were on an ever deeper and broader path to defining the concept of development.

But the reality of the facts belied this broadening of concepts. The world's wealth has grown over the last fifty years, and at the same time the pauperisation of most of humanity, the deterioration of environmental conditions, inequalities between the North and South of the planet and between the North and the South of each society.

2. THE PARADOX OF INCREASINGLY HUMANISTIC CONCEPTS, AND INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT IMPLEMENTATION

At the same time, at the conceptual level, the growing gap led development to become associated with 'economic growth'.

To this end, the *International Development Strategies* adopted by the UN General Assembly in each decade (a problem already felt by the UN itself in June 1980 when the Secretary-General convened a round-table on alternative strategies chaired by me) took a fair share of the blame.

In the mid-1990s, a conference on *social development* was held, which, as the great inspiration behind this summit, Juan Somavia, the OIT's Director-General, pointed out, amounted to the taking of a stance by the international community:

> *bringing people – more than the economy – to the centre of planning.*

The opinion of the more than 2000 NGOs that participated in the Conference was quite different, and the final statement clearly states:

> *… we believe that the economic framework adopted by the final documents is in flagrant contradiction with the objectives of sustainable and fair social development.*

It was, however, a set of commitments that fuelled strong hopes, since, for the first time, States had solemnly pledged to fulfil the following three commitments out of ten:

— *Second commitment* – We commit ourselves to the goal of eradicating poverty in the world, through decisive national actions and international cooperation, as an ethical, social, political and economic imperative of humankind.

— *Fourth commitment* – We commit ourselves to promoting social integration by fostering societies that are stable, secure and just and that are based on the promotion and protection of all human rights, as well as on non-discrimination, tolerance, respect for diversity, equality of opportunity, solidarity, security and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable people and persons.

— *Sixth commitment* – We commit ourselves to promoting and attaining the goals of universal and equitable access to quality education, the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health and the access of all to primary health care, making particular efforts to rectify inequalities relating to social conditions, without distinction as to race, national origin, gender, age or disability; respecting and promoting our common and particular cultures; striving to strengthen the role of culture in development; preserving the essential foundations for people-centred sustainable development and contributing to the full development of human resources and social development. The purpose of these activities is to eradicate poverty, promote full and productive employment and foster social integration

What is there to say five years later?

In June of this year, a general breakdown of all these commitments was recognised at the UN General Assembly.

There have been enormous difficulties, but above all there is a great aimlessness of political leadership worldwide. Signs of this void had already been evident at the 1995 Summit:

— The 20/20 proposal failed to be approved.
— The world's credit institutions failed to get in line.

What was missing then? Why this breakdown? There are undoubtedly many factors that deserve in-depth study. There is a governance problem, resulting in large part from the complexity of contemporary issues. But I cannot help being reminded of the statement of a great politician – whom, among all I have known, I claim to be the greatest of all – and who

left us two weeks ago, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, twice Prime Minister of Canada, for a total of 15 years. In a statement from the InterAction Council of former heads of government he suggested that we begin the final statement by stating: 'Leaders must lead' (Leaders must make the necessary decisions).

3. PARADIGM CHANGE AND NEW CONCEPTS

What is the result of this analysis?

The texts I have mentioned are in my view the 'swan song' of a particular paradigm: the paradigm of 'always more'.

A few years ago one of the rare politicians who, in addition to being a manager, also created thought, Prime Minister Gro Bruntland stated clearly that it is only possible to solve the enormous problems of the present and the future when we move *from the quantity paradigm to the quality paradigm.*

In his book *A crítica da razão indolente*, Boaventura de Sousa Santos succinctly links the quantity paradigm to the epistemology behind it and which supported it:

> *To know means to quantify. Scientific rigor is gauged by the rigor of its measurement. The intrinsic qualities of an object are, as it were, disqualified, and in their place, the quantities in which they can be translated will prevail. What is not quantifiable is scientifically irrelevant.*

We do not yet have a new paradigm from which we can draw all the consequences, but the evolution of philosophy, physics, biology, and the social sciences opens up new paths which, at least conceptually, we must begin to follow.

Thus, the new, still-evolving paradigm presupposes:

— that quality has value in itself and, beyond the survival imperatives of any system, is capable of constantly safeguarding and improving the system's capacity for self-organisation;

— that each reality does not exist in isolation or even independent of others but that there is a permanent exchange of energy between all systems; these are autonomous realities because they are interdependent;

— that the capacity for self-organisation is both a guarantee of individual survival and a guarantee that it is framed within a larger and more complex system;

— that, contrary to the Promethean myth of linear evolution, each system is not only unpredictable but irreversible;

— that if the systems have a macro behaviour, from which one can imagine evolutionary scenarios, they are in turn the result of permanent microcosmic fluctuations where each bifurcation corresponds to a great number of possible ways in which the decision which seems apparently less important will determine the evolution of the whole.

The transition phase from one paradigm to another cannot fail to have consequences on the very notion of development.

In the current context and with the great systems on which it depends and in which it expresses itself remaining untouched, *development is a concept that is no longer functional.*

It is, therefore, my conviction that it is urgent to replace the cold, increasingly macro-economic concept of 'development' with the concept and practice of Quality of Life. (Here I invoke Amartya Sen *versus* Amartya Sen: if his last book reassesses development as an expression of individual and collective freedoms, it is also true that the economic foundation of the concept of Quality of Life owes much to him. And because of the evolution of the word 'development' to which I referred at the outset, I find it more effective and likely to spare such a concept of Quality of Life from hazardous detours.)

Quality of Life in a given society requires:

— that the level of mere survival be surpassed for the whole population;
— that international legal instruments be considered imperative; being a comprehensive list of civic, political, social, economic and cultural rights proclaimed as interdependent and indivisible in the two International Covenants which bring into the body of international law the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Thus, the fulfilment of this long list works as do other *objective indicators* of Quality of Life.

But what is equally important as regards Quality of Life is that it is also the result of a *subjective evaluation*. Over and above the level of survival, different rights and degrees of implementation are measured for each person in response to their aspirations and choices of lifestyles and personal priorities. Therefore the content differs for each person, beyond that threshold.

Working for a society in which Quality of Life is thus measured at once by objective and universal rights and by the satisfaction of subjective and diversified conditions is a new way of looking at society and at the world.

4. NATIONAL PRIORITIES THAT COULD RESULT FROM THE NEW PARADIGM

Having become synonymous with 'economic growth', development can only gain new contours when the economy itself is seen in the multiplicity of factors which make it up: (a) the increased and diversified financial resources factor; b) the social factor; c) the environmental factor.

As regards *financial resources*, it is socially unacceptable and ethically condemnable that individual levels of income which do not guarantee someone's livelihood are left exactly as they are.

However many protests the necessary measures may provoke, the people can only delegate the power within themselves as a source of sovereignty to those who are strong and imaginative enough to ensure that the minimum Quality of Life is achieved by all. This presupposes a State that is 'inherently good' but stemming from a society which is 'inherently good' also.

(In Portugal, the relation to money and its sharing is part of an old tradition of 'taking advantage' of all 'shortcuts' that 'facilitate' life.

We lack the Anglo-Saxon and Nordic sense of citizenship that assumes, even with a high degree of sacrifice, responsibility for the good of all.

And even so, today we have philosophical foundations and economic instruments which, for example, the Swedes did not yet have in the first decades of the twentieth century, when they emigrated en masse to the United States.)

Moreover, social mimicry creates an unbridled appetite for the consumption of superfluous goods. We need tools that help the reader or viewer to evaluate the reason for their desires. It is a true initiative of economic and psychological literacy that must be conducted at national level, as a major education campaign.

The *social factor* of the economy implies a rethinking of the concept of work itself. And then imagine new ways of sharing work, time and profits. The new international division of labour requires the ability to participate therein with dynamic concepts and work practices. What is unacceptable is work without flexibility, without mobility, that is constantly penalised.

The environmental factor: 'the polluter pays' is not good enough, because the processes are irreversible.

Some will have to be stopped from the get-go.

Moreover, budgeting for the environmental impact forces the economy itself to adapt; that is, if the environmental cost is incorporated into the cost price of any product, the productive landscape will necessarily change. (As a first step, parallel national accounts. While this is not done, the most important policy decisions will continue to be taken on the basis of incorrect data.)

4.1. Education

A radical change must occur in what is nowadays called 'education'.

It is a question of creating a scientific-cultural matrix that structures thought, respects and channels emotions, permanently links content to real life and instils in all children the desire to create something new.

Without falling prey to audio-visual showiness, it is necessary to use new technologies in order to stimulate the learning process and help teachers to excel, capable above all of nurturing an individual in the process of forging personal articulations of the learning experience.

In addition to what may be defined as 'basic education', it is important to create 'transferable qualifications', discounting the possibility of learning everything in our youth and ensuring a healthy margin of mobility and novelty in an active life spanning more than 50 years!

4.2. Eradication of poverty

The eradication of poverty is the touchstone of a society that wants to continue to flourish.

It was Latin America which first showed how above a certain number of poor in society, development has no capacity to absorb them. It proposed, therefore, the formulation of *national strategies for the specific fight against poverty*.

To date, however, no country has dared to implement such a strategy. The reasons are multiple, but possibly all have to do with exclusion, which is spoken of as if it were a disagreeable reality.

It is because exclusion is concerned with objective and subjective issues. The 'enemy' is not named, but it is the whole of society that closes the door, excludes, does not share, bars, rejects.

Obviously, the objective issues are the appropriation of fundamental rights only by the few, as a result of mechanisms of poor value rationale and inefficient management.

The subjective elements have to do, on the one hand, with our attitude towards the other, and on the other hand with the tendency to disqualify those who are deprived of the most basic rights.

4.3. Health

Education and poverty eradication are interlinked with a third factor: health. There are sufficient national and international guidelines that need to be put into practice without naming study groups once again. Such as the following:

It is vital for all to provide basic preventive and curative services in order to eliminate the existing two-speed health care system.

It is essential that the management of health resources cease to function as an application of universal management principles: it is the management that has to integrate into the health services serving its own optics rather than the other way around.

According to all the international norms that have been adopted time and again and perfected, it is urgent to move on from an overdeveloped curative model (for example, hospitals in 20-kilometre-wide triangles) to local community clinics (or health centres) for primary care and homecare and prevention programmes.

4.4. Participation

None of this is feasible without society mobilising as a whole. There are a number of civil society actors and each has its own role. I stress the importance of NGOs in the last decade, because I am convinced their role is not yet adequately defined. For example, NGOs cannot be just a focal point of resistance. They have to play an active role. Most undertake courses of action in response to problems, sometimes in an original way – their contribution is pioneering and, despite taking place on a reduced scale, it opens up innovative perspectives. But its role has yet another component that has not been sufficiently developed: it is the one I have been advocating for more than 20 years, which consists in their recognition as true and legitimate social partners.

Elective political power and the political participation of citizens and groups can create a synergy that will help achieve the goals we propose. At the opening of the Social Development Summit in Copenhagen the then Prime Minister of Denmark said:

Let hope turn into action. That's what people expect from us.

It would be important for civil society to live up to this phrase with its own affirmation of identity in the construction of the new paradigm and the priorities that derive from it:

Let hope transform itself into reflection, research, innovation.
It is what the generations of today and the future expect of us.

GROUP IV

EDUCATION AND CULTURE, VALUES, RELIGION, ETHICS

The sacred and politics[1]

A WORLD OF UNCERTAINTY AND COMPLEXITY

The question of governability today is the dominant problem of the political arena[2]. Within it reside a wide range of problems:

— the escalation of monetary disorder with the permanent threat of the collapse of the system and its inevitable repercussions on the democratic structures themselves;

— precarious stability built on global economy management that fosters institution-alised undersupplying and injustice, incapable of producing models that respond to the social demands of individuals and entire regions;

— the contradictory data on the interconnection between development (at any stage), the accelerated degradation of the environmental conditions necessary for human survival and the inability to reach a level of demographic stability;

— the new frontiers of the relationship between ethics and scientific research that genetic engineering leads to uncharted territory unbeknown to Einstein and Oppenheimer;

— the drift of the tension between the two superpowers towards new forms of present or latent conflicts between peoples and groups[3].

The practical application of the modern sciences not only does not respond to this problem but also manifests it even more crudely. See examples below.

The thick strata of satellites that interconnect the planet does not take away the feeling that, despite the instantaneousness of information, things are totally beyond human control[4].

---

1   Paper presented at the conference *O Sagrado e as Culturas*, held 18 to 22 April 1989. Published in Perdigão, Maria Magdalena de Azeredo *et al, o Sagrado e as Culturas*. Lisbon, ACARTE / Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 1992, pp. 245-255.

2   It was the central theme of the celebration of the 20th Anniversary of the Club of Rome in October 1988; it is one of the major research items in the medium-term of the United Nations University and has been a recurring theme of recent literature in political science. *(Author's Note)*

3   The major topics listed are taken from the agenda of the General Conferences and General Assemblies of United Nations agencies. *(Author's Note)*

4   Michael, Donald, in *Can Leaders Tell the Truth and Still Remain Leaders? (Author's Note)*

The self-organising capacity of all living organisms does not prevent the entropic tendencies of organised societies[5].

The highly sophisticated instruments at our disposal, as the general feeling of uncertainty continues to rise, are increasingly less capable of responding to what to them appear to be the more ambiguous questions of human intelligence. (And it is not the *'fuzzy logic'* which we have begun to speak about in the last few weeks that will immediately resolve the issue. It will probably shift towards a metaphysical interrogation of the conditions and limits of artificial intelligence).[6]

On the other hand, the theory of systems that until today appears to us as the best way to deal with this multiplicity of phenomena, in codifying the forms as they interact of the autonomous and interdependent parts of our social communities, only serves to give a name to big 'bundles of confusion' or leads us to the unstable and intuitive management style today known as *'muddling through'*[7].

That is why the reference to the unpredictability of the future, to the incoherent context of phenomena, to civilisation characterised by uncertainty (in the sense given by Heisenberg), to turbulence as a permanent condition of today's social and political issues is now widespread. It is a time of complexity.

2. THE SACRED AS A REJECTION OF COMPLEXITY

It is in such a context that the question of the sacred can be examined today in new terms.

In other ages of the development of civilisations, the sacred was often a refuge from the fear of natural phenomena, of unknown causes for the men of the time.

Today it is the diffuse awareness of the complexity of political phenomena, and ungovernability experienced on a global scale, which, when confronted with individual and collective impotence, provoke the reappearance of the sacred.

The questions that complexity raises and the anguish that it provokes lead to the rejection of modernity. And then the return to the sacred of whole societies is symbolised by the appearance of mass religious phenomena, and ritualistic pietism at the individual level.

The manifestations of this primary form of the return to the sacred are in political terms before us in entire societies: the *ayatollah* is the supreme point of reference, sole interpreter of the law and distributor of all wealth, supreme judge of life and death; the multitudes are stripped of their own will to merge into a collective consciousness that galvanising factors (such as the condemnation of Salman Rushdie) consolidate cyclically; the people become immune to voices from the outside and any accusation of the violation of Human Rights is totally incomprehensible and falls on deaf ears.

---

5   For a careful analysis of this contradiction, the latest book by Costa de Beauregard makes an important contribution, to be added to the literature on the self-organisation of systems, especially the Cerisy conference. *(Author's Note)*

6   *New Herald Tribune*, April 3, 1989. *(Author's Note)*

7   The founder of operational research in the United States, Russell Ackoff defines a problem consisting of numerous sub-problems as "a mess"! *(Author's Note)*

In such a society individual consciousness is submerged in this state of fusion between the people and the political *leader*. There is no place for the demand for Human Rights or for the most elementary expressions of democratic life.

But the rejection of complexity also occurs in societies from which all reference to God has been barred – I quote the example of North Korea because I experienced it directly and because it seems to me paradigmatic. It is not, in my view, primarily the political system in force there. The isolation of Korean society is less an ideological problem than the result of a sacredness that keeps it permanently in a 'nascent' state. Statues of the President proliferate around the country, above all in places considered sacred because they were the setting for the war of liberation. All achievements, from agriculture to industry, to education, to culture, are described as having their origin in the intelligence and wisdom of the *leader*.

In such a society the human individual cannot speak up or feel based on one's own knowledge, but can only express himself through the 'revelations' of the political leader.

3. THE SACRALISATION OF SECULARISED SOCIETIES

Industrialised and secularised Europe is no less vulnerable to the anguish of complexity. But it reacts to it in another way.

What made Europe what it is today in the context of the sacred/political relationship was the cultural path of progressive autonomy of all political realities. Although it has not been a linear process over time, its dynamics are clearly perceptible to the point of being one of the constituent elements of European identity.

On the one hand, the recognition of human rights in the French Revolution affirms the dignity of human existence and radically changes the relationship between the sacred and the political. This new relationship will have repercussions at all levels of the social and political structure.

On the other hand, industrialisation imposes the inflexibility of the laws of physics and chemistry on a previously unknown scale, while production management relates to the area of macroeconomics which reveals itself to be eminently autonomous.

As the laws of the metropolis came to be defined without sacred points of reference, society was to head down a secular path. The last two hundred years in world history have been the chronicle of this slow process of secularisation, of emancipation from the realities of this world and the city of men.

But gradually – and especially in the last thirty years – unusual expressions of the sacred have become apparent. The very structure of democratic organisation, in its specifically political dimension, began to manifest phenomena which, by their characteristics, are part of the domain of the sacred.

In no way indifferent to this fact are both technological progress, with the innumerable possibilities the reproduction of events and the creation of seemingly otherworldly environments offer, and the *media,* which magnify, mute or ignore happenings altogether, playing the part of supreme authorities of the universe created and of the perception men have of them.

Political happenings have characteristics that, even for atheists, and when the message is stripped of all reference to a divine presence, can seem akin to a religious experience.

Individual consciousness is sacrificed to the alienation of the sacred – as in other instances of its hegemonic sacred power. It is the silence of the social of which Baudrillard speaks. They are the silent masses.

This issue is often analysed exclusively in terms of the political experience that does not mobilise, or lead to participation, etc. In my view, what is at stake is a perversion of the political process as it has been experienced in Europe, provoked by the sacralising elements of democratic formalism itself.

In the face of complexity, Europe cannot renounce its cultural specificity, which at the same time is the cradle of human rights and scientific and technological knowledge as autonomous and constituent elements of political society. Hence, instead of returning to the sacredness of religion, it generates the sacred with its own secular ingredients of the political process.

In the civilisation that originated in Europe and was consolidated in the Northern Hemisphere, it is the very structure of democratic organisation that segregates new phenomena of sacralisation. In a sense, it can even be said that the greater the democratic experience or the more uncorrupted the democracy, the greater the tendency for sacralisation.

Complexity, reflected in the clear evidence of ungovernability, means that, for the first time in history, mankind is aware that it does not know how to govern its peoples.

It is the question of the aims of politics, now disparaged as the absence of 'a grand purpose'[8], as French politicians and sociologists have grandiloquently expressed it.

It is the meaning of politics in the economy of human activities.

It is the insecurity of our political actors, hiding sometimes behind Olympian distances and sometimes by sporadic contradictory decisions.

It is the total ineffectiveness of politics in the management of the real problems of humankind, in their responsibility to establish 'law and order' at the level of the fundamental rights of each person and each people.

Confronted with this backdrop of uncertainties, society seeks, in new ways, the sacred that exorcises, provides security and consoles.

(In a different context of religious influence, Brazilian sociologists and anthropologists have explained the vertiginous increase of interest in *macumba* and the different syncretic sects, as the need of the masses, in the face of political bankruptcy, to find comfort in religion.)

And in this new conception of the sacred, too, the human person is deprived of his critical faculties and democracy is compromised to its very core, although its formal mechanisms are respected.

---

8   Touraine, Alain, in *Le Monde*. *(Author's Note)*

3. THE SACRALISATION OF THE LEADER

In this unconscious movement towards the sacred, society is united and projects itself onto a figurehead, a political leader. In sacral society, someone 'has to' represent a higher power, constitutive of the people as such[9].

The process that 'calls upon' the leader is eminently sacral, despite the vote that democratically legitimised that leader.

It is an interesting phenomenon of sacral societies that the forces, powers and energies present in these societies are experienced as ambiguous when in a virtual state and become univocal objects of sacral cohesion when they are acted upon[10]. Similarly, politicians are resented by the people as ambiguous poles of attraction and repulsion while they are simply candidates, *leaders* in a virtual state. Winning the election makes them univocal objects of popular attraction. In addition to all the personal merits of elected *leaders* (which are not called into question here), the post- election period witnesses a decisive increase in those supporting the politician. (It is not a kind of 'opportunism' of the people: the categories of individual morality do not go so far as to explain the collective deep-rooted phenomena that are at play in these circumstances.)

The classic case in recent times was that of President Reagan whose limitations, *gaffes*, distractions and errors were well known to the American public. But, in their sacral need, the people glossed over all of this, and Reagan abandoned the White House with the highest popularity rating of any American president. (Even more succinctly, the French television comedy that has been a success since the last presidential elections, *The Bebete Show*, put Mitterrand on the same pedestal as God!!)

Diverse ritualistic behaviours confirm and accentuate this fanciful sacred force projected onto our leaders.

Assuming as a hypothesis that the ritual is intended to inscribe the profane into the sphere of the sacred to give it the depth of reality[11], we may ask ourselves if we do not get from there the pomp and circumstance of the swearing-in ceremonies – does it not presume that, in addition to the oath whose legal value would be sufficient, there are other associations that transcend the popular vote? Is not that what Maria Velho da Costa says in *Missa in Albis* when, in describing the events of Carmo in 1974, she says that 'there the people were praying to a power-that-Be'?

This force has its own vocabulary. The ritualised word can go in one of two directions: that of violence (and I leave for another occasion the problem raised by Rene Girard[12] on the relation of the sacred to violence) and that of self-fulfilment.

---

9   Caillois, Roger, in *L'homme et le sacré,* (Man and the Sacred). *(Author's Note)*

10   Caillois, *idem. (Author's Note)*

11   Rim, Julien, in *Les chemins du sacré dans l'histoire. (Author's Note)*

12   For an in-depth analysis of Girard's thought which constitutes a complete 'doctrinal' body of work, see *La violence et le sacré*
     e *Le bouc émissaire. (Author's Note)*

And are not often the major international meetings (to put ourselves on a more general plane) great liturgies of words where politicians are officiating and political commentators are mediators who echo the words spoken, interpreting them in their permanently initiatory role?

5. FROM SACRED SPACES AND TIMES TO PSYCHOLOGICAL CONDITIONING

Sacralisation requires separate consecrated spaces and times.

In the sacralisation of the secular space that characterises modern society (from banks to the headquarters of multinationals or to new 'temples of culture') politics is no exception. But in political life space is condensed and concentrated in such a way that the mere mention of the White House or Elysée, number 10 Downing Street or São Bento, has in itself an enchanting effect that intimates power in its expression of magical force.

And what about the sacralisation of the times? If the social gathering is indispensable to sacral society because it breaks routine and serves as an opportunity for new generations to forge collective memory[13], is it not an atmosphere of celebration that organisers of the major electoral *meetings* try to recreate with the mass dissemination of the sacred objects? And will it not be emptiness that then characterises almost all the so-called political speeches, and will not the multiplicity of sounds and signs be the unconscious attempt to reproduce original chaos, in the hope that a new world will be born?

The sacralisation of political mechanisms finds echo and reinforcement in the psychological dynamic of politicians and crowds.

On the one hand, the politician who accepts this sacralisation (and who does not?) tends to be self-sufficient. When we hear him, we would say that the politician, perceived in the public imagination as someone who sacrifices himself for the love of his political vocation for the good of others, only loves himself. It is this self-love 'probably,' says Serge Moscovici[14], 'the reason we trust without exception in his abilities, in his ideas, and in his sense of superiority. In him, narcissism endures the worst hardships. The love that he has for himself allows him to live without the love of others if it is not evident.'

On the other hand, there is no such sacralisation without consent. It feeds, to a large extent, on the relationship between authority and dependence. In this sense, history can never be explained by the madness of one, but by the acceptance and consent of many.

In this sacral picture, we can ask ourselves what remains of politics, individual conscience, personal freedom, and the exercise of a single and inalienable responsibility.

Individual rights themselves are threatened, as the massification of behaviours and opinions is exercised and decisions are driven by mechanisms that nullify individual participation.

---

13   Caillois, *idem. (Author's Note)*

14   Moscovici, in *L'âge des foules. (Author's Note)*

The totalitarian principle is present in all forms of political behaviour which exclude, directly or indirectly, participation.

When I demand a greater participation in political life and in the diversified forms of democracy, I am demanding that the conscience of each citizen be re-appropriated of the political space where, free of the sacralisation that crushes it, it can emerge in total freedom.

6. THE ABSOLUTE REFERENTS

European civilisation gives us a fundamental archetype to clarify what is happening in today's society. The tragedy of Antigone is the one that has best reflected the struggle of individual conscience with the political order.

Apparently it would seem to be Antigone who, obeying the unwritten law, as demanded by her own conscience, would represent the sacred. This is not the case. Antigone does not seek divine protection; her attitude and discourse, are born of herself, of her own inner consistency. At no time does Antigone beg for Zeus' help.

On the other hand, Creon, the politician, speaking of the place of politics in order to justify his decisions and political actions, invokes Zeus and all the prescriptions of the constituted political society, thus becoming the priest of an authentic 'religion of the metropolis'.

Thus the knot that ties politics to the sacred is complete. What turns the despair of Antigone into inconsolable solitude is that 'Thebes, like any other city, is a closed world with nothing beyond it, where the orb of the sacred merges and blurs with the social space'[15]. It is blocked society where 'anger grows'.

In this society, the 'religion of the metropolis' does not ground the subject other than 'in its social relation and ritual of exteriority'. It removes the interior space. Bernard-Henri Levy notes that the type of death to which Antigone is condemned speaks of the tremendous nature of the transgressive act she committed by behaving under the aegis of that interiority. The fault of Antigone would be of such a magnitude that even her traits had to be erased from the land of men. She had to be out of bounds even in death, making her 'a being from nowhere'. For the religion of the metropolis the supreme sacrilege is the affirmation of the person in its singularity: 'To become' 'I' is to condemn oneself to disappear'.

The 'religion of the metropolis' is called into question because an unheard of behaviour breaks the ties that bound politics to the sacred. As Georges Steiner points out, 'the transcendent absolutes to which Antigone appeals in her debate against Creon are, in a radical sense, unholy absolutes'[16].

---

15   Levy, Bernard Henry, in *Le testament de Dieu, (The Testament of God)*. *(Author's Note)*
16   Steiner, Georges says in *Les Antigone (Antigones)*s. *(Author's Note)*

For Antigone these absolutes are simple to enunciate and to understand: before death, her two brothers are absolutely equal; the evil and good done in the life of each of the brothers belong to the domain of the past and do not decide the right to family solidarity.

Antigone lives following laws that no one wrote, from a feeling that inhabits her and from which she knows, in humble lucidity, that the result will be death. It is not the sacred but the stronghold of her conscience that harbours the courage and strength of Antigone.

7. WHAT ABOUT CHRISTIANITY?

It is in this sense that Antigone prefigures, also in this respect, a Christian attitude.

Because Christianity is not, in the first place, a religion, there is no distinction between the sacred and the profane for the man of Faith[17].

Three points just to remember.

Firstly, Christianity is beyond sacred space. After the merchants are expelled, Christ responds to the Pharisees by telling them that if they wish, they can destroy the temple because He will rebuild it in three days: He realigns the sacred space with His own existence.

Secondly, Christianity is beyond sacred time. When the Pharisees ask Him to heal a paralytic on the Sabbath, He answers them that He is Lord of the Sabbath.

Finally, the decision taken by the Apostles at the First Council of Jerusalem not to require circumcision means the liberation of nascent Christianity from the sacred ritual.

And Peter goes even further by saying in his first letter that the necessary sacrifice is a spiritual sacrifice, a holy, merciful, compassionate life.

The man of the sacred – of ritual and sacrifice – contrasts with the spiritual man, the man whose very status is that of a fundamental freedom.

For the spiritual man, in his own secularity, in his earthly autonomy, everything has its origin in God and everything in Him is transfigured. As Paul says, the creation groans with the pangs of childbirth waiting for the children of God to bring Redemption.

For the spiritual man, the great question, in the face of politics, is not the distinction between the sacred and the profane. It is rather the intimate relationship between mysticism and politics.

It is the savouring of divine things, it is the austere exercise of the constant divine presence.

And it is, at the same time, the restitution to politics of its absolute profane terms of reference:

— the truth: of words, of gestures, of projects, of decisions, of campaigns;
— justice: in the management of the universal destiny of all worldly goods, in the essential respect of equality among all men, in the search for and in the discovery of

---

17 Certeau, Michel, in *La fable mystique*. Kung, Hatis, in *Être Chrétien*. *(Author's Note)*

solutions that enable every man, in every distinct society and at the level of the whole planet, meet their basic needs and respect their dignity as human beings and their responsibility to be free.

To so little or so much does complexity lead us today.

Elements for a women's spirituality[18]

WOMEN IN THE PLURAL

I speak of women; I speak of them in the plural.

Not because I reject the originality of every woman, but in order that this originality can emerge in the larger human context that makes it possible, that generates it, and welcomes it.

I speak of women; I speak of them in the plural.

Because today we are able to characterise womanhood sociologically. It is possible to say what, in their psychological evolution, binds together all women; to distinguish, in the evolution of our times, the furrows already dug by women, and the paths of thought and action which they can take, when the private flows through a thousand tributaries into the immense river which is the public.

I speak of women; I speak of them in the plural.

Because women are at the heart of vital issues of social structure. The definition of decisive public policies for the future of each person and of humanity will depend on their behaviour as a group. Whether we are conscious of it or choose to ignore it, they are the most decisive social agents guiding civilisation at the end of this century; because – as I have said and repeated in many circumstances – women are potentially the strongest, and most international, of all social movements.

I speak of women; I speak of them in the plural.

Because since Vatican II it has become very clear what the Christian message teaches us: no one is saved alone, it is as the People that we receive the salvation of God[19]. Women are a part of this people, a particular 'ethnicity' with no territory of its own but bearers of values and culture that are decisive in the history of this People and on the path to God's salvation.

---

18 Article published in the magazine *Reflexão Cristã* no. 66-67 (October / December 1989), pp. 102-122. Note: Using the text as published in the referred edition, it was decided to preserve the formatting of the original manuscript (in verse).

19 *Lumen Gentium*, par. 9. *(Author's Note)*

1. Individuation – Psychic Birth

Women are linked to each other by the primary conditions of their existence – their process of individuation is made in relation to the mother.

Following the autistic stage of symbiotic unity with the mother, separation takes place. The conditions of unity and separation are decisive factors in the life of every woman. It is then, following these two phases, that the key moment of the identity of each woman occurs, a moment that can be considered a true "psychic birth"[20].

A great silence reigns over this part of women's individual history. Does the modesty that now barely raises an eyebrow at the physical nude create obstacles to its psychic equivalent? It is in society's interest to do so. It's easy to see why. The large proportion of women in the working population, if they suddenly became aware of the importance of this primordial relationship, would set in motion a radical change: the understanding of work, its rhythm, its conditions, the compatibility of the female presence beside the child in the 'psychic birth' process. If every woman in the world of work became aware of the importance of her relationship with the child in this process, the rules that govern the workforce would most certainly wobble.

But this does not happen. The vast majority of women remain oblivious to an existential understanding of the laws that determine the psychological evolution of the human person.

In the case of Christian women, this knowledge is often replaced by a hyper-valorisation of motherhood, understood as the 'dimension of female vocation'[21] and seen as the point of arrival of the gestation process.

It is true that the letter *Mulieris dignitatem* speaks of the decisive role of the mother in the foundations of a new human personality[22], but it reduces the scope of this role by associating it to the task of education, nominated as the 'spiritual dimension of the parental function'[23].

Contrary to the widespread ignorance among women of their conditions of 'psychic birth', in popular iconography it is vividly represented. The statues of Saint Anne which first appeared in the Middle Ages and later in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, become, in some cases, the statuary that the people call "The Holy Mothers"[24], where Mary and Anne, emerging from a common core, seem to indicate this symbiotic unity between mother and daughter. Moreover, is not this also the idea of Leonardo de Vinci when he shows appearing from Saint Anne's very bosom, Mary and the Child?

2. The Identification Process

Women forge their identity by internalising the central figures in their lives. The super-ego, indispensable to the conduct of one's own life and to the management of one's drive, needs

---

20 Margarete Mitscherlich, *La femme pacifique*, Ed. Des Femmes. *(Author's Note)*

21 *Mulieris dignitatem*, 1989, par. 17. *(Author's Note)*

22 *bidem* for. *(Author's Note)*

23 *bidem* for. *(Author's Note)*

24 Soares dos Reis Museum. *(Author's Note)*

these figures as the backbone of its gradual elaboration. Contrary to what Freud, undoubtedly influenced by the society of his time, had described at the beginning of the century, the super-ego has not only as a frame of reference the world of paternal values and the drives that bind the human person to the father figure. Decisive, in the formation of the young girl, is the identification with the mother or other women.

In a survey conducted in 1986 and 1987 among female university students from highly industrialised countries (Japan, Canada and northern Europe), I found that the generation in their 20 to 30s has no internalised female role models (except for, in one-third of the Japanese participants, female family figures). The loss of role models that has taken place between this generation and those that preceded it leads to the formulation of aspirations expressed through everything that is identified to a greater or lesser extent with the 'career'.

Which leads me to ask whether there are in the present achievements values of womanhood that correspond to their own identity or whether women are only recapitulating processes followed by men decades or centuries ago.

It is certain that today's times – in the deluge of images and the demands they make, in the flurry of impressions they leave behind – have made the process of identification that helps build the super-ego, involuntary home to our values, practically unfeasible.

For this reason, when we speak of a 'crisis of values', I do not believe that what is at issue in the first place is the absence of abstract ideas, noble ideals, or moral proposals. In my view, what is at stake is the absence of strong affective relationships that have accompanied the psychic growth of the person.

Christian women have not eluded this phenomenon. An entirely non-scientific notion of autonomy often leads them to reject the very process of identification that formed them. There follows a deconstruction the consequences of which are unpredictable. The external symptom is that of a regression to a childish phase of growth characterised by a return to the bosom of the family, of wallowing in childhood memories, of fixation on affections that are the antithesis of what had been for years its super-ego.

Christian or otherwise, women who have never gone through the process of identifying with other women or who have rejected it, find themselves then desperately seeking a new identity – so often like the mismatched bits of a cubist painting!

Picasso's 'Girl in the Mirror' is not just a source of visual amusement. It is the certainty that we need to perceive the image to see ourselves, to define ourselves and to know ourselves. Or we end up feeling that the model that shapes us, even if we fear it as if it were an image in the mirror, is always different from what we actually are!

3. Beyond Equality

Women have lived the last two decades under the banner of equality. Although if in practice this still far differs from the letter of the law, it can be said that the achievement of equality between men and women has been the great struggle that women have waged in the last 15 to 20 years.

In the wake of other social movements, women have diagnosed the discrimination they suffer in all walks of life. This created a genuine international law which was gradually incorporated into national legislation.

Along with many other women, I believed that the equality experienced by a large number of women would lead to a qualitative change in the various areas of human activity. There would thus be profound transformations in work, in the economy, in public services, in politics. Or so I believed…

Today I have to recognise that this change is far from tangible or even perceptible. On the contrary, women seem to reinforce the *status quo* by adapting, unchallenged, to the norms created by men. In the exceptional cases in which one or another woman breaks this marasmus of forced equality, it is often the other women who stand at a prudent distance, withdrawing the only social basis of support that she could legitimately expect.

More serious are the consequences of this assimilation. The adaptation of women to the current framework is at the price of an inhumane workload for the vast majority of women – who in our country constitute 42% of the working population, a number that is only matched within the EEC by France and the United Kingdom.

Immersed in this way in the structures that man has created, women adapt at a great price: that of silencing their own contribution, their own culture of womanhood.

Just like those peoples who are enjoying recent independence, the community that women make up cannot just assert themselves or acquire an identity of their own through the defence of their civic autonomy, of their existence in the face of the law. It is not enough for womanhood to exercise its 'sovereignty' over its 'territory'. In order to constitute itself as a people, that is, as a differentiated culture that has unforeseen answers to situations and problems, which expresses unprecedented attitudes to the wide range of ideas, feelings and gestures, women have to assume that equality is their right as a principle and not a gauge of social levelling.

Equality does not mean uniformity, or the undifferentiated exchange of one set of people for another. The principle of equality guarantees that there is no discrimination based on difference. Instead of legitimising uniformity, it safeguards difference. Instead of levelling, it says that novelty is salutary.

Women, having undergone substantial exposure to the risks the affirmation of difference brings, have easily submitted to the demands of the 'ideology of equality'. These demands are diverse and misleading: the stand taken by the great behemoths that consider themselves guardians of ideologies; group dynamics that establish the principle of turnover of responsibilities as a logical consequence of the principle of equality. All one and another do is guarantee by all means necessary the defence of society and its institutions in the face of agents of difference that could call into question some of its foundations.

This ideology of equality, apparently guided by respect for individual rights and the lofty ideals of freedom, has its deepest roots in the totalitarian tendencies of people and groups

and in the feelings of 'envy'[25] that contribute towards structuring the relationship mechanisms of each person.

Despite the danger I see in the ideology of equality, I cannot but consider as positive all the affirmative action in the name of equality that focuses on the dignity of the human person, male or female. For this reason, I consider John Paul II's extensive defence of equality between men and women in his letter on the dignity of women to be of great historical importance. This statement is all the more meaningful the more I recognise in his arguments fragments that come from women's own thinking – from Edith Stein in the early 1940s to theologians who have deftly inserted themselves into the women's movement.

Equality has to be affirmed and defended – and I know well enough to what extent, in practical terms, women are still far from achieving it. But it is important that we qualify equality. A few years ago I named the equality between men and women 'unprecedented and subversive'[26].

The fact is equality inevitably raises the problem of the 'norm'. Therefore, being historically unprecedented, still unsteady on its feet, it is always potentially subversive. It does not leave the norm untouched – it affects it, it transforms it. Hence the potential for change that self-aware women can bring with them.

WOMEN AS A PEOPLE

The moment that women live in is decisive, as it is also for the great social movements of our time.

If women are able to add fresh approaches to all kinds of arenas of human achievement, female culture can help to trace new paths and enrich everything that is human.

If this fails to happen, all that remains is the hope of a 'diaspora' uniting by invisible threads the women who, in all domains and in all continents, venture into the unknown.

This is where women find themselves these days, in transit – on the way to a place where they belong, hoping for a time that still has not yet reached full-term.

The importance of women's movements lies precisely in the possibility of forging a people out of the diaspora, in a space and time where the culture of womanhood is moulded, expressed and deepened.

1. From Images to Vocation
Christian women have been particularly keen to seek equality. It is undoubtedly in the USA that this quest has been more intense. It is sufficient to refer as proof of the institutional

---

25 I am not referring obviously to envy as a moral category, but to envy as a psychoanalytic concept, cf. Margarete Mitscherlich, *La femme pacifique (Étude psycanalytique de l'agressivit'e selon le sexe). (Author's Note)*

26 'L'égalité inédite et subversive', in *L'égalité*, Geneva International Discussions, ed. La Baconniere, 1982. *(Author's Note)*

significance of female proactivity, to the letter of the American Bishops that was written in dialogue with women across all walks of life, with representatives of women's groups and movements.

It is true that the hyper-simplification of the woman's role in the Church – mimicking the example of Mary, 'Virgin and Mother'[27] – could not respond to the radical change taking place in the lives of women. Ergo the 'discomfort' of many women, hence their dissatisfaction. It was a question of forging new paths, addressing issues for which there were no ready answers.

The epithet 'Virgin and Mother' is very rich in perspectives illuminating these new paths, but in practice 'the dust gathering over centuries' has failed to shake off patriarchal inter-pretation. At its most extreme, it is virginity consecrated to God and physical motherhood that are seen as equivalent to the epithet. I think that the simplistic reduction of the vocation of women to a mere social and psychological framework of the management of sexuality is not sufficient to express the complexity of the situations in which today's women circulate.

It is therefore worth clarifying the various levels at which women make their presence felt. If we take an apercu offered some years ago by a female French philosopher[28], there are four levels: civil status, vocation, functions and social roles.

The civil situation of women, within Western civilisation, is part of a framework established by secular society. The changes to customs in the last 25 years have led to many situations that are not foreseen in the law. Thus, for example, in the early 1980s a study by the United Nations University on alternative lifestyles in Europe indicated that in Germany alone there were more than 3,000 independent living communities whose civil status was not covered by the existing laws. Although the desire to lead alternative styles has diminished in the second half of the decade with the wave of narcissism to which professional women in particular are vulnerable, the civil status is still not very clear. But this lack of legal clarity only confirms what I wish to point out: the absurdity of any attempt to equate women's civil status with their vocation.

Vocation is not, therefore, the 'baptism' of a specific civil status – seemingly religious, such an attitude would mean an unsustainable secularisation of a sphere of life that cannot be subordinated either to the contingencies of sexuality or to the juridical rules of civil soci-ety. Vocation is the summons over time to accomplish a mission in which the gifts and the conditions of the life of each woman make sense. It is a life project, made up of a thousand instants and possibilities, the fruit of a myriad of situations. It is, at the same time, a reading of individual history and its confident projection into the future. It is, in the Freudian sense of the term, the realisation of a 'destiny'.

The functions are the visible, exteriorised, 'productive' side of the vocation. They are equiv-alent to the concrete tasks that each person is called upon to perform, both by the nature of the work he or she is given and by the social constraints that determine it. Responsibilities vary with the stage of the life of each woman, with her cultural situation and with the demands that

---

27 Unfortunately, the Holy Father, in his recent letter, allows his thoughts to fall back on this simplistic formula. *(Author's Note)*

28 Yvonne Pellé-Douel, in *Etre femme*, 1967. *(Author's Note)*

result from it. It is undoubtedly at the functional level that the consequences of the societal transformations of our time have been most felt in the lives of women.

The social roles already have a different reading. It is no longer the concrete responsibilities/ tasks required by the work, but rather the result of the expectations and affective investments of others in the various circles of relationships to which the woman is attached. It is through the roles they assume in a community or group that women exercise power. It is in these roles that people are enthroned or dethroned. It is at the level of the roles that women's groups find their greatest difficulties, since the emotional investment that women make in each other is profoundly influenced by the history of each woman's individuation – and to this history no group can make changes, no matter how great their commitment to the women's movement…

Roles, responsibilities, vocation, civil status, do not exist in a vacuum. While they influence each other accordingly, they all feed off images perpetrated by the great opinion-making and value-adding industries. The images that women receive about themselves are the result, in part, of the already recognised social transformations, but they are, to a large extent, the determinants of what women will think about themselves, their choices, their 'destiny' and how they will perform tasks and play roles.

Faced with this complex web of autonomous and interdependent factors, it is not surprising that the general debate in the United States has more to do with the roles that women play than with any other aspect. What remains to be resolved in this debate is still and always will be the relationship between the 'destiny' of each woman and the cultural identity of this people that are women.

2. Women, Disciples of Christ

It seems to me very significant that John Paul II addressing women and speaking about women has unhesitatingly categorised women in the Gospel as the true disciples of Christ. Therein lies the originality of the Church's official position on women, in my opinion.

It is not only a general reference to the presence of women in the multitude that followed Jesus, nor to the description of their faithfulness on Calvary and their generosity in the proclamation of the Resurrection. These aspects have long been a part of Church doctrine and important references to the spirituality of women. In this case, the reading is another: three moments in which the public affirmation of women in the community of disciples, male and female, are endowed with particular force.

The key moment is that of the meeting with Martha[29], after the death of Lazarus.

Christ comes to the house of his dead friend and seems to want to console Martha by telling her that the brother will rise again. Martha answers him:

I know he will rise again in the resurrection on the last day.

---

29   Jo. 11, 23-27. *(Author's Note)*

Christ then speaks to her in a tone of solemn affirmation, one to one. He speaks of Himself – and asks her for the answer that will confirm her or not as a disciple. He tells her:

> *I am the resurrection and the life.*
> *He who believes in Me, though he may die, yet shall he live.*
> *And whoever lives and believes in Me shall never die.*

And Martha answers him:

> *Yes, Lord,*
> *I believe that You are the Christ,*
> *the Son of God,*
> *who is coming into the world.*

We come across the same answer from Peter at another time in the Gospel[30]. The disciples tell Christ that people think He is John the Baptist, Elijah or even Jeremiah. Christ asks them:

> *But who do you say that I am?*

Peter spontaneously responds:

> *You are the Christ, you are the Son of the living God.*

The parallels between the answers of Martha and Peter are absolutely evident. The affirmation of faith in Christ, as Son of God, is direct and clear. It is so important that in response Jesus entrusts His Church to Peter. And Martha? Is it not legitimate to think that, in a way that we do not know, the Church of Christ will also be built on her? Perhaps it is this intuition that John Paul II feels when he says in his letter that the passage referring to Martha is "one of the most important of the Gospel"...

3. The Legitimation of Non-written Law

Martha's case is not an isolated one in the Gospel. Another moment appears in our eyes today as so important that one of the most significant Theology books on the place of women in Christianity is devoted to it. It is Mark who tells us[31]:

> *It was now two days before the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread (...)*

---

30   Mt. 16, 13-16. *(Author, 13-16)*

31   Elisabeth Shussler-Firenza, *En memoire d'elle*, ed. du Cerf, 1986. *(Author's Note)*

While He was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper.
A woman came to Him
with an alabaster flask
of ointment of pure nard,
very costly,
and she broke the flask,
and poured it over His head.

There were some who said to themselves indignantly
"Why was the ointment wasted like that?
For this ointment could have been sold for more than 300 dinarii,
and given to the poor."
And they scolded her.

But Jesus said,
"Leave her alone. Why do you trouble her?
She has done a beautiful thing to Me.
For you always have the poor with you,
and, whenever you want, you can always do good for them,
but you will not always have Me.
She has done what she could;
she has anointed my body beforehand
for burial.

And truly I say to you,
wherever the gospel is proclaimed
in the whole world,
what she has done
will be told in memory of her."

The solemnity of Christ's affirmation, his prophetic intensity, lead one to think that by his gesture this woman did more than prove the generosity of her respect: she obeyed a sacred rite; she did so without thinking; she performed the rite for all to see.

I cannot fail to find in this event in the life of Jesus an astonishing parallel with the myth of Antigone, just as was articulated by Sophocles in the tragedy he wrote about it. And it is of no less importance that the myth of Antigone is the one that, with most frequency, has resurfaced time and again in various stages and cultures of Western civilisation.

Why this fascination? Apparently Antigone does nothing extraordinary: she only wants to bury her brother's body that the king of Thebes had ordered to be disposed of without burial. Creon's logic is irrefutable: it is up to him to defend law and order. But so is that of Antigone: it is up to her to respect and fulfil the obligations the gods have always demanded.

Antigone's attitude goes beyond the clash of two logics: she wants to imbue blind metropolitan logic with that of the most sacred human obligations. She wishes to give her responsibility as a woman – in her capacity to care for her brethren and respect unwritten law – the legitimacy of the written and public law.

This aspiration of Antigone is yet to be resolved even today. It represents 'a primordial psychosocial conflict'[32], insofar as 'the segregation of men and women into separate spheres is an invariant in the history of civilisation'.

It is true that in the episode of the anointing of Christ the confrontation between the woman who anointed him and the disciples who are present does not take on the tragic proportions of the confrontation between Antigone and Creon. But the main ingredients of Antigone's tragedy are therein present:

— it is a matter of obedience to sacred customs, of a burial rite inscribed in the moral codes on which the civilisation in which it takes place is founded – it is Christ himself who says that it is in the woman's gesture that the rite of his burial is foretold;
— the basis for the disciples' indignation against the woman who anointed Jesus is, as in Antigone's tragedy, based on political logic: the proper use of money and the argument in favour of the poor seems as irrefutable as King Creon's argument is in defending the political laws governing Thebes;
— just like Antigone, aware that she cannot go beyond this gesture of compassion for the body of her brother, the woman who anointed Jesus does all that is in her physical power to do; therefore Christ says that "she has done what she could."

The dialogue between Christ and the Samaritan woman is of another nature33[33]. There is a startling tooing and froing between solemn affirmations of the divinity of Christ and the carefree words of a woman taking care of her daily chores, between the proclamation of the mission of Christ and the sudden awareness that Jesus is truly Christ.

Here we have the time-honoured act of drawing water from a well leading to a public revelation. The woman drops the pitcher and runs to the city to tell how she had seen Christ:

> *Come, see a man who told me everything I ever did.*
> *Can this be the Christ?*
> *(…)*
> *Many Samaritans from that town believed*
> *in him because of the woman's testimony,*
> *"He told me all that I ever did."*

---

32 Rosiska Darcy de Oliveira, in *La formation des femmes en tant que miroir de l'ambiguité,* in the process of being published. *(Author's Note)*

33 Jo. 4, 39-42. *(Author's Note)*

These women historically live through what Antigone's myth has predicted: it is in the relationship with the wisdom that comes before written laws, from a source prior to the rules and norms of the city of men, that these women draw the strength to be / speak the words / make the gesture that places them at the very centre of history and therefore grants them integral identity as disciples of Christ.

PATHS FOR A WOMEN'S SPIRITUALITY

But what are the paths, the processes, that lead these women to these sources? It's no use beating around the bush: the spiritual quest of women has to touch upon the depths of their very own being – what some American female theologians call touching the 'foundation of being', the very root... It is there, in their own personal experience and that of the world experienced within them, that women can find the force that will lead them (perhaps...) to change the values of society.

We are thus on the path of what we can timidly call 'spirituality.' This is not an intimate quest with no basis in reality, or the world and history, nor even in the ancient and modern practices of meditation that women can fully find their way to God.

1. From "Within" History itself

It is in the midst of history, in contact with things and with others, in the most ordinary or most exceptional of circumstances, that is where this incarnation of the Faith takes place: the exact moment when the personal search for God partakes in the history of men and, therefore, enlivens and transfigures it from within.

What is there to be said then about this spirituality? It is commonplace today (while not my concern to summarise here) in all women's theology about women to insist on how Jesus Christ appears to us (as Paul says) as the 'Power and Wisdom of God'.

In fact, there is a whole Christian tradition, in particular of the thirteenth century with Joachim di Fiori and his followers, who saw in the Holy Spirit this wisdom. Moreover, they saw in the Spirit of Christ a 'feminine' reality that was yet to take shape. Other groups followed at the same time in a way considered more or less heretical, a similar path.

But soon the Renaissance and the Reformation would erase the last traces of what was a Theology hingeing on the Holy Spirit. And why? Because a certain autonomy enjoyed by the religious orders of the day, where it would have been possible to expand upon this same theology was hampered by the fact that the Reformation had dispensed with the religious orders found within its bosom, and for that reason contributed to the consolidation within the Catholic Church of the masculine imperative and hierarchical control.

It is true that the personalisation of knowledge, both in the books of wisdom and in the New Testament, seems to point to a divine reality which has had very little echo in Christian attitudes.

It is not for me a decisive (nor even pertinent) question, that of the masculine and the feminine – or, to put it even more succinctly, the masculine or feminine terminology used to speak of God. That seems to me to be a secondary matter. Moreover, if among the foundations of God's revelation to Israel moulding Him into graven image is taboo, as is the taking of His name in vain, all anthropomorphic representation, whether male or female, is considered nothing but the recourse to idolatry.

Another is the importance to me of the fact that the revelation of God in the history of men takes place in the person of Jesus Christ who is male. Returning to the tradition of the Middle Ages to which I just referred – and even more so the tradition of the Fathers of the Church from the fourth to the sixth century34[34] – is it not true that Christ has dedicated His Spirit to us until the end of time? And is not it true that in the identification between Wisdom and the Spirit another reality is in fact being expressed?

I cannot take this any further. But what I observe indicates a convergence, a path I cannot ignore. The Spirit takes up an important place in Christian life today. Women manifest attitudes, gestures, experiences that are akin to an 'echo' of this Spirit-Wisdom. And I ask: what if the Good News in our time was heralded by this manifestation of the Spirit/Wisdom through women as a people?

It is not necessarily that women in general are endowed with a special intuition that connects them to the Spirit, nor even the groups that in the Pentecostal Church are particularly prominent. These days it is a question – this also being the continuation of the 'fullness of times' in which God is revealed humanely in our history – of women who, in various ways, seek to live through this wisdom.

2. The Lineage of Women

Of whom we are their heirs. There is no female identity – and I return to what I said at the beginning – the collective strength of womanhood does not exist if there is no such thing as a sense of legacy passed from one woman to another. Every woman who breaks the chain of this legacy has moved on from her feminine identity.

And when I speak of the legacy of women, I think not only of Christian women but also of those who are not Christians, who do not call themselves Christians or even some who call themselves non-Christians. It is that in all these paths the search for someone is constant, someone speaks up, as if in expectation of encountering another. It is they above all who manifest some of this intelligence, this fineness, this deftness, this immense goodness with which Solomon describes the Wisdom that creates everything.

I recall the book[35] in which Marguerite Duras speaks in unmistakably autobiographical terms of her cure for drying out from the effects of alcohol. It is described as a phase

---

34 *Lettres de St. Macaire. (Author's Note)*

35 Marguerite Duras, *La Vie Matérielle. (Author's Note)*

where she has the feeling of seeing people and things that exist in her imagination (or in her unconscious?) and that others around her do not see. The last two or three pages contain an impressive description: she sees a man whose age she does not know, whose hair at times looks black, and at others white; she sees this man every day, in the morning, and at night she also sees him; and she says: "He does not speak, but he asks me a question as if there is something I should know and I don't. He keeps asking, he keeps insisting and I do not know what he wants me to tell him."

If anyone asked Marguerite Duras if she were a Christian she would say not. But it is so poignant, the anguish of someone who senses the presence of another, who knows a question is coming, who knows that there is an answer to it and yet does not know what the words are because she does not know what the question is and yet, as she says, she should know...

There are many women in this century who follow this very path. And if we put to one side – as Clarice Lispector says – "these childish games that are the problems of sex" and look for something else in women's lives, then we discover throughout this century, decade after decade, women who in telling their lives reveal to us something beyond all the established canons and beyond their own conception of their history.

This 'something' which is revealed to us in so many different ways speaks to us of a time belonging to the Spirit of Wisdom which renews all things and which, as Solomon says, 'is the mother of all earthly goods', who created all of what there is in the universe, and which extends from one end of the earth to the other.

Today the Gospel is the proclamation of the power to replenish from this spirit/wisdom. It is by experiencing this power that it frees us and enables us to choose our life to lead in this continuous flow of the Spirit/Wisdom: united as one people to live the time of the Spirit; scattered as one people to be the space of the Spirit.

Three years ago I saw in California a painting by Françoise Gilot in the artist's36[36] own studio. At a particularly important point in my life in March 1986, I spent hours contemplating it. It is of a low-ceilinged house, ochre or white, somewhere in North Africa. Outside the landscape is parched, the heat is tangible. The door is wide open. But you can't see anything inside the house. Only a great light emanating from it. At the door, there are the silhouettes of two women whose faces we cannot see. To these nameless women Françoise Gilot gave the title: "The guardians of the threshold".

It turns out that for me, the expression Church of the threshold, used by Fr. Congar during the Second Vatican Council, is the strongest expression of the meaning of the Church in our time. Unless we wistfully long to create small 'Churches', it is always on the threshold that we can place ourselves.

Why: where does the Church begin? – a question that the Council itself left without a definitive answer, when giving the word Church no less than nine different interpretations

---

36 Françoise Gilot is a painter of French origin who currently lives in the USA. She is the mother of Paloma and Claude Picasso. Her perspective on painting is expounded upon in her book *Ma vie avec Picasso, (My Life with Picasso).(Author's Note)*

of which the least important is not that of the Church as humanity in its entirety, a wealth of tribes and people who are heading for the Holy City.

'Women of the threshold' is thus immensely rich in meaning.

On the threshold with those who dare not take another step – because many things hold them back.

On the threshold with those who speed by us – because the hectic pace of life does not allow them to stop.

On the threshold with those who seek out the temples of all religions – because the need for religion of some kind has led them to times and places where the presence of God is recognisable...

Women of the threshold, living, reaping the fruits of the Spirit. And therefore autonomous and free because, as Paul says, "against such things there is no law."

Motivations and values
in today's society[37]

INTRODUCTION

I have just returned from a meeting of politicians and experts who, assembled to discuss the costs of ecology, debated, with impressive urgency, the survival of our planet. They reaffirmed that the world population cannot be fed if it continues to grow at the current rate. They have shown that the 'saturation' of the planet (beyond the breaking point of eight to 10 billion people) will inevitably lead to the destruction of life systems (in the atmosphere, water and soil) which support and provide the fundamental conditions for the possibility of human life on the planet.

At some point in the discussion, a Bangladeshi social scientist and policy researcher recounted to us an episode from his fieldwork. Talking to a man considered 'rich', that is, who owned a pair of sandals, two changes of suit and a little piece of land found at the mouth of the rivers that flow into the Indian Ocean, he spoke to him at length of the 'greenhouse effect', the increase in the temperature of the atmosphere and the consequent rise in sea level. It was evident that, in the face of such a prediction, the land which the rich man had bought would be the first to disappear under the waters. And the rich man only answered him: "Why me?"

What does this man tell us?

That great catastrophes do not choose their targets – all men are directly involved even when they have nothing to do with the production of the greenhouse effect or when they are at the tail of *per capita* income.

Never before has the interdependence between the person and society reached such a degree of symbiosis. Never before has this interdependence been experienced on a planetary scale with such acuity.

Men, with their way of life, their social organisation, the technology they use, the resources present in everything we call 'the earth', form a global system. This scenario is unprecedented in human history.

SUBJECT AND SOCIETY

1. In a global system, the noosphere

As part of the global system, mankind forms a 'layer' which, having its own laws, never ceases to be in permanent interaction with the other layers, the biosphere, atmosphere and the physical foundations of the planet itself, water and the soil. It was this layer which Teilhard de Chardin referred to as the noosphere.

How can we describe the noosphere? It is formed by this immense chain of individuals that populate our planet. Fragmentation can sometimes prevent us from having the perception of humanity as a continuous 'layer', but it manifests itself and is clearly visible in politically structured territorial units – it is the nation-states. Recent events in Eastern Europe show that there are other units, made up of links of culture, history, tradition, and religion. On another level, we also see it in communities that are established across borders – among scientists, academics, businesses, and young people.

All the groups that make up the noosphere have overlapping zones: the companies are located in countries, university students belong to certain cultural areas. That is its richness. The greater the overlap is, the more stable is the social and cultural fabric, though its degree of complexity constitutes a serious difficulty in the interaction of all subsystems.

In considering the noosphere, we are, therefore, in the same instant, contemplating the individuals and the various groups that they form; we are talking about people and society.

2. The circularity between individual and society

When social and political problems worsen in any society, the question is often heard: do who need to change structures or mentalities? We wish at all cost to establish an order of priority between the individual and society. It is based on a number of hypotheses pertinently analysed by Crozier, where it is thought that all transformation is coherent, whether ultimately a system consists of subsystems which may not fundamentally cohere or may even be considered in opposition. It is thought that there is a hierarchy that determines interaction when it is known that it is not so – each system has multiple inputs and it is not always the most important subsystem or the most socially meaningful variable that introduces change. It is finally thought that the whole domain is homogeneous when the system contains a plethora of 'lifestyles'.

This is why society is not a one-dimensional reality, that is to say, defined exclusively by its political regime, or its degree of economic development, or its contribution to the arts, its oral tradition or religion. Haven't we recently just seen this for ourselves when the societies of Eastern nations opened up before us? We do not see only communist societies that have

ceased to be communists: we see economically underdeveloped countries with specifically European problems, we see societies with a high cultural index, we discover worlds in which the religious dimension of existence is constitutive of society itself. Society appears to us as multidimensional.

The question of priority between the individual and society cannot be solved other than by Morin's perspective: that of a process of circularity whereby individuals and societies co-produce each other.

In the multiplicity of actions that take place in society, individuals think and act at the same time as a product of society and as instigators also. The isolated individual is, in a vast extent of his or her identity, almost an epiphenomenon of the cultural and economic reality of the society in which he or she lives. But the isolated individual is an abstraction: our coexistence with others in the family, at work, in the innumerable opportunities for interaction and exchange in contemporary life, provoke unexpected reactions, perhaps even new values and postures. Having reached the necessary critical mass, these values and postures will, in turn, in the strategic free-for-all of social subsystems, lead to new contours in society, granting it new characteristics.

It is true, people as individuals are affected by society, and depend on it; in a sense, they emanate from it. But in their turn, by taking a critical stance in society, by placing themselves in the narrative as subjects of independent thought and decision, they generate society. Moreover, we find here the scientific basis for the theological assertion that the Christian generates and is generated by the Church – it is the Christians constituted within the Church who, in turn, generate in the Spirit other Christians.

3. Intervention of the person in society

More than in any other field of analysis, the observation of society and reflection thereof embody the subject that observes and reflects. All acts are driven by values and norms from which the subject cannot escape. By intervening in society, the individual conveys the way he sees himself and the world.

Conversely, it is true that this vision of the world and of ourselves was shaped in its fundamental structure by the bonds, atmosphere of affectivity and values present in the society where our personal history was forged. It is not an influence that manifests itself by simple mathematics: a single social cause is not discernible in the definition of its psychic structure. It is above all the overlapping of the various subsystems, the way their coherence or homogeneity is experienced (or, as we have seen, the lack of global coherence and compatibility of heterogeneous subsystems), in a word what we call in macrosociology (a) 'organisation of society', which is largely responsible for the answers that the individual will give to the questions posed in the course of his or her life.

The autonomy of each individual, self-development, and being a person, is inseparable from society and its functioning as a whole and from the subsystems that make it up. Gradually, his or her universe of representations, made up of the myriad circumstances of the life lived, and

the reflection on that experience, lead the individual to a view of the world that is intrinsically personal, specific and unique. The verbalisation of this vision is the first instrument given to him or her, in turn, to influence society.

The interactive process that takes place throughout life between the individual and society gives an indication of the infinity of processes that constantly crisscross the social community and the dynamism that society always in itself contains. Static society, which Margaret Mead described in her account of Samoa in the 1920s, is today no more than an abstraction, a snapshot, an image captured of a particular moment.

Society is a living organism, a system in which multiple subsystems combine, face off, and overlap. In relation to it we can only perceive, as from its decay, the 'differentials'. We feel and experience variation without it being possible for us to define society at every moment of its manifold manifestations. As part of society, the individual grasps these variations porously. It is in the way the differentials affect us that resides the stimulus to our critical capacity and our intervention as unique individuals.

With each variation a moment of 'juncture' or 'bifurcation' takes place. Prigogine has clearly shown that at times of divergence in a system, a small phenomenon is enough to provoke a reaction and ensure a new level of energy. For this reason, the intervention of the person in society is first of all awareness of the currents that manipulate society from within and are capable of provoking divergences to introduce, at the meeting point, the element that will replace the 'random' with human decision. (There follows the question of the 'will' of the masses, which, as Baudrillard has pointed out, are amoeboids, and have a will which can be superimposed on the individual and impose a single interpretation where there once was divergence. This predicament is, in political terms, the most difficult issue facing democracy today.)

The person/society dynamic to which I am pointing is one that shifts the proactive charge of motivations and values acting upon society to an internalised system perspective, where everything is interrelated and where actions and feedbacks occur that reflect on individual people and at the same time are provoked by them.

Motivations and values are, in this context, the result of sociocultural conditions prior to the psychological process of individuation and expression of the most radical differentiation that separates each individual from another in each one's unique history and agenda.

INCIDENCE OF COMPLEXITY IN MOTIVATIONS AND VALUES

1. Characteristics of society as a system

To a theoretical study on societies and their production there must today be added a reflection on the empirical data of the time in which we live. Nowadays problems of such a magnitude converge to the extent that they 'overflow', as it were, from their own realm to invade others and give rise to new problems within these. The above-mentioned overlap is a constant feature of the phenomena that make up society and the problems it generates. The theories of 'concentric circles', so in vogue in the discussions that take place today about the new

architecture of Europe, will not lead anywhere since they suppose a society without intersection or interference.

Society today is a reality that is defined in terms of its complexity, that is, a set of autonomous elements that mutually condition themselves to such a degree that in observation they appear to be totally interdependent. These elements are not fragmented entities but, in turn, conjugations with the same characteristics of autonomy and interdependence. Any attempt to look for the central core is ineffective, since in each subset or subsystem there are elements that are simultaneously part of other subsystems – for example, the bakery integrates the bread production system but is also part of a neighbourhood, belongs to the network of commerce, is eventually part of the *catering* of a hotel chain, and so on … All these subsystems have their own laws as part of a political society but also have their operating laws as sociological elements of our systemic reality.

Out of this whole cosmos of intersections, interdependencies and overlaps, a complex system is born. Due to the fact that its elements belong to a variety of subsystems, it is always notoriously unstable. It overlaps turbulent, uncertain phenomena. One and the other term should be understood in their scientific meaning. The turbulence of systems is linked to the situation around them, predictable and unpredictable disturbances that alter the behaviour of subsystems and the overall functioning of the system. (In this regard, referring to the governments' capacity to get things done, French Prime Minister Michel Rocard at a conference of the Club of Rome referred to the need for new 'piloting instruments' to cross zones of turbulence.) By uncertainty one should not understand something vague or random, muddled in nature. What is meant when speaking of uncertainty is that there are matching probabilities of the system remoulding itself to go down different paths, but there is no absolute certainty as to the best path to follow.

This state of complexity, once perceived as such, especially when we become aware of the existence of contradictory phenomena, causes insecurity and fear. In these two frames of mind we perhaps find the reductive, simplifying mechanisms that impact upon all levels of existence. In my view, therein lies the unconscious motivation for religious fundamentalism, which tends to return society to an archaic past where things seemed much simpler.

Our motivations are not impervious to this perception. In the face of the complexity of reality, in constant movement and in which each positive transformation brings with it new problems and questions, our response is to reduce everything simply to an elementary technicality – for each cause, an effect; for each effect, a cause. It's the mechanical age. It is the path towards a proactivism that is often generous and well-intentioned, but sooner or later becomes non-viable for not taking into account the fullness of reality.

2. Disorder and noise

Our society, as it becomes increasingly complex, brings with it ever more disorder. By disorder we here mean from a sociological perspective, the multiplicity of subsystems and the overlapping of some of its parts prevent the total regulation of the system. In a free system

of government, no single legislation accounts for the multiple interactions that exist. That is why men can 'create', that is, invent new orders for new situations. But once they have been created, they are an existing reality that, in turn, will introduce even greater complexity and disorder into the global system.

While manmade machines don't take long to break down from the disorder of wear and tear caused by failing parts, the same can't be said for living systems. Each element is in a constant altered state and is thus a source of disorder. In a sense, it is even possible to say, when talking about living systems, that "the more complex they are, the more they tolerate disorder itself and its whims".

In static societies, permanence brought a notion of 'order' that once accepted would spur us on, dictating our choices and behaviours. Nowadays, understanding society as a dynamic system, partaking in the global balance of living systems leads us to contemplate a new way of looking at life. To live, as a person who is inevitably part of this living system, requires that we 'recognise the multifarious disorder of the social organisational framework'. The value of 'order' ceases to conform to what exists to become a creation, by definition always nonconformist.

This new perspective is difficult to follow and just as demanding: it forces us to be insightful, and take risks. That is why 'disorder' motivates other behaviours. The examples are manifold: keeping a safe distance by wearing personalised headphones, allowing us to negotiate the disorder around us; experiencing analysis paralysis, thus avoiding confrontation with disorder and with it the probability of making the wrong choice or failing; overvaluing management professions as if the organisation of small business cells could shatter the disorder that epitomises the entire social organisational framework; submitting oneself to psychological assessment, in the dream of finding a new way of subjugating this disorder.

Disorder is accompanied by an accumulation of 'noise'. As it is impossible for the human mind to grasp and store all the information available in its social environment, in the way it reaches out to each individual, this information becomes background noise. The acceleration of history leads to the hyperconsumption of events. Increasingly, the information that makes them up is simplified into signals that are 20 to 30 second one-off, disjointed facts.

A culture that makes society a living system of humans for humans must acquire the ability to integrate this 'noise' by treating it and breaking it down into its constituent elements. It needs to gather the information and find its essence.

A new dignified human approach to this noise is required, to deal with it and to prevent the truly significant and important signals from being muffled. It is our cognitive ability and its development that must be stimulated by new configurations. I think that we will be increasingly inclined towards coextensive learning throughout life and all activities. Individual motivation may initially be simply a defence mechanism for mental survival. It will become, empowered by our newly acquired dignity, a need to get to the essence of the matter and create ever more space for the signals that reach us.

3. Technical mediation and ambiguity

Much of the disorder of the social environment results from the increasing technical mediation of all social acts, even the most elementary. Buying and selling, entering and exiting through doors or turnstiles, traffic flow, appliances to do all our chores from washing machines to microwave ovens – everything consists of a technical framework with its rules, its requirements, its own language.

If, on the one hand, this added texture presupposes the sway of technology over our lives, on the other hand, it tends to overcome the ambiguity as a component of human behaviour.

It is true however, that ambiguity is essential to human behaviour. Ambiguity in our words, feelings, and rationality itself. As Clarice Lispector says, "what seems to be meaningless – is meaning". The whole instance of meaninglessness "is precisely the frightening certainty that that's exactly what it means, and that not only can I not reach it, I don't want to because I have no guarantees". The human being lives this ambivalence in the depths of his being. So how does he respond to technical mediation and its linear logic?

On the one hand, the ability to function with technology is an asset for the time and society in which we live. The reasons why are multiple and even contradictory: from simply adapting to conveniently avoid making mistakes and the risk of failure, to the desire to learn other ways of doing things to better perform the tasks society demands or that we allocate ourselves. In the same person and act of using technology (see the obsession with personal computers) the 'peace of mind' provided by an instrument that answers just 'yes' or 'no', gets confused with our burning desire to save time and resolve a given problem in the best way possible.

The individual is thus obliged to separate water from water: to acquire the insight that makes us capable of determining what is physically possible here, to understand our real grasp of the technology involved and, at the same time, our complicity with its non-human technical basis...

4. The variation of the invariants

The globalisation of events, cultural, economic, social, and political interdependencies, the polycentrism of social phenomena, are all factors of our recent socio-political history. Eastern Europe and South Africa each reveal in their own way the extreme simplification or even reductionism with which we have approached the 'communist world' or the '*apartheid* regime'. It is found that in all societies, even in those which were subjected to repressive systems, there were societal elements and phenomena that allowed a constant flow within societies without, however, being visible to the outsider.

The sudden overthrow of communism leads us to question the interpretation of society constituted on the basis of 'hard nuclei', as a totalitarian and messianic ideology of course is. Once these nuclei have been undone, it turns out that at the level of the peripheral membranes of society, transformations have the conditions to take place. We live in an interface society. It is in these that originality resides and not in the hard nuclei.

What do these proclamations mean? For many, 'communism' is simply replaced by 'capitalism'; *'Apartheid'* by 'one person/one vote'. That is, new 'hard nuclei' replace old ones and, while they imply greater freedoms, they still compromise the fluidity of society. If everything that contributes to the vibrancy of the system is eliminated in the process of transformation, paralysis will soon manifest itself. Society quickly becomes blocked – one of the most obvious symptoms is the emergence of power struggles, the taking of 'sides' within the very core of those forces that, as peripheral membranes, had been able to propel society to such a vibrant state that change took place.

In such a blocked society, different motivations face off. On the one hand, the desire to 'repeat' what others have already done. The strength to say 'no', which led to the overthrow of the hard nucleus does not, in the vast majority of cases, have original alternatives to help shape a new society. Unable to withstand any kind of instability for very long (a symptom of its own vibrancy), it then succumbs to the irrepressible desire for stability by implementing extreme versions of formulas already tried in other societies. On the other hand, (although to a much lesser extent) there is the common desire to 'innovate' that tends to introduce new operational templates. By their very nature the solutions they point towards accentuate instability insofar as they expose the whole of society to a mechanism of positive change that is open, however, to as yet undefined variables.

Innovation operates at all levels of the social structure. It does not attempt to change society as a whole, but works with existing subsystems; by transforming them, it also transforms their interactions. Morin states it rather clearly:

> It is necessary to consider as a whole the repetitively reproductive order and the transformative/innovative movement where what evolves is the reproduction system itself ... In transforming itself, the reproduction system makes the invariants vary.

In this confrontation it is the present and the future that are at stake. It is in our lack of imagination that resides one of today's greatest challenges, because the scale and constituents of the problems are unprecedented in all the history of humanity. Hence the mood of crisis, experienced as psychological stress at the individual level, and as disorder and conflict at the social level. But as Donald Michael insists, "we have reason to believe that the human capacity to learn is immense and virgin, and includes not only the ability to receive information, but to learn from it, and to learn about learning".

FROM PARADIGMS TO MOTIVATIONS

1. Paradigms, ideologies, norms
Motivations and values are deeply dependent on the ancient paradigms and myths at work within society.

Ancient myths provide the 'story told to us' of heroes, tragedies, fairy tale endings. They constitute the cultural sediment of the history of our society, whether real or fabled. They have a symbolic value that affects all representations of the real. They differ when they are passed down from generation to generation or recounted by scholars. Even in their most current form – the structure of language – they provide a framework of cognitive reference that is imposed on the very creation of our motivations, exempt from all value judgement. However, there are normative arguments in paradigms and myths that end up being the strongest foundations of the ethical identity of individuals.

On the personal level, the essentiality of myth leads us to the classic predicament of Antigone. Antigone, obeying a law before all laws, is the example of a consciousness "shaped" by a fundamental myth. These are the last words of Antigone in Sophocles' tragedy: "Look what I suffer – and at whose command! Because I respected the right." It is her surrender to a founding myth of society – respect for the dead – that is the motivation for her behaviour.

But rarely do the paradigms remain in their original pure state. Constantly reforged according to each society, paradigms manifest themselves through what has been lived and tend to leave behind the purely symbolic – creative and liberating – in which they are cast to drift towards ideology. Logical systems of thought and causality are appropriated. Generated by rationality, and tending to fall back on it whenever a new social situation confronts them, ideologies do not embody symbolic values.

As soon as symbolic values disappear from the conscious horizon of society and its individuals, ideologies become closed and dogmatic. Grafting symbolic or transcendent ideology *a posteriori* is always ineffective, which explains, among other things, why Christianity, when reduced to an ideology, loses its transcendent dimension in which the service is no longer a contemporisation of the Mystery of Christ and where the Gospel loses its evangelistic potency.

At the same time, ideologies, weaving through society in space and time, become social norms and conventions. And so this then is the great travesty: social conventions substitute our motivations; and social norms are taken as values.

2. Mechanisms of motivation

In spite of the consequences of the fact that society and the individual are co-productive, the latter can feel motivated for one of two reasons: one is rooted in the person's self-determination; another has as its starting point the various levels of cultural identity of society. The two processes interact in an incessant exchange within the system and are intensified or diminished by the broader social and political ecosystem in which the individual and society fit.

Our motivations express, to a large extent, the relation of the individual to the society. Society provides numerous stimuli at all levels of its perception. The libido provides energy that leads to explicit and consensual motivation.

Experienced as need – objective or merely subjective – motivation is a construction. It is based on a strategy constantly elaborated within us, but whose work and constituents the subject may be unaware of at the conscious level.

A strategy is not a plan. As a result of rational and affective factors, of this permanent struggle between the conscious and the unconscious, the strategy of each individual, even among the most resolute, is contingent, arbitrary, erratic. On its way it changes direction and objective, it rejects what has been sought before, seeks what it has just rejected; transforms the means into ends and is capable of nullifying the ends. Nevertheless, motivation always has a meaning that can be rationalised empirically, because it reveals itself in the repetitive character of the mechanisms that it uses.

By the multiplicity of the mechanisms to which it appeals and by the spiritual 'manoeuvres' it requires, motivation is a manifestation of the freedom of the individual. If, on the one hand, in each situation vis-à-vis society, the individual finds him or herself trapped in the machinations of others whose behaviour, or the circumstances themselves, are the decisive factor, on the other hand, we have the freedom to make decisions vis-à-vis the 'state of play' of the game: calculate, manipulate, influence, try to conquer power. It is true that these acts are carried out many times without the individual realising it, but in the long run the mechanisms of their motivations have to come to the surface and access rationality.

In each individual the motivational strategy is profoundly linked, in its rational justification, to the social conditions or social organisations (subsystems) in which he or she is directly inserted. Thus, there may be counter-motive motivations, as a result of the different logics that each 'game' implies:

— motivations originating in the dominant order (in the hard nucleus) and motivations originating in minority interests (in the peripheral membranes), in constant conflict and only able to converge at the moment when the vast ecosystem constitutes a threat (transformation of the pacifist movement into a double zero option, transformation of the environmental movement into coordinated policies to safeguard the environment, etc.);

— motivations of pure survival at the level of satisfying basic needs and, side by side, in the same metropolis, purely enjoyable motivations of which, among others, art collectors are an example;

— nationalist or regionalist movements, involving rivalries, exclusion, dissociation, and in the same people, motivations from a global perspective, aid, cooperation, integration;

— firm motivations, born of the precise need, with clear objectives and unhesitant strategies and, at the same time, fluid motivations, without clear objectives, comprising multiple strategies at the unconscious level;

— motivations with full awareness of their limits and, therefore, aiming at a possible compromise between reason and desire, and, on the other hand, motivations that know no bounds, desiring more and more, faster and ever further.

The individual is not indefinitely bound to a single logic. It is intrinsic to our freedom to respond to a system's deterministic tendency in a way that complexity regards as random, not necessarily drawn in an immutable way from a hierarchy of values....

In a linear, non-systemic rationality, motivations would be born of need, become desire and be 'judged' by the individual in the light of the abstract values before they are acted upon. However, according to my own perspective, we can say that the ecological relationship, that is to say, our relationship with the ecosystem, depends on the degree of complexity of the subsystem, individual or society. Values are expressed from 'within': the autonomy of each system is measured by the novelty of the personal or societal equation that each system elaborates with its own values.

These values are not, however, treated as relative vis-à-vis an individual or societal centre that, in relation to them, becomes discretionary. The more autonomy a system gains, the more complex it becomes – it must necessarily manage in an innovative way a much greater number of constraints as well as relational and power 'struggles'. Paradoxically, the more autonomous it is, the more dependent it has to learn to be, since it is bound by the multiplicity of links it establishes as a result of its autonomy with other systems and with the wider ecosystem in which it is situated.

The process of self-development is the long and interminable maturation of this struggle which, by demanding values, will create and project on the motivations just like a magnetic field that gives direction, meaning and form. Is not this the path of wisdom that we find in so many fully realised lives?

FOR A NEW ETHICS OF SOLIDARITY

A perpetual insatiableness characterises the human person: everything that we 'learn' partakes in the dynamic process of our formation and vision of the world. Some values expand, take on new forms, manifest themselves in our thoughts and actions, while others appear conditioned by more global and long-term concerns or even begin to impose themselves as simple fact.

It is in response to this complexity that Pope John Paul II indicated in his message of 1 January 1990 as a priority "the urgent moral need for a new solidarity".

Thus, the new morality of solidarity, if it is on the one hand, a new theoretical quest, it is also, on the other, an original reaction to the state of the world (the global ecosystem) at the end of the century.

In a civilisation of intangibles one begins to intuit what might be a time of the Spirit, a time in which values emerge and in which motivations, even in increasingly complex systems, gain transparency, and, as part of this movement, become less dramatic.

We begin to see a new sensitivity to poverty, to the humility of the Beatitudes – an awareness of our ignorance, of our inability to control events, our responsibility for the destruction of the Planet and the uncertainty to which we have subjected future life on Earth. We are being

asked to gain experience primarily not by *stockpiling* knowledge, but rather by learning to live with uncertainty and by being able to share it with others.

A new skill is vital: to constantly re-imagine the world based on its complexity and inter-dependence at all levels.

Our own vulnerability, now enhanced, opens us up to looking at the world with compassion. Instead of trying to bend events to our will, we find that it is our job to care for each other.

So we return to the path of Wisdom of which Solomon says:

> *For in her there is a spirit that is intelligent, holy*
> *unique, manifold, subtle,*
> *mobile, clear, unpolluted,*
> *distinct, invulnerable, loving the good,*
> *keen, irresistible, beneficent, humane*
> *steadfast, sure*
> *all-powerful, overseeing all,*
> *and penetrating through all spirits*
> *that are intelligent and pure and most subtle.*
> *For Wisdom is more mobile than any motion;*
> *because of her pureness she pervades and penetrates all things.*

(Book of Wisdom 7: 22-24.)

The importance of religious values in the construction of Europe[38]

I am particularly pleased to have received this invitation, for in a way this means I have witnessed the beginnings of the Conference of Religions for Peace, one of the founding members of the Conference also being part of this movement mentioned by Father Geffre, the Grail.

Not being a historian, I'm not here to talk about what happened in the history of religion in the construction of Europe. For that I refer you to the publications, especially to the speeches of the great religious leaders, and to the books that reflect on the importance of religious values.

My place rather is in the present, not the immediate present, but that of the last few decades.

Beforehand, I should like to start from an observation.

For 30 years, in Europe, the slow and painful undertaking that is the Common Market has carried on, originating from an idea that could be called cultural, i.e. the unity of spirit, the homogeneity of values and a European vision, the renewed coming together of peoples, above all those who had clashed during the Second World War. The idea, initially cultural, was transformed into an economic process, ceasing, in the name of its 30-year journey, to have a spiritual anchor. During this period, religion did not play a direct or indirect role. At most we can suppose that a different religious framework would have suffered from other kinds of internal tensions and would have manifested itself.

As it stands, religion, far from being an obstacle, has, at least implicitly, played the role of economic and cultural unifier. It blended in with what has been called the common cultural tradition, seen as the pillar of our European identity.

From 1986 onwards, with the signing of the Single Act, the economic process of European integration has sharply accelerated. At the same time, its long-term economic goal (the internal market) has been augmented by social and scientific aspects: from a social dimension and cohesiveness to research and environmental programmes. In the consequent stages, it would have been possible, I dare say necessary, to incorporate a cultural dimension, even spiritual, in part inspired by religious values. But it was not to be. This absence of a cultural dimension has been fiercely criticised by Alain Minc, who asked whether the construction of Europe

wouldn't have gained a new lease of life from a cultural, and non-economic, vision, with the economic getting caught in the cultural current.

From 1989 onwards following events in the East, the construction of Europe was confronted by the challenge of a world whose division into two blocks had kept it on hold.

What Europe are we talking about?

During the elections of June 1989 in Poland, interviewed by a journalist who used the word 'Europe' when she meant to say 'European Economic Community', someone answered: "But by what right do you consider yourself Europe? Are not we, too, Europe? You need us, as we need you."

The construction of Europe on a continental scale was linked to a set of events: a joint economic approach at the start, an acceleration in 1986, an expansion of its framework with the events of 1989. And whatever the institutional response of the twelve, it was this mould, to a certain extent, that ushered in a new era of cultural dynamism.

This is why the other countries of Western Europe, members of the European Free Trade Association that until then had various feelings regarding the European Economic Community, have made rapid headway, and have expressed a desire to participate in the global shaping of the continent. This has long been the case of Austria, and now more than ever Switzerland and Sweden.

Switzerland: in 1989, in a meeting where I had the opportunity to publicly exchange views with the Federal Secretary for European Affairs, he was calling into question what is called the democratic deficit of the Community, perhaps rightly considering the Community to be the bearer of another democratic dimension, of another political culture.

Sweden itself was trying to make breakthroughs. But it was only during the last year that one or the other quickly came to the conclusion that their destiny would be played out as part of the construction of this European framework. A case in point, Switzerland currently bears, in terms of investment in the general, multi-year scientific and technological research programme of its community [a weight] much greater than many countries that are already members of the Community. Thus Sweden has already, within its legislation, guidelines which follow, *avant la lettre*, any directives which are issued from the Economic Commission of Brussels.

This means that these countries are ready to join the Community.

With the emergence of the Eastern European countries being actively involved in the construction of Europe, religious values, which until then had been kept on standby, have become more apparent, if not as integral to the process, at least as a justification for the burgeoning need of a common spiritual identity. Suddenly, everyone is quoting Dostoevsky willy-nilly, everyone has discovered that there is such a thing as a common culture, an art, an expression, that stems from a spirituality, a common spiritual source.

I do not think I am being partisan when I say that John Paul II has assumed the mantle of a hero to perhaps the majority. When he said, for example, in October 1988, at the Council of Europe:

It is true that the men and women of this old continent, with such a tormented history, need to regain the awareness of that which forms their common identity, of that which dwells in their vast collective memory. Indeed, the European identity is not a reality that is easy to understand. The distant springs of that civilization are many, coming from Greece and Rome, from Celtic, Germanic, and Slavic sources, from Christianity which profoundly shaped it.

I believe that we owe a lot to what, throughout his pontificate, John Paul II has had to say about a multi-faceted Christianity that has historically, for the most part, shaped our continent for 1000 years.

At the same time, the growing underdevelopment of the southern hemisphere has led in Europe to the emergence of a population reflecting other cultures and religions. It would follow that religious practice would thus have acquired new forms, conditioned by different modes of expression. At this moment of history, it strikes me as extremely difficult to imagine the practical consequences of these new conditions on the construction of Europe, How much are we really aware of what is taking place presently? How is Greece going to take the initiative at the confluence of the different spiritual traditions in Europe? What will happen to Greece in the wake of current events in the Middle East and their repercussions around the world?

I have to say that I was moved by the joint call of French Jewish, Muslim and Christian leaders. Amongst Catholics this call was disseminated in churches this weekend. However, I find this call somewhat timid, because it seems to me rather little to ask all those who are *believers* to pray – what is obvious, necessary and first before anything – and to commit to thinking together about possible actions to promote fraternity and peace. Paradoxically, when the media reported on this declaration, they omitted the latter to ultimately just focus on the call to fraternity. Which, to a non-French reader as I am, already made quite some impression on me. I would have rather liked anyway, perhaps arising from excessive idealism on my part, that it had shown at this moment in time, as it could well have done, more concrete proposals.

In making reference to the declaration of the Jewish, Muslim and Christian leaders of France, I must clarify that I do not restrict religious values to the public positions of religious leaders at all. *Religious values can only be manifest to the extent that they express the spiritual rooting of believers in their faith, and from there, their presence in the world.*

In the Christian experience, in Europe, religion has been shaken every time it has been confronted with the great questions of modern culture: critical philosophy and scientific positivism, of which we are still seeing the consequences, political activism and in particular over the last three or four decades, Marxist-inspired political activism, and last but not least psychoanalysis. Whenever the spiritual is confronted with the new, will the new be a challenge to the spiritual? I am thinking here of the rather paradigmatic book by Françoise Dolto: *La foi au risque de la psychoanalyse* ('Faith at the Risk of Psychoanalysis'). That is to say, at least in the Christian world, faith has always seen each new step as a risk, which had to be analysed to see how far the faith would not be undermined by fresh perspectives on things. That is to say that religions, and in Europe in particular the Christian religions, found themselves, in

each phase of cultural evolution, at the crossroads between the vision of God, man and the world that it represents, and the new realities of the cultural milieu.

This phenomenon is not only, nor especially, institutional. Religious values arise as a fact of our time, as reality – and therefore socially, culturally and politically relevant only to the extent that men and women of faith are themselves challenged by the great cultural questions of their day. In that regard, it is up to one and all to individually take the initiative as must their respective religions in their institutionalised form, whether in the Church's teaching or in theological research, and to grasp the critical points of all the questions addressed to the faith by each cultural moment. Already twenty years ago, Maurice Bellet said it in a remarkable way, in his book *Le point critique*. He wrote: 'It is a matter of being the subject of the faith and of the word of faith, genuinely involved in an initiative that engages the whole man. It's about knowing if faith can now be present in the experience. For it is there, in this actual, precise arena, that faith should have something to say. Whether it is by challenging, moving, upsetting, giving meaning, or being enlightening and dynamic, that's where it should be.' If I had to summarise what I have to say today, these eloquent phrases of Maurice Bellet would express it in a most clear and concise way.

By doing so, Christians and all believers, by going beyond an elemental faith divorced from the real, can then constitute the critical mass necessary for the establishment of what we can call a religion capable of starting a dialogue with current cultural and political realities. The importance of this critical mass becomes decisive when faith itself questions the age-old myths at work in society (and does not pose as the sounding board of society).

The thrust of my argument today is built on the need to engage the society involved in the construction of Europe, through the values of religion itself.

But, in order to do so, I have to take into consideration, first and foremost, a great cultural and even socio-political current that characterises the state of affairs in Europe, by trying just to contextualise the new contexts of relationship dynamics between people, peoples, and nations in our continent.

Despite the invasive presence of the media and all our personal and community pursuits, we have evolved in a world where, to reassure us, we are constantly striving to simplify the facts. We always need, for each event, a cause. We must always break down what has happened into something simple. We must always find the scapegoat, some kind of single explanation for everything. It is our way of reacting to the absurd, and it is also our way of reacting to a complexity that, in reality, is more than we can take.

However, Europe is in a world where this very complexity is the most appropriate expression of the end to causal and unequivocal relationships and thus to explain the end of the isolation and simplification of the issues at stake.

This complexity is expressed more and more in autonomous and at the same time fundamentally interdependent systems and subsystems. For example, at the political level, far quicker than socially, the environment has come to the fore. By calling into question technological processes, involves the economy. By questioning the economy, it touches on man's relationship with nature. There is a loop within all the real that certain facts, certain phenomena, clearly highlight. According to the French axiom: "In reality everything fits together". And not

in a static way, but in continuous exchange, in a dynamic relationship that is at the heart of a free society and produces what has been called the circularity of reality. In other words, all aspects of reality breach, influence, and change other domains. Contrary to what one does in the laboratory, we do not analyse each element per se, we analyse the interaction.

Now, if everything fits, we don't see why religion, which the individual attitudes of believers have endowed with sociological depth, would not fit alongside also. This means that a new status of religious values, as an expression of humanity and its culture, is implicit in this complex circularity of the real. I know that I am touching here on our heritage that comes from the Age of Enlightenment,

It would be bewildering to see kept apart, on the one hand, the interdependence of societal issues, and on the other, the unavoidably globalising presence of religion. If all societal facts are caught up in this interdependent system, religion, when it exists as a fact and not only as a respected institution, could not be kept apart from it.

Complexity also has a global expression. And as such, we see it more clearly than ever in this moment of our history. We are living in a time of global interdependencies of issues and peoples, stemming from economic interdependency. We can criticise, or rage against the debt of the third world all we like, but we know this debt is linked to the surplus of Japan, and Germany, and the double deficit of the United States which has passed from the rank of the primary creditor to the leading debtor nation in the world. All this is part and parcel. And all this shows how much the behaviour, the living circumstances of each people, is both cause and effect of the living circumstances of other peoples.

There is interdependence also in the ability of biological survival, at a time when the dimensions of environmental pillage reveal the vulnerability of our life systems. It is not by chance that everyone is suddenly aware of the issue of pollution in the Gulf. Everyone is trying to find specialists who will help us cope with this catastrophe that the ecologists, who once were regarded with a complacent eye by the warring parties, had already foretold.

There is still political interdependence, so deep on so many levels that already, in spring 1990, it was possible, around a table of 40 or 50 former heads of government, to say: "Now that the cold war is over and the stability its fear mongering had created coming to an end, we must expect regional conflicts, possibly of global significance." And it was thought that the Middle East would be first on the list. The facts have shown that this analysis corresponded to this immense political interdependence existing in the world today.

I believe that the absence of a keen awareness of the level of global interdependence and complexity in each society leads to the vagueness which, despite the torrent of words and analyses of events, characterises the official discourse. I would like to say how much the interdependence of the world causes yesterday's enemies to parrot the same arguments.

One of your compatriots, Edgar Morin, wrote recently in *Le Monde* about the Gulf, which gets to the heart of my message today:

> *We had all the geopolitical data, but the problems were isolated from each other and we thought we were dealing with them on a global scale by treating them as one, this itself*

stuck in its technical-military-electronic mindset. We did not perceive the links, the gears, nor the mutual encroachment between the military, the political, the sociological, the psychological. Here is revealed the moronisation and destructive ravage of simplistic logic which, aggravated by hyperspecialisation, is incapable of linking, of contextualising, other than in abstract cybernetic calculations which, likewise, obscure the human realities of flesh and blood and folklores.

Interdependence, complexity, would suggest a new openness to religious values as expressed elsewhere in other parts of the world.

I have just returned from a seminar in the United States, which I attended with specialists from the Middle East. They declared that everything was done (in the Gulf) without any input from the region's specialists, without a single consultation on the psychological, or cultural ... on the hard, authentic facts of the Gulf region.

Within the European continent, aware of the role played by religions in the identity of many European nations, whether or not they have become actual states, we must also recognise a new flexibility in religious practice which was to a certain extent necessary.

By putting religion in Europe into context, *in* its complexity and interdependency, I try to place myself in what Christian theology calls '*Kairos*', in the opportune moment in which we live, in what is imminent, in what we need, to face the present world and have an adequate response. There also come to mind the trump cards religious values can play to contribute decisively to the construction of Europe. Otherwise, we can make all the moralising and self-righteous speeches we like about Europe, and it will have no bearing on reality. Indeed, the very articulation of the religious factor must lead it to think globally each time the subject of God, man and his destiny in and with the world comes up.

And it is because religious values manifest themselves deep within society that we can look at the current cultural panorama, trying to see within it both the limits and the ideological vectors of which it is a carrier.

For if with the collapse of the communist world some believed that ideologies had had their day, in fact they have not disappeared. On the contrary, one lone ideology remains, reinforced by the collapse of Marxism.

This ideology is coincident with the industrialisation process that has been going on for two centuries in the European and, by extension, in the American continent. It has infiltrated society, in parallel with the very notion of progress. Indeed, the benchmarks of pure unadulterated industrialisation are present there, and they filter down through all the formulae that the Northern hemisphere imposes upon the South:

— the autonomy of scientific and technological progress, compared to other areas of society, in detriment of the social and the cultural;
— technology passed down as a commercial asset (the so-called technology transfer which is nothing but the sale of our obsolete hardware to the countries of the South, as if the technology had any commercial value, as opposed to pure science which by

all appearances is still universal and accessible to all, regardless of where it came from);
— the exploitation of natural resources as raw materials for industrial purposes;
— the displacement from rural to urban (3 to 7% of rural populations in Europe);
— the *media* as a support for the economic model that drives all industrialisation.

And we already know that major consequences stem from this process:

— highly competitive lifestyles which result in the weak being marginalised and stress besetting the strong, to which can be added the narcissism a lifestyle based on success presupposes;
— a society dominated by consumption and by the need to satisfy our desires and appetites mirrored by all the different kinds of advertising media;
— an environment where our forests are disappearing, the soil is losing its regenerative capacity, water is becoming scarce, climates are changing dramatically.

This process has taken place within an all-encompassing context: the market economy. And so far, given the failure of the central planning economy, we have found no alternative to market economics just yet.

And so, the market foists itself upon us today – and as such surreptitiously takes ideological form – as the total stranglehold of the economy over humanity.

In September, I participated in a working group at the OECD. We had access to a number of documents produced by the OECD for reference purposes, and to our astonishment, we saw that during the 1980s, and without perhaps some of us being aware of it, the concept of structural adjustment was defined therein as a set of transformations that allows the balanced functioning of the economy. It is curious to see that this expression 'structural adjustment' is used by exactly the same countries in the framework of the International Monetary Fund, when applied to the countries of the southern hemisphere to which money is lent; they are then expected to comply with a number of economic and monetary conditions, which on the whole are seen as 'structural adjustments'.

Well, for us, industrialised countries of the North, and OECD members, the document says: "The economic ideology of all OECD members is based on the deregulation of the state to allow for natural market conditions to function." As you can see, paradoxically we return to natural laws.

Society, as a complex system of interpersonal and interinstitutional processes, is thus replaced by the single logic of economic actuation. It is the economic process, the workings of the market, which will replace the very concept of social change, of the social project, and other equivalents. And yet, it is well known that the market, according to its so-called natural laws, is blind to all that is not marketable. It is blind to the environment, as it has eloquently demonstrated; it is blind to poverty, to the weak, to the moral significance of the goods produced and exchanged. As your own Prime Minister pointed out a few months ago: "What's

more profitable than drug trafficking, or real estate speculation?" As for the laws of the market, why are these not discussed?

However, we must not be made to feel unnecessarily guilty.

The implementation of a market economy has been posited as a condition for assistance to Poland and Hungary by Western Europe. And paradoxically, in spite of all I have just warned about, such a market economy is also aspired to by the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. Gradually, countries in other continents realised that this was part of the general consensus and they needed to transition quickly to a market economic model. Hence the global nature of the market economy. Hence its ideological intent that we try at all costs to drill into one and all.

To put it simply, change does not happen overnight. Poland has declared 7,000 companies privatisable. Then Poland went from 7000 to 12, then five, then to two, and there is still no one willing to take over these companies. What this means is, the transition to a market economy, so inflexible in its current state, requires us to discover, within the economic process itself, other ingredients that will help to shape it, to make it accessible to others, not just those who saw it be born.

So, the project of the construction of Europe has begun inextricably linked with this market economy.

And that, it seems to me, is where religious values come in.

To challenge this market economy. To stimulate economic science to find new sources for the creation of wealth. To eventually supplement the market economy, by finding other mechanisms (I am currently working with Pierre Trudeau and a small group of experts, trying to identify the necessary ingredients for a changing economy, so that the market in the southern hemisphere can be as free, as that of the north). To ask the humanities and political sciences to design the regulatory and distributive mechanisms that compensate for the blindness of the market. To prevent the idea of a New Order – as President Bush called it – from being established in the world and in the good conscience of all of us, which would ultimately succumb to being simply nothing but organised international disorder and possibly even decided unanimously.

We can live through this moment in history without having to make distinctions that the complexity of reality cannot sustain. Yes, a new continent can be devised, emerging from lucid decision-making in the face of the issues at stake, and in a continuous effort to overcome the inhuman consequences of the ideologies that are making themselves felt.

To do this, allow me to say it paraphrasing the words of my spiritual tradition, it must be that the light is not hidden, but that it shines where its light can be seen by all, for nothing is hidden that will not be made manifest.

Thank you.

Changing values in a world in transition[39]

INTRODUCTION

Recently, the Pompidou Centre, in Paris, organized a seminar on «Values for the *XXI* century». I was invited to participate in one of the round tables dealing with a specific set of values. They were weakness, slowliness, frugality, and availability.

The unexpected configuration of this set of values is an example of *the search* that goes on in different circles for values capable to embody another philosophy of life.

Have we not heard political leadership being referred to by modern analysts as a leadership of «competence and compassion»? And what about the values pro- claimed by the «Summer games» which are a light version of the unregulated liberal mode of living?

What to say? Before our eyes, series of values {or attitudes presented as values) seem to define *ideals* to reach, *codes* of behaviour to adopt. It is against such back- ground that I situate what I have to say this morning.

My perspective doesn't flow from an essentialist concern. Rather, I will try to see things in a *socio-cultural* and *socio-political* perspective, attempting to see the consequences of a *world-in-transition* on the *formulation and perception* of values.

I. A WORLD IN TRANSITION

At different levels *the transition* process is underlined. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, we spoke of *economies in transition,* meaning with that the transformation of centrally planned economies into market economies. Practically at the same time the process of *democratic transition* gained momentum as well. In Europe, countries under Communist regime moved

---

towards democratic forms of governance. Similarly, complex changes started taking place in Africa and else- where, as part of a general mood towards «democracy».

These two processes are showing already that it was a fallacy to think of a sudden change from well-established regimes into forms of political and economic systems we considered as defined once and for all. The transition appears now *open ended, undetermined,* leading to a different landscape from the one expected.

In some countries (for instance, Hungary) very strong *rural* components with their values of security and tradition remain as important actors. For all countries, *technological* progress appears seductive and, with it, the concern with success, experimentation, confidence in machinery, desire for newness. Again in some of them, the environmental degradation had gone so far (Poland, Check and Slovak Republics, former DDR) that *ecological* thinking is proned with the accent on: cycles of life, primacy of organic solutions over mechanical ones, of process over machinery.

All these traits coexist in the same space and time. It is not obvious that they may be able to compose with each other. Conflicts may arise. A firm political direction may give priority to one tendency over the others. The question necessarily arises; how is *the education for values* pursued? is it a mere instrument of the *status quo*? or is it an attempt to form a *criterium* above/outside all social tendencies? If the solution is to encompass the existing trends, who is invested of the wisdom to define the values? If it is resistance and an attempt to form a new awareness, how much of an ideological overtone is then given to the education for values?

Put in this way, the problem doesn't offer any way out. Values become *opportunistic devices.* – This seems clear for us, because we are seeing it *in Movement,* in a transition period, when *the choices* and *the decisions* on a macro-level appear very clear to the outsider.

I contend that education for values asks to be seen, if not in a transition period (society may be stable if not stale!), at least in *its differentials* as a way to overcome the internalized effect of the social and cultural trends.

This is why *a world-in-transition* offers a *unique opportunity* for a reflection on values in the education process.

A world in transition *empties* itself necessarily of the dominant modes of thinking and judgement, of the acquired ideas and norms. It dares to adventure itself into the newness of the unknown. It is a time of «not anymore» and of «not yet», apparently empty and yet full of the potentiality for a clear reassessment of values. This is why it seems to me adequate to try to perceive some of the trends of this transition period – in order to seize some of the trends which may open questions in relation to values. I look particularly at *societal processes* and at *cultural phenomena.*

1. Societal processes at the transition period

a) New ideological frames of reference

As direct impact of the changes I mentioned – the economic and the democratic ones – there seems to be a *replacement of old ideological terms of reference* by new ones.

Ideologies are *not* dead. They tend to emerge over and over again as an expression of *discomfort with uncertainty* and as mechanical replacement of *action by reaction.*

With the reinforcement of the market, *competitivity* permeates all the spheres of doing, with its accompanying set of attitudes, namely, centrality of the *«ego»,* persuasive *confrontational* mode of operating.

Without any philosophical clarification, possession, property, ownership accentuate the trend towards *having*, at the expenses of *being.* The *mediations* used, namely all the steps of *marketing,* dilute the frontier between what *is* and what *appears* to be.

The *subject* is thus diluted by the mechanisms needed for the full functioning of the market. (As if «the market» would be a magic entity.)

Overarching economy and politics, the archetype of the *winner* shapes aspirations and desires. The spiral of power and visibility, having the winner at its centre, conveys equally with it the marginalization of the weak, vulnerable, disorganized. The *freedom* leading the struggle towards democracy creates, paradoxically, social zones of *dependency* or of *outcasts.* Both mechanisms are driven by the motto of «always *more»:* more things, more freedom, greater speed. The empire of MORE, of quantity, annihilates judgment. In the name of freedom, ceases the evaluation of each new situation and of its components.

Society is already reacting to these blind mechanisms. National mechanisms have been created to analyze and judge new forms of social realities. Hence the councils on *audio-visual* or the councils or committees on *bio-ethics.* But we are still so convinced that the de-regulation of the State is a must in economics that we fail to define centres of ethics for the economic or the political process.

How does the educational system relate to this environment? If in its macro – reality the educational system conveys these values, how can it evolve *other values* at *the individual level!* Is the educational system schizophrenic?

b) Globalization of issues

We have come to this period in history from a time of *division, separation, exclusion.* We are part of a globalized picture: one single chain of *world information,* one type of pop music, one system of credit and interlinked currencies... are we on the way from a bipolar to a unipolar world? And if so, what are the consequences for values?

But many diversified events are shaking the boundary-shaped map of the world. In front of our eyes boundaries are revealing themselves in what they are: ways to preserve identity, self-sufficiency and power. No wonder that the world is gradually allowing the erosion of boundaries – nothing is anymore self-contained. Boundaries, when they exist, become thin barriers through which circulate freely money, merchandise, people.

While *globalisation of issues* seems to create an ever more unified world, we see a painful, sometimes bloody, effort for each culture to affirm its own identity, to be respected in its own identity. *Global* and *local* become the two sides of each cultural and sociological reality.

How then, to relate these two modes? Which values are there *in the world culture,* as well as in *a specific culture of a group, so* that the circulation between the two may be possible? Through

which set of values are they communicating? Which values reinforce the two poles? How can education evoke, at the same time, the world as *a global common* shared by many and the local – country, city, school *as the specific* where all values will be expressed?

The globalization leads to a *broadening* of contents of values, as well as to new ways of formulating them. How far we are then from the *dichotomies* of values used in classical examples of moral judgement! The traditional question of *either/or,* gene- rated in a world of separation, division and therefore of polarization gives room to the compatibility of elements which for a long time had been seen as contradictory. What is at stake then is not a mere accommodation of diverse realities. It is rather the discovery of the *interconnectedness* between such different realities. Concentrating on their mutual connection, the values that reside *in the interface* will be relevant. They will stand out and will illuminate in a new way the *two realities.* It is time to replace sharp antagonisms of either/or by *both/and.* No issue remains close in itself. Reality is not a set of things but a chain of connections. All processes in life cease to be seen *as parts of a great machinery* and become gradually *components of a great thought.*

Entering such a «thought» is ultimately *the goal of education.* Less than the passing on the mechanicist approaches *to segments of* life, it is the understanding of life itself in its accessible processes that is the bulk of education. Values are then related to their context as integral part of knowledge.

c) Social policentredness

The relation of local to the global *doesn't* happen within the logic *of a hierarchical scheme.* The *social and cultural tissue* of the world-in-transition is *policentred.* The hierarchy of events is disseminated into different webs of culture and society. This can be seen at its extremes in the economic chain of production and distribution in our time. The delocalisation of enterprises, characteristic of the last decade and probably of the years to come (because of the economic growth it has helped to generate), illustrates this point. Employment and unemployment are generated in a *decentralized* way. *Unemployment* is happening *where* a corporation has its headquarters while generation of jobs is happening where no profit is taxed or redistributed. Thus, any decision concerning the economic and social management of such an enterprise has to encompass disjointed units and to be formulated in relation to different social realities.

This example illustrates the need for embracing all the time in the *value- system,* the *multiple causes and consequences* of any action. Values are said to be contextual, not because of a mere relativism of principles. Rather, because of the fact that, outside the full context, they may be irrelevant or even inadequate.

2. New cultural phenomena

The world-in-transition offers already some inkling of what the new reality can become. This is perceived, first of all, by *culture.*

a) Centrality of information

It has become obvious that the greatest change has occurred in the *role and dispositif* of *information.* (Reading recently a biography of Marguerite Yourcenar, the shock of realizing that she had to copy all her manuscripts – no photocopy machine, much less a computer, and yet she is from our time!). I don't make any hypothesis about an information society... But I stress the *centrality of information* (and our appetite for its renewed hammering into our ears and our eyes.)

Two opposite movements can be seen in the *information pattern.* First, the fragmented scattered information, episodic, in 1,30 minutes! News, stories, publicity, all around the clock; information given in order to call the attention, not to widen knowledge. Second, the attempt to put it all together, to assemble the *puzzle.* And, at the end, a perception of things, some knowledge. It seems to me that these two movements can play an important role in the understanding of the education for values.

Information is pouring out from many sources; it builds up «noise», undifferentiated mixture of signs. The incapacity to follow one single information is the indication that «noise» is beyond human acceptance. A first ethical question is thus the following: – in order not to fall into madness, the balance between information and noise has to be reached. This is the *level of survival* in the information zone. Still, information continues to pour in, including in the classroom (or in a lecture like this one!). Many signs come, are singled out by the mind or the heart or both and registered in one's own memory.

To find a centre for human life, for knowledge, for ethical values, the second movement is necessary: to put it all together, to relate, to assemble, to connect.

And again this movement corresponds to a moment. Soon it is overcome by more information which doesn't come in by organized layers but in disconnected events and by diversified channels. Then the whole process is starting again.

To be able to deal with the information around the human person is, to my mind, a *pre-condition of an ethic life.*

b) Interdisciplinarity

The *interconnectedness* I referred earlier becomes unavoidable in the culture being born of this transition period.

The world is facing a globalisation of issues, an erosion of boundaries. This is not only true about social events and phenomena but about *knowledge itself*.

The capacity to assemble information and to organize it in meaningful ways is dependent on the understanding of knowledge. A recent study edited by UNESCO has as its title «entre-savoirs» – *inter-knowledges.* We would say, in more conventional terms, *interdisciplinarity.* No solution, no breakthrough is found only within the scope of one discipline – the circulation between different fields, their inter-relatedness is an essential ingredient of the world-in-transition.

One of the fundamental tasks in life – at all levels of creation and execution – is to explore the passage from one field to the other. Life is not in isolated patterns but in the interconnections.

Boundaries cease to be what separates. They become *what can unite.* It is the work at the *interfaces.* It is there that *creativity* can emerge, that new viewpoints can be discovered and elaborated.

I don't think this can be grasped in a fragmented use of school-time. In the context of disperse information, the discovery of the borderlines is possible when *problem-centred knowledge* is sought. We go back to Chesterton's old question: «What is there more relevant than to teach the world?»

I consider that one of the great *changes* of the years ahead is the practical learning of the interdisciplinarity. There lies one of the ethical questions which are most relevant in today's world: the compelling need to deal with life and its real problems. The resistance encountered at many different levels leads to the incapacity to cope with new problems.

Here we are facing the key-approach to science, to education, to politics, to problem-solving. We are dealing with the question of complexity.

c) The complexity approach

We are dealing, at all stages of knowledge and learning, with autonomous and yet interdependent elements. This double feature characterizes a system or any of its sub-systems. It is the understanding of the *inner* evolution of systems and of *their interaction* that is at the root of *the science of complexity.* Complexity is the cornerstone of all living reality. We are led into it through inter-disciplinary approach and through problem-centred knowledge.

The science of complexity creates a high turbulence and uncertainty. Because we are dealing with living realities, all scenarios are just probabilities. But above any other consideration, what is important in this approach is the fact that every- thing is related with everything else. Nothing is isolated, determined *per se.*

I have moved here in the frontier between the ethics of knowledge and the ethics «tout court». I don't think that this frontier separates two different questions. We are coming at a period in history when the subject is channelled in the study of the object, when the object acquires the autonomy of subject, when subject/object accomplishes a partnership. The act of knowing conveys the knower. Maybe then education for values can be equated with education as such.

Yes, I agree with those who establish a relation between *understanding* and *judging,* between *knowledge* and *ethics,* but only in one way: *Knowledge* in our time contains specific demands that encounter the root of *ethical* values.

II. CHANGING VALUES

A world-in-transition provides new questions to the education for values. But likewise *values* are also perceived in diversified ways.

3. Myths and social construct

a) Myths and absolute values

Two sets of elements are at work in the shaping of values – *the primordial myths,* on one side, and *the social construct,* on the other.

Primordial myths are passed on, from generation to generation, as *fundamental beliefs* that structure the individual existence and its relationship with the others and the world. They permeate, implicitly, often unconsciously, the most elementary choices and decisions. They provide the ultimate *criterium* for what is «good» or «bad», often without an articulated rationale behind it. In this context, they generate values which are often *absolute values*, appearing as imperative to the individual conscience.

Social constructs are shapes taken by the social organization as a result of the various ways in which a group of human beings structures its existence, the relationships between young and old, between men and women, between the living and the dead, the living and the new generation, the different types of activity, the organization of property and solidarity. The interplay between all these elements gives also rise to values which are *contextual values,* (for instance, the change in the status of women over the last five decades led to new contextual values in the relationship between men and women).

Myths are providers of meaning, while social constructs give direction. Myths *precede* the individual, while social constructs may be *changed* by the individual.

b) Contextual values

An ideal society would combine in equilibrium myth and social construct. Values would then spring forth as the interplay between myth and social construct – sometimes in harmonious blending, at other times in unforgettable tragedy. One such case, in our Western tradition, is the story of Antigone. Though in this century, because of Freud's discoveries, Antigone's story has been replaced by the story of her father, her tragedy remains a paradigm of the two sources of values.

Antigone, led by the primordial myths of her people, encounters the social construct of the political organization of the Theban society. In Greece, the sense of the city carries with it a very clear definition of the fundaments of political organization: obedience to the law is seen as the basic ingredient of any judgement on individual behaviour. Hence, Creon's strength in affirming that if he doesn't defend such a law, there would be no meaning in his task as a King. But Antigone comes to the fore of the scene by taking another stance: she has to obey, first of all, to the unwritten laws of respect for the individual – her brother, whose treason leaves him without burial.

In Antigone's decision there is more than a rebellious gesture. There is the respect for every human being (even those who have become outcasts out of their own will); there are the ties of brotherhood (even the one tainted by the double crime of Oedipus and Jocasta); there is the cohesion among human beings in spite of all the boundaries that separate them (even the fact that only Antigone and Ismenia took care of their blind father, while the two brothers vanished from their duties).

Antigone's attitude illustrates that in the realm of primordial myths, there is a wealth of the *symbolic reality* of life which gives consistency to values. The strength of the symbolic reality is not only in the fact that it opens one's own practice to a *spiritual dimension:* it *is also in the* capacity to *subvert other values* it conveys with it.

Deprived from the symbolic dimension, values lose their autonomy and become easily entangled in *moral norms*, if not in the rigidity of *social conventions.*

Paradoxically, primordial myths can also lead to social conventions, in a series of *reductionist* processes. Alongside the path for values, primordial myths can translate themselves into rigid *ideologies.* When these ideologies take form into society they create a set of norms which are the core of *social conventions.*

The frame of reference of the symbolic is an essential source for values – besides any cognitive achievements, any technological training, any dynamic learning process, the openness to the symbolic is the basis of all paths of *spiritual* and moral development.

The *primacy of the symbolic* takes its status from the acknowledgement of the superiority of the mystery zone of being over the *rationality* in all its efficiency and its logic. It is not a denial of rationality but it affirms that rationality covers only one aspect of one's own perception of life.

In this context, *education* is *the process through which one gains perception of and access to,* where the symbolic illuminates and clarifies the whole field of knowledge. «Education to values» is first of all the path and the method that will enable all who are involved in the process to enter *the universe of the symbolic*.

It is my conviction that, in the face of a world-in-transition, we have to *discover anew* the *primordial myths* and the *social construct* in which our lives are called to live.

Before we tackle any methodologies in terms of education for values we have to ask ourselves among Europeans:

— which are the primordial myths that shape our culture? where is the source of strength? which are the stories that carry with them spiritual energy?
— which are the pillars of our social construct, of our living together? what is for us a «taken for granted» attitude in relation to ourselves, to others, to things, to nature, to events? which are the unspoken rules of our living space?
— are there absolute values? from where do they derive? are we able to rethink our contextual values apart from ideologies or schools of thought? isn't there a task ahead to situate values both in the mythical and in the sociological realm?

4. The person at the crossroad of values

The human person, the subject, the «I» who gives blood and flesh to the values, who makes them unique, is the key actor of the equation of values.

The education for values appears to me as the process by which *values are appropriated* by the conscience of other human beings in a totally *new alchemy.* Three aspects have to be taken into account.

a) Integrated contemporaneity

The *sense of time* is *crucial* in this process of appropriation. Every moment offers an *opportunity for bifurcation,* for choices to be made, for options to be taken, for paths to be followed. This means that the education for values draws the consequences of *integrated contemporaneity.* Being present to one's own time. Neither stockage of knowledge nor philosophical study of values can replace *the appropriation into oneself of contemporary thought,* contemporary knowledge, contemporary human and social experiences and organization. Whatever has to be taught has to be channelled through today's culture and events.

b) Commitment to Nature and future generations

The new conditions of today's world give a new relevance to *the future dimension* in one's own time.

As *nature* became part of history, it asserted its existence as a philosophical category, constituting itself a partner in what Michel Serres calls «the natural contract». The responsibility for nature, for the preservation *of its future* enters as a new dimension of an ethical education. The *many facets* of such a responsibility are only too obvious in the day-to-day display of natural or man-made disasters and in the clumsy attempts to bring a remedy to them.

The commitment to future is also present in another way. By safeguarding nature (and in the threshold of catastrophic changes in the next decades), it is also the life of future generations that we are safeguarding in a way that no other gene ration had to be in earlier periods of history.

Finally, a person-in-the-world, yes, but a person-with-others-in-the-world. And this being «with-others» is so vital that it can become the ultimate value by which the individual life can be measured.

«The future lies with the man or woman who can live as an individual, conscious *within* the solidarity of the human race. He then uses the tension between individuality and solidarity as the source of its ethical creativity.»

What does this mean today? Which are the expressions of such a solidarity? How can it be learnt?

Most generations of adult people are still from the time when *collective commitments* had a great appeal. «Project of society», «Alternative project» ... were signs of such solidarity.

Meanwhile, alternatives have disappeared. Many people have taken refuge in strict individualism: personal desire, personal careers, personal fulfilment. *Where,* then, to find the sources for this intense participation in the «solidarity of the human race»? Maybe the chance of educators today is to rediscover that solidarity *together* with their students.

The person who makes the personal equation of values is either a boy or a girl. A whole new perspective will come into society if education for values will open the doors that men and women spontaneously are ready to open. And they are *different* doors (Carol Gillingan).

Our world needs both sets of values. But they need to be cherished, unveiled, articulated, shared.

III. VALUES IN EDUCATION

5. A search for new paradigms

We are talking about values in a time when the need for a new paradigm is manifest. To the logic of the «more», to the force and absoluteness of the «winner» we raise fundamental questions. The world cannot cope with always more, nor the earth with the growing exploitation of resources. We cannot proceed calmly through a road in which millions of men become every day more destitute.

> End of linear progress
> The fallacy of continuous growth

The linear progress is over. Growth is not the solution. For a time, even 20 years ago, it was possible to say that growth, progress, onward and upward, *was* the course for technology. But as Rollo May already then stressed, «in ethics, in aesthetics, in other matters of the spirit, the term progress in that sense has no place». Today we can stress that, even in technology, that progress has no sense. Many scientific achievements are possible which are neither socially acceptable nor desirable. The time of limits has begun. A new sense of values has to be probed, discovered, made visible and cherished.

6. Lifelong learning

> *Partnership in learning*
> *The Masters and the values*

The changes taking place at all levels of society, as well as in our perception of things and events, leave everyone unarmed. Nobody has the information, the tools required to match the situations. So, all those involved in the education enter- prise have to discover they are learners too. This reveals clearly the main shift: from education to *life-long learning.*

This supposes a *questioning mind, a dynamic attitude* and a capacity to go on reformulating one's own understanding of things and personal convictions. Moreover, life will be captured as *a learning system* where every element provides information and helps to advance one's own questions. The life-long learning can only happen in a *partnership relation.*

First of all, the dynamic attitude. 1 want to make it clear: *a questioning mind* doesn't operate in a vacuum. It is the fact that, at any given moment, information and its interpretation are firmly stocked and secured, that enables a question to be formulated whenever new stimulus appear. The essential question there is not one of intellectual grasp but rather on *affective security* – it allows to challenge the thresholds of stability, it allows to jump with quantum leaps, it allows to «surf» through the waves of social transformation.

The life-long learning process is also built on the realization that since World War II there were as many discoveries as in all history before that period. The acceleration of the cognitive process since the 30s' makes of the great minds of the beginning of this century new *classics* – they stand out as wise men and women whose works have provided us with new knowledge, new patterns of interpretation, new roads to the symbolic world… An initiation into values is also *the discovery of the new classics* and their appropriation into one's own life-project. This is a task still undone. If there is going to be partnership in learning, I guess it ought to start at the joint discovery of the treasures of wisdom brought by the new classics. To bring history back to today's realities.

Global ethics in a world
of global problems[40]

A CHANGE OF PARADIGMS

The presentation we have just heard has led me to decide to address a question prior to any discussion of ethics. It is on the recognition of the paradigm shift that characterises this end of the 20th century. I refer only to some of these paradigms that I consider fundamental for the elaboration or even the simple understanding of 'global ethics in a world of global problems'.

THE MYTH OF UNLIMITED PROGRESS

The first paradigm shift is evident: it is the clear notion that progress is not unlimited, that everything has boundaries, that science and technology are always limited and subject to error. When there is a catastrophe, for example, when an airplane crashes, there is always the temptation to look for the error that justifies the absurdity of the technological malfunction. In seeking out the 'black box' to find out the cause, it inevitably ends up by declaring that human error was to blame.

This notion of the implicit innocence of technology endures thanks to a myth, a Promethean myth, which is to think that in technology always resides the path to progress and never failure, error, imperfection, the limit.

To deny the existence of the unlimited, means that the unequivocal statement that science does not always correct itself is ignored – we have the examples of Chernobyl and Three Miles Island, or the problem of the decommissioning of nuclear power stations in England (the first country to have them) and in France (with about 80% of its energy of nuclear origin). Let's not delude ourselves: the technology available does not know how to decommission nuclear

power plants, unless all the visible earth became a cemetery of nuclear power plants sealed tight behind walls of lead, or dumped in the oceans – both solutions with unpredictable consequences for the life of all species.

Taking this as an example, what becomes evident is the material unfeasibility of continuing to increase the use of technology and science without limits. The planet is limited, as are its conditions, and technology, in itself, also has its limits. This leads us to ask ourselves (as did the great biologist Jacques Testart who introduced the technique of *in vitro* fertilisation in Europe a few years ago) if there is no such thing as rationality and the logic of non-discovery, or rationality and the logic of non-invention. And why? Because, above all, technology and science serve men. It is this ultimate criterion for the good of humanity that we must face, at every level of scientific knowledge and its technological application.

The questioning of unlimited progress also applies to the human person. We could almost say that to be or become a person is to discover our inner law, to find out what the limits are within us, and within these limits necessarily do the most and the best we can. For example, my freedom at this time does not allow me to play the violin. As much as I would love to play the violin, I wouldn't have 'the freedom' to do it, because I never learned and it's too late now. These are reasons that relate to the internal logic of my own being, to the limits that characterise it at the outset or that its history has defined.

THE PRINCIPLE OF UNCERTAINTY

This set of assertions about boundaries is reinforced by the change of another paradigm that occurred in the first half of the century. The laws of nature that the school teaches are undoubtedly necessary to ensure the wellbeing of the child as he or she broaches the world. But they are based on an out-dated paradigm: a world of codified laws, where all phenomena would be explicable, and events predictable. Now, isn't it 100% true that, at normal pressure, water boils at 100 degrees centigrade? There is a strong probability that this is so, but what the science of this century tells us is that we cannot speak of an absolute law that always works, but only of the possibility that this law manifests itself in most circumstances. But how difficult it is for us to abandon the 'truth' of the paradigm according to which we were educated to accept in our habits and thoughts that nothing is safe, nothing is certain, nothing is linear!

We live in a world of probabilities, governed by a principle of uncertainty, which is increasingly a determining principle of everything that happens. We are very far from understanding the significance of this change in practice: I have the feeling the Berlin Wall fell, that it was clearly messianistic in nature and that this Berlin Wall fell only on one side. On the other side there remained the same convictions, and the same naive, not to mention ignorant hope in a world that was right and necessarily built according to immutable laws which we are always capable of discovering, mastering, and applying properly. We have little doubt that everything will work out. Now it is not at all guaranteed that everything works out ok! The principle of uncertainty, which the great physicist Heinsenberg formulated, is a constant principle of all

action: when I do something difficult to ponder and decide upon I do not know if I am doing something well, or badly, if I am right, or wrong – whether in matters that are intimate and private or in those that are public and recognised by all. I let myself be guided by what I experience as the most viable, most 'natural' probability in the evolution of my life and its context.

THE ABOLITION OF REDUCTIONIST DICHOTOMIES

Another paradigm shift is the discovery that we do not live in reductionist dichotomies but what I call a *continuum* of possibilities, a *continuum* without any absolute classification of its parts. What emerges from this continuum can be situated at one point or another in the *continuum* without necessarily resulting from an opposition of terms, concepts or practices. Recently I heard Alfredo Bruto da Costa say something that seemed to me a clear illustration of this new paradigm, although he did not intend to underline it. He said that today the problem of poverty cannot be placed in the poor / rich dichotomy (which, of course, is the dichotomy that has managed not only the economy in the nineteenth century since the beginning of industrialisation, but has also managed a certain doctrinal morality over property); there is no such thing as 'the poor and non-poor' – which immediately makes us aware that the rich are not those who are far away – in that small 5% of the population, who pay very high taxes, etc. who might be trading with millions, every day, in international capital transactions. The poor can no longer place themselves in the simplistic dichotomy that opposes them to the rich. Meaning, between the poor and the non-poor we do not know exactly what is there, because we are all on the same *continuum*. The relation of the non-poor to the poor ceases to be one of opposition to become one of proximity; it stops being about the preservation of its assets to become about sharing; it also ceases to be that of charitable condescension to become actively involved with the poor in their personal and social reality.

These dichotomies of extreme terms are necessarily reductionist. They exist not only in the object under analysis, in the life that surrounds us (as we have just seen in the question of the poor), but also in the structure of thought itself, especially with regard to the dichotomy that informs the entire school curricular structure: the opposition between theory and practice. Far from this dichotomy, we know today that there is no theory that is not based on resolute practice, whether it results from voluntary will or whether it is taking shape as an integral part of the generous answers to all the challenges that life poses. In the age of electronic information and the possibility of immediate access to all documentation in any field, theory often results from accumulated, reflected, continuously verified practice. For its part, there is no practice – no matter how ordinary the act through which it is expressed – that takes place outside a theoretical field, even if just intuited, not systematised or identified as such. Between the two poles of theory and practice, there is also a *continuum* where diffusion theory insinuates itself into practice and grants practice an increasing weight in the theory itself.

Ethics also suffered for a long time from the dichotomies that took opposing stances within it. Furthermore, easily reduced to the category of 'moral', ethical choices have appeared (and

still appear today) irreconcilable being simplistic manifestations of 'good' or 'bad'. Now, ethics also covers a continuum of principles in which there is a hierarchy of values. This non-equivalence means that ethical principles cannot be invoked indiscriminately. Before they have to be weighed against the kind of issues that are put to the person and society. Hence, for example, the existence of ethics commissions in the field of life sciences – and their urgent need in areas where, as John Paul II says, 'the structural sins' of society occur, *meaning*, in the possession, use and distribution of goods and wealth.

Morality stands as a position-in-progress along this *continuum*, always relative to a time and a place, to the concrete circumstances of personal or collective life. While ethics is universal, morality is tied to its moment. To keep this in mind is to contribute to exorcising the 'demons' via which traditional dichotomies easily infiltrate any public or private decision.

GLOBALISATION

Before defining 'global' ethics (informed by the desire to bring peoples closer together and by a genuine investigative zeal), we must understand the reality of the globalisation of facts and the world. However, it is essential to raise two ambiguous points linked to the word globalisation. Globalisation is not a juxtaposition of problems happening in different parts of the world which, by cumulative effect, create a global problem; nor is it the simultaneity of similar phenomena or events taking place in different countries, giving rise to the perception of a global problem.

In addition to these two aspects that sometimes appear to us as global, but which we can more appropriately call worldwide, I see globalisation in the displacement from the place where an assertion is made and where phenomena occur. This place is the planet *as a whole* – although the emergence and revelation of that place may loom more sharply in one or another part of the world, in one or another aspect of social reality.

The adjective 'global' has to be used as rigorously as possible. Global is not a new trend; global has to do with a new way of dismantling the existing archetypes and paradigms and of adopting the logic that science and technology have granted us throughout an always global contextualisation of human existence.

THE FACTS OF GLOBALISATION

There are three classic globalisation scenarios, all made possible by the spectacular transformations science and technology have wrought.

First of all, a daily realisation: our climate, understood nowadays as the result of a variety of planetary causes that are beyond us. Often, when we see the meteorological activity of the planisphere, we ask ourselves: how is all this affected by what is happening around Ecuador and the tropics (it jumped out at me when I saw a satellite image of cloud formations in the

Arctic and Antarctic, one clockwise, the other going in the opposite direction). We are in a *global* climate: we speak of an interdependence of thousands of factors happening in different places. But the place where this manifests itself is planetary-wide and the place where it is to be verbalised has to be planetary-wide also.

Secondly, I give as an example the extraterritoriality of the economy, both in terms of production and consumption, and in its financial instruments. This economic extraterritoriality is clearly one of the most important and significant global events of our time. As global as it is, its planetary location cannot easily be grasped: for example, where exactly did the recent Asian financial crisis unfold?

Thirdly, I take information as being the result of technology that is always spread via planetary, and even, extra-planetary means. Instant and truly global information is already giving new contours to culture, communication between people, groups, nations. But we are still barely aware of its societal consequences, although we already feel them at a more personal and daily level.

Global facts give rise to global problems, although this is not all. On the contrary, they also bring with them new forms of wellbeing and other possibilities of Quality of Life. The change that is still taking place (and which began a decade ago) is in fact the beginning of a new stage in the history of mankind. I do not tire of reaffirming that, far from being at the end of history, we are at the beginning, at the beginning of a truly planetary history.

It is not just a change of scale, but a new nature of the convictions that shape society and the problems that characterise it. Some of these changes are undoubtedly the starting point for the discovery of a global ethic and for the discovery of values that in turn will structure society.

SOVEREIGNTY: CONTRADICTORY CONSEQUENCES OF GLOBALISATION

While we are in the midst of this extra-territoriality of the economy, of data and of the climate (as a matter of fact, with regard to climate, it has always been so, but only now have we begun to realise that this is so), paradoxically, the territoriality of the sovereignty of each state becomes a factor that facilitates these movements. At the same time that each state opens the doors to globalisation, it tends to become fragmented, as attested by the more than 80 internal wars that befell them, or are still going on since the collapse of the communist regime.

The paradigm, which guides our understanding of the world and our place in it, has undergone a radical change of coordinates. Today, Gedeão's poem is no longer just a metaphor. In fact, "the whole world is my village." The boundaries have fallen.

The transformation that is taking place in the world thus leads us to a change in the perception of our societies, countries, and groups. Going beyond the issues of the United Nations and other multilateral institutions, we cease to think as an *inter-national* order to rightly think as an all-encompassing, transnational, truly *global* order.

The first immediate and obvious consequence of globalisation is a new perception and even a new reality of the nation-state. Nothing stands in the way of any small group today

claiming to be a nation-state if it sees itself as such – even empirically, even if it weren't for the CNN news granting it a platform anywhere in the world – understanding and capable of constituting itself as a unit of culture, language, and traditions. As we are seeing in many regions of the world and in the many fragments that already exist, or are beginning to surface within nation-states, the emergence of a leader who wants absolute power is enough. What is happening in Kosovo has many causes: it is a mythical reality for Serbia, it is a foundation of its history, etc. But not only that. Its appearance, the explosion of small groups, even the unbelievable solution that was the Dayton Accord turning Bosnia into a 'hotchpotch' of territories and nation-states where it becomes impossible to tell which is which, has to do with this perception of groups as being able to arbitrarily, for reasons of their own, define themselves as nation states.

In the Nation-State, whether the result of a long history (as is our case) or more recent (and as such still inexperienced in matters of the nation-state), the problem of sovereignty takes new forms: it ceases to mint its own currency and the defence of the inviolability of frontiers is something on which a great question mark hangs.

But then, what next? Sovereignty becomes *the responsibility to discover mechanisms, ideas and institutions* that make it possible to manage global problems. And it is there that we can, in fact, convey our cultural, scientific and technological richness, our imagination, our ability to create a new world.

IN GLOBAL SPACE, ANOTHER UNDERSTANDING OF THE HUMAN PERSON

But it is not only at the macro level or at the level of the Nation-State that global space introduces radical changes: it is also at the level of the understanding of the human person.

We are increasingly aware of the existence of a biosphere undergoing an enormous transformation, with such an evolution in biodiversity that in the long term we do not know what forms of life will be viable at the end of the 21st century. Sixty biological species disappear every day. We cannot know what the transformation of the cycle of life will be.

On the other hand, we are aware, as we have seen in relation to the climate, that the atmosphere is increasingly the result of chemical transformations resulting from the biosphere and human activities. There is thus a constant interaction between the biosphere and the atmosphere.

In this context, another reality, another concept, consolidates itself. I wish to reinstate a term written and spoken of over 50 years ago by Father Theilhard de Chardin: the *noosphere* – the human layer that covers the Earth – a notion that is only beginning to be understood today, appearing in one or another scientific article, and not necessarily from the West (the first time I saw the concept of the noosphere already formulated was as part of an investigation by the Centre for Development Studies of New Delhi, in an article published in *Alternatives* magazine, of the World Order Models Project). And this noosphere constantly interacts, as our own lives tell us, with the biosphere and the atmosphere.

Interaction has been expressed over the centuries through different philosophies.

While Asian civilisations, particularly those moulded by Buddhism, have always viewed it as a constant harmony between humans and other beings, Western civilisation, shaped by philosophies born of a Judeo-Christian worldview, would see men dominating the earth, and over the centuries has been instrumental in implementing this dominion over the Earth.

In this context, what is the human being? Just as a fact or a value emerges from a *continuum*, so too does the person emerge from that noosphere. In other words, the person only arises as a human person from the human community (this is what the story of the savage child found in Switzerland shows us); and, more than that, will only arise from a human community structured by values (epitomised, to an extreme extent, by the disturbing narrative of *Lord of the Flies*). When the community is not structured by values, the human person does not arise from it; when he or she is outside the human community, he or she does not become a human person in all its fullness.

What the human community does is confer upon us the language, the coming to the word – and this coming to the word is the first given of its definition.

The human community also gives itself the ability to name things: "He went and came / And asked each thing / Its name." In writing these lines, Sophia [de Mello Breyner], as do some of our great poets, expressed a philosophical principle: the capacity to give a name to things is to acknowledge them in an unprecedented way and recreate them. And it is this knowledge that constitutes us as a people, which makes possible the decisive capacity of symbolic representation as foundational in humanity.

I also wish to emphasise that the human community also confers on this self that emerges, the constant notion of its interdependence. That is why I have not focused heavily on the theme that was given to this panel discussion, namely that of self-interest.

Interdependence is integral to the human being; autonomy is the management of our dependent relationships: our dependence in relation to others and ideas, the dependency of others on us. Autonomy is the management of this interdependence. In this sense, everything I do, as Lacan would say, interpreting old Freud in his own way, is because '*ça m'arrange*' ('it suits me') and '*ça me convient*' ('it is convenient'). Self-interest understood in this sense – not in the sense of the interest of economics *versus* our passions that dominated the thinking of many philosophers at the end of the last century and at the beginning of this one – is the structuring force of our human life. And it is not because we are good or bad. It is because, necessarily, our life contains this dimension, even when we do something that is difficult for us.

GLOBAL ETHICS

All this is to say that the experience of global facts, their resolution or merely coping with the global problems that arise from them, also requires global ethics. It is important to highlight what ethics is not:

- ethics is not a compendium of 'success stories' in a world where we have not yet found a solution to the problems; for example, population experts on population growth will quote several success stories: Thailand has a declining fertility rate, having attained a level of sustainable generational growth; Indonesia is another success story, recipient of a UN award! But in these success stories, the reality of a world where the needs and violations of human rights in those same countries are gigantic is completely glossed over;
- ethics is not the keeping of a clear conscience by using the law of averages to measure the real;
- ethics is not the acceptance of suffering in a panorama where the recourse to rationality to describe and explain it has increased;
- ethics is not a linear, stand-alone space-time in which a certain idea of
- 'progress' gives meaning to the course of events;
- ethics is not the construction of a version of history by its victors and the interpretation of defeat not for the crimes committed but for the fallibility of the instruments used. Thus, the defeat in Vietnam, being impossible for the American ego to accept, inevitably led to a spectacular improvement in science and technological prowess that eventually resulted in the Gulf War.

It should be emphasised, from the perspective of global ethics, that it is not a uniform model, or a lesser common denominator. Nor is it the imposition of one ethical system over another. But indeed it is the discovery of a central nucleus of ethical values shared by the major currents of thought, in particular religions and philosophies, in which all humans can recognise themselves and with which they can align not by exterior pressure but by listening to their own conscience.

This work is being done on several fronts. The first effort is called the 'Trieste Declaration of Human Duties' and was prepared by Nobel Prize winners, alongside thinkers and representatives of various fields of thought. The InterAction Council of former Heads of State and Government has also carried out similar work. For 10 years, we have been trying to bring together representatives of religions and the great schools of thought and see what the fundamental principles are, on which we can agree: principles in which the so-called 'golden rule' would be the mainspring of all these systems: "Do unto others, as you would have them do unto you." It is the condition common to all mankind.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

There is a list of rights that is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We have taken care to link our obligations, duties, and responsibilities to our rights. From this has been created the text that we wish to submit to the UN in the year in which the 50th anniversary of the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights is being celebrated. And so, I wish to indicate the relationship between our rights and responsibilities:

— if we have the right to life, we also have the obligation to respect life;
— if we have the right to freedom, we have an obligation to respect the freedom of others;
— if we have the right to feel safe, we have an obligation to create conditions for every human being to enjoy the feeling of safety;
— if we have the right to participate in the political process of our country and to elect our leaders, we have an obligation to participate and to ensure that the best leaders are chosen;
— if we have the right to work in just and favourable conditions, in order to obtain a decent standard of living for ourselves and for those who depend on us, we also have the obligation to carry out with the utmost precision, and to the maximum of our abilities, this same work;
— if we have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, we also have an obligation to respect the religious thoughts or principles of others;
— if we have the right to be educated, we also have an obligation to learn as much as our capabilities allow and to share our knowledge and experience with others;
— if we have the right to benefit from the abundance of the Earth, we also have the obligation to respect, care for and replenish the Earth and its natural resources.

Each right undoubtedly comes with its own corresponding responsibility. But I must say that the reception to this initiative has not at all been peaceful, and in particular, in the case of those institutions that remain stuck in the old paradigm. Speaking of responsibilities, duties or obligations, has raised two criticisms.

One endows these concerns with a pessimistic worldview: we are suddenly seeking a global ethic because we have a catastrophic view of the world. There is a parallel here with what I experienced years ago: when a solution was proposed for a country, which at that time was 26% illiterate and more than 30% poor, any concrete solution was criticised immediately as being idealistic! And now, when describing the world situation as it is, it is said to be pessimistic. Let me give you just a few numbers that speak for themselves.

In three to five decades, the world population that in the year 2000 (tomorrow!) is 6 billion, will have increased by 4.1 billion inhabitants, that is, to the world in which we live we would have to add the equivalent of the world that existed in 1975: that's 10 Swedens per year; one Latin America in every five years. This is in line with United Nations projections and the average (not the most catastrophic) projection, bearing in mind that the lowest projection is not feasible, because it would be based on the assumption that all countries of the world were simply replacing existing generations.

And the question is: how are all these people going to have enough bread, a roof over their heads, adequate clothing, education and health, if 1.5 billion people already live in absolute

poverty? Out of every four people, one lives in absolute poverty. How can we speak, then, of pessimistic reality!? Shall we shut ourselves in our cocoon and forget what is around us, as long as we have what we want? Is this what we call self-interest?

The point is not to label change as negative or positive, but as one of the most highly contentious opportunities for change that humans have had to face throughout their history. It is a moment that brings about countless opportunities and dangers, and for that reason radically poses the question of ethics, that is, of criteria for values and guiding points from which values can be born.

The other criticism that arises from the need to articulate responsibilities common to all humans, is the suspicion that such responsibilities and duties will limit individual freedoms, a criticism that conveniently forgets the limits already imposed upon freedom today. For example: in the city of London the average speed limit during the day, during working hours, is equal to the average speed a century ago, when carriages were drawn by horses!

In fact, our rights and duties are inseparable. They are both sides of human dignity. It is precisely the massive violation of Human Rights that shows the existence of a void of responsibility, even though this massive violation occurs in places that are unfamiliar to us. Why is this so?

NEGLIGENCE

Firstly, due to negligence. Negligence in its etymological sense, which is to 'deny what binds.' Negligence is not the person who arrives late, it is the person who knows that, because he is late, there are people who are being negatively impacted, thus denying the connection that exists between all people.

There is also another reason: the difficulty we have understanding contemporary reality. It is also, and depressingly so, a lack of imagination. It was Bernardo Soares himself who expressed it succinctly: "... there is also infinity in the *Rua das Douradores*". The worst thing is that few of us understand it, do we? To see the infinite on *Rua dos Douradores*, or on the *Avenida dos Aliados*, is very important. We are not always aware of this, as he said, "from a fourth floor window, in spite of the crates and carts, we can see that there is a sky, and that there are stars in the sky." But above all the call for a global ethic comes from the realisation that in this emptiness there is tremendous ignorance. It was to Kundera's merit, in his best-known novel, to underline the fact that the great tragedy of King Oedipus was not to have killed his father and to have unknowingly taken his mother as his wife, it was ignorance. And it is from this ignorance that he, in Sophocles' second play on Oedipus, repeats tirelessly: "There was something I should know." After all, he was ignorant, he that knew all things and determined the laws of Thebes.

But stating our duties and responsibilities is nothing more than the first step towards a system of global ethics. I think it necessary to take the various dimensions of global ethics even further. Any attempts to do so thus far, in my view, have been based on past experience. And so it must be, for all the religious wars and ideological confrontations of the past rearing their head in new ways. But what is true is that the data is new, and global ethics must also

take that leap forward in the face of new facts. First of all, by declaring that our duties and responsibilities relate first and foremost to people and to each person, and not only to States, and to that abstract entity of the Nation-State.

These are not laws to be codified, but ethical imperatives coinciding with human life. That is why they can be translated into values; but they are, most certainly, disturbing to those who say: "It's your problem, not mine"; or who also say: "I do this because it pleases me"; or the very common expression in academic circles: "It's good for my CV"; or those who seek victory and success in each gesture they make, and each action they take.

DECISIVE EPOCHAL FACTORS

And so, if we see the human person as emerging from the noosphere, then we have essentially placed ourselves within an ethical framework, in which we immerse ourselves and where significant epochal factors are present. Firstly, *complexity*, which I have previously referred to in another way, as an interdependence of autonomous systems in a constant process of self-organisation; hence the learning of autonomy, as the management of our dependencies in various spaces and times. The management of dependencies in our country is different from the management of dependencies in Japan. And it should be independent and different. Persistent, continuous effort throughout life grants the capacity for self-organisation, both personally and socially.

Two German words distinguish the community of living things from organised society – 'Gemeinshaft' and 'Geselshaft'. We have ceased to belong to the Gemeinshaft, living in concentric circles that go from the village to the district capital, to the region, to the country, to the world. This circularity made for a very beautiful *Gemeinshaft*, very close-knit, in which the Church tower was the focal point and the problems were discussed in the churchyard, and everyone knew each other in all innocence, as the books of Hélia Correia, on rural life, clearly demonstrate. We ceased to be that, to emerge at the intersection of what would now be different *Geselshaft*, with all manner of goals and horizons. It is at these crossroads, at this intersection, that new communities of living things would arise, other *Gemeinshaft*, of a heart and mind that the Americans would call a 'networks of kindred spirits', in other words, people bound by their deepest interests, who meet again 10, 12 or 15 years later and recognise each other by their shared concerns. (One of the most interesting experiences I've had in recent years was with Jonas Salk, who won the Nobel Prize for having discovered the polio vaccine in the 1930s and who founded the Salk Institute in California. We met in 1986, and spent a whole day talking about many things that had to do with paradigm shifts. After that we never met again. Seven years later, I just sent him a small fax saying that I would like him to come to the meeting of the Independent Commission for Population and Quality of Life, and added: "It's just one day; it's in Washington, you probably can't come." He said: "Why wouldn't I come!? We belong to the same community. We share the same ethics and seek the same values.")

Secondly, I see *transdisciplinarity* as an epochal value of global ethics, as an entirely new way of discovering and finding out things, breaking down the frontiers between different realms of knowledge and recognising that the points of convergence are more important than stand-alone content. Real culture is where the interfaces are found. Breaking down knowledge is an ethical requirement, because ethics is also vital to the cognitive process.

It is transdisciplinarity that responds to the need to create what has been called the expression of a collective intelligence, to construct stone by stone a knowledge greater than the sum of its parts, giving form to analogies, to *connections*, to the pleasure of intellectual friendships that allow the revitalisation of the spirit. For this, it is necessary to free up the time devoted to material concerns to circulate and walk the hallways of knowledge – understood here as the kind of knowledge that comes from experience – with the pleasure of savouring knowledge in the knowledge we are savouring something that grants us pleasure.

In transdisciplinarity, we come across the ever-greater conviction that phenomena are *irreversible* in the physical sciences. Sartre made it clear that in order to escape the irreversibility of the spoken word or gesture, there was just one solution: to fold one's arms and do nothing. And also Pessoa, through Bernardo Soares, spoke of the 'metaphysical importance of the smallest gesture.' Hence the futility with which we often classify this or that event, referring simply to its intentionality, because in fact there are no futile gestures, all are inscribed in an invisible world, and therefore can never be futile in the sense that they would be expendable. They may be of less importance, but as gestures they are undeniably there at the time of our action.

It is also essential to remember the importance, in the formation of global ethics, *of emotion, of feelings, of sensations*, as determinants of the exercising of responsibilities. In fact, only the one who accepts to be moved by certain possibilities of life is able to ask himself the decisive questions. Whoever contents himself just with the neurons of knowledge can come up with very interesting discoveries, but in fact will be oblivious to the decisive questions.

One emotion takes on particular importance in today's world: fear, an intense, if not contemptible feeling. We focus far too much on those fears within us and others that hold us back. It seems to me fundamental, in this world of emotions, feelings and sensations, to confront fear face on in order to be able to act. Courage is nothing but a set of fears that are overcome, not the absence of fear. This fear calls for responsibility. But responsibility is not a 'minor' duty of ours. It is rather responsibility as the encompassing value of all ethical behaviour. We feel this fear or trepidation, for everything that is vulnerable. It is a conviction shared by Levinas and Hans Jonas that "only a vulnerable and fragile being can affect us and compel us to be responsible, to the point where we become its hostage". Ethics, at this moment, is to accept being hostage to that fragile being that is humanity, in its *habitat* that is the planet.

The cultural system as it deals
with the society of today[41]

The cultural system confronts other systems in society and interacts with them at all levels where society contemplates, generates and transforms itself. According to this perspective, we cannot agree with those who consider culture to be the 'software' of politics. In our opinion, it is rather the 'hardware', since it provides the necessary framework for other systems in society.

The systems integrated into a society differ from one country to another and also vary over time. What, at a given moment or in particular circumstances, is only a subsystem of a more global whole, may at other times and circumstances become an autonomous system. This is why we cannot establish the relationship of the cultural system with other systems in a rigid and general way. These are relationships perceived through the specific environment where we place ourselves.

The globalisation of certain phenomena in today's world allows us, however, to identify certain fundamental interactions that touch on the very roots of the cultural system. These are, in our opinion, the interactions that are established between: cultural system / environment; cultural system / technology; cultural system / *media*.

THE CULTURAL SYSTEM AND THE ENVIRONMENT

All civilisations are more or less directly focused on the dominion of nature. It is Western civilisation that has pushed this mastery farthest, so much so that the relationship between man and nature ceases to be a relationship of respect and communion to become one of destruction and domination. In the industrial period in which we live, man introduces into nature artificial rhythms which risk destroying the very notion of natural equilibrium. We are talking about breaking the ecological system. For many, it is a question of the very future of life itself.

The problem of the limits of human action on the environment is a problem posed to the cultural system. It is not only about survival, but also about the new conditions of our possible

---

41 Talk given in Paris in December 1999; it is part IV of a longer text. The sources of the citations are ignored. [archive version].

survival. Take for example, the use of natural resources. This involves issues that simultaneously concern the ecological system and the cultural system, namely: the land use option (what are the fundamental links that bind human beings and peoples to it?); ecosystem conservation (what is the cultural meaning of this preservation?); the role of nature reserves (must we keep them intact, what is the minimum threshold of the definition of a natural park or historic site?)

To these general questions, other more concrete ones are added: Which forests will we destroy? What quarries are we going to rip open? What kind of soil are we going to end up with after we are given what we want? (We only have to think about the forest fires in southern Europe leading to the replacement of existing flora with fast-growing eucalyptus plantations, which are essential for pulp mills. In some areas the surface water table is exhausted and groundwater is likely to be so in five or ten years. In the short term, they will become desert landscapes – what can we do?

The question of natural resources brings us to the question of decision-making on their use. In most countries there is still time to establish social control over natural resources, the fundamental right of every people and population. It is not only the role of the State in safe-guarding its legitimate sovereignty but the responsibility of any group of citizens as regards their habitat and their natural heritage.

The creation of entirely artificial ecosystems – urban life – the fruit of the process of industrialisation of the last 200 years, changes the very notion of the environment. Instead of talking about the natural setting, we talk about the living environment, the human habitat that men have created over the years.

The new question that is posed is that of the significance of human settlements.

The living conditions of the city have a decisive influence on the infrastructures of democratic cultural participation. Here, the scattered city, with its impractical transport system, stifles the desire to participate and, over time, wears away the ability to take part in the decision-making and creative process. Elsewhere, *ghetto* life sidelines those left behind. Urban geography induces cultural differentiation, a prelude and consequence of an unbalanced sharing of power. It is therefore not surprising that the average citizen feels increasingly peripheral, a 'beneficiary' of cultural and democratic concerns but not a true participant.

In fact, at the level of urban spaces, culture is a direct element of democratic participation. It is not enough these days to set up neighbourhood action committees: all those involved must be able to express their views and justify them. The city secretes superstructures that prevent solidarity. It is up to culture to be a place and opportunity for gathering and thus assert the communities of interests and affections that structure democracy.

The environment breeds culture and this in turn generates and modifies, sometimes dramatically, the environment. This interaction is particularly evident in artistic and intellectual creation. On the one hand, the visual and sonic universe man operates within, acts upon and shapes. On the other hand, the creative eye is both an assumption and a refinement of what is there as well as the anticipation and announcement of a new environment.

Industrial society tends to consider aesthetic values as superfluous, a 'balm for the soul', compared to the structures of production. Well, beauty, and compositional harmony have forged ahead as part of the evolution of society as a whole. In this sense, it is time the repertoire of artists, artisans, intellectual, and groups directly linked to cultural activities were recognised as an indication of the overall development of a society. Cultural creators should also be included in advisory bodies to executive bodies to ensure the presence of the aesthetic dimension at all levels of planning. Culture would then function as a corrective element of the levelling tendency of technocratic management.

THE CULTURAL SYSTEM AND TECHNOLOGY

Technology can be understood as the systematic application of knowledge to the resolution of human problems. In this sense, technology is parallel to human existence and embraces all types of civilisations. For two centuries, however, this component of social life has changed to such an extent that on its own it has constituted a new type of civilisation – the industrial nation. This change has occurred on two levels: one – which is focused on almost exclusively – is the extent of its dominion over the universe of physical matter; the other – often forgotten – is the cumulative effect of its 'trivial' applications on all walks of everyday life.

This civilisation is characterised by the dominance of 'hardware' operations over 'software' operations. The distinction is no longer – as was asserted in outdated patterns of the past – between so-called primary, secondary or tertiary activities, but in the 'hard' and 'soft' technologies. A country or society are the place of technological civilisation when hard technologies have invaded all sectors not only of the production of goods but also of services. Thus, a bureaucratic system of social security, for example, is a typical case of the use of 'hardware' in its own domain and manifests the technical civilisation at work.

Technology has become a part of the social structuring process of today. It has established itself as a cognitive and instrumental necessity for all those who are expected to use and manipulate it. However we just have to look around us, at the most trivial of situations, to see how much the individual struggling with technology, instead of understanding and making use of it, is actually the one being used.

The influence of technological civilisation on the average citizen manifests itself, inter alia, in the following three aspects.

— Since the accumulation of knowledge has been greater in the last 70 years than in all the centuries that preceded them, the vast majority of people only notice the technological achievements that affect them most directly. The consequence is that at the same time that knowledge changes the whole universe in which it lives, humankind of our time becomes more isolated and 'narrow-minded' in the present.

— In its interactions with technology, humankind today is more object than subject. "The unanticipated effects of growing knowledge and the technologies it creates have far outweighed human adaptive capabilities, be they psychological, social, organisational or political." As a result, the superficial crises that everyone experiences take root, whether we are aware of it or not, "in the much larger crisis of our inadequate and narrow perceptions of reality".

— Technologies (from rockets to tax returns) call for a degree of perceptiveness and knowledge of information storage and processing that go beyond the physical capacity for mental arithmetic of the minds of individuals. The only defence mechanism accessible to all is to fall back on the bureaucratic machine, which makes it possible to speak of a new form of alienation which we all succumb to.

All of these factors make it clear how technological civilisation is shifting the cultural framework, by fundamentally questioning it. What about cultural freedom – at the individual level as much as at the level of communities and groups – as it meets the technological world and its sprawling development head on?

The cultural system is shaken by the 'expansionist' power of technology both at the level of its aims and also its means. Social practices, principles of knowledge, means of production and social reproduction are continually emerging shaped by the logic of technology. Its autonomy with respect to the social environment does not result solely from a kind of exponential progression. It is also due to the fact that technological knowledge cannot be confused with *know-how* if it is the *logos*, a principle of knowledge. Its tendency is to operate in a closed circuit, spreading its mechanisms through a socio-professional entity (the 'experts') which today constitute a new aristocracy. (The masses remain, obviously, outside such a circuit!)

In addition, the proliferation of small-scale working models of the latest technological breakthroughs undoubtedly creates the illusion that the technological world is at the fingertips of all. Gradually, the individual relinquishes his tasks and makes do with the gadgets that are offered. This means that the cultural act, as an intervention in history, is mediated by technology to such an extent that the mediation blurs the subject's relationship with the object by substituting itself for the subject. It is not difficult to see this happening at the individual, as well as at the social level.

The cultural system is not just a passive receiver of interactions with technology. As a system, it is 'obliged' to regroup in the face of technology. And the first step of this self-reorganisation is to confer on our knowledge, on the principle of knowledge of technology, a visible status as a cultural integrant. (This, moreover, is the consequence of what we have already said about the relationship between culture and science.) To do this, the cultural system filters technology through its own sphere of knowledge and logic. It thus helps to give a platform to the rationality of the technological system.

It is at this level that the relationship to democracy is called into question. Narrow-minded perceptions are becoming more and more dangerous and lead to decisions based on inadequate information but that involve increasingly larger and longer-term patterns of causality.

All means must therefore be deployed for individuals and peoples to attain the level of knowledge brought by technology and to do so in its rightful context, which is within the cultural system.

Technology is not only a principle of knowledge: it is also a way of life, it projects a lifestyle. We now come to the question of technological choices. Innumerable studies relating to this issue highlight the impact of technological choices on the cultural system of a given society. Three major questions are often asked.

First, technology feeds and is nurtured by the *paradigm of progress*. This being one of the founding myths of the industrial-technological civilisation, it is not surprising that it is so omnipresent. Built on absolute dogma and blindly dictating the technological choices made, it risks, however, leading society to the irreversible brink of its own downfall. Paradoxically, it is the paradigm of progress that projects the state of collapse. The cultural system is alone in being able to question this age-old myth.

Secondly, technological choices may be, of all the choices that the human community has to make, those which are most imbued with an imitative mechanism underlying any initiative. The risks of the levelling of societies, uniformity and one-dimensionality have been sufficiently forewarned. However, only the understanding that technological choices are, ultimately, culturally influenced, can explain this imitative tendency. Scientific research that ignores, for example, the agricultural sector in a food-deficit country would inevitably lead this country to the stripping of its own cultural resources. Similarly, the kind of scientific research, which in some rich countries is moving towards more and more sophisticated uses of computers, while research on the conditions of decentralisation of large cities remains to be done, would inevitably be doomed to failure.

Thirdly, technological transfers continue to be denounced not only as choices that totally ignore the cultural identity of the host country, but also are the Trojan horse of domination and thus sound the death-knell for any autonomous cultural system.

The issue raised by the clash between 'horizontal' culture (universal technology) and 'vertical' stand-alone culture (traditional values of the endogenous culture) is the only one that reflects the key issue of technology transfer. Rigorous analysis of the elements of 'vertical' culture is essential whenever new elements of 'horizontal' culture come into play.

The evolution of science and technology allows us to make the case for not every society needing to go through all stages of the industrialisation process to evolve. Taking steps to bypass this evolution is proving even indispensable so that non-industrialised societies are not breathlessly trying to keep up with the superhuman demand to be simultaneously in dialogue with the technological breakthroughs of today and those of the historical past.

The choice of development paths to be followed for each society is profoundly linked to the capacity of the people to assess the consequences of their technological choices. It is true that the man in the street cannot know in detail the problems posed by nuclear power plants, but he knows enough about them in countries where the issue has arisen, to have an informed opinion about their implementation.

The ability to choose the technical means to be used is, without doubt, a new line drawn in the exercise of democracy. For today's individual, democracy cannot be limited to the freedom to think and express oneself; it is also the freedom to influence the decision-making process. Every new technological choice poses very objective questions, which every conscious citizen must try to answer.

Have all possible options been explored? What will be the costs and benefits for different groups and individuals? What will be the social and environmental consequences and their future repercussions? Will the new technology create irreversible changes? Could the same goal be achieved by other means?

THE CULTURAL SYSTEM AND MASS MEDIA

Mass media has become a world unto its own in which values and thus judgements are forged, where needs are created and mechanisms are activated to respond to them, where representations are formed which determine choices and behaviours. This means that *mass media* compete with the cultural heritage of individuals and peoples and become vehicles of culture. To what extent do they nourish democracy and determine its implementation in a way parallel to that of the cultural system? This is the fundamental question that we have to ask ourselves in the context of this study.

Mass media began by extending humankind's realm of interaction with others. By simultaneously presenting individuals and groups with events, news, reality and fiction, they are actually creating another form of contact between people. We are touching here on the very nature of the *media*. It is a question of the world of representations of individuals and peoples, because a means of shaping thought and opinion is inherent in the type of *media* used. There are interrelations between people and groups who read the same news, listen to the same sounds, and see the same images, whatever tiny speck of the planet they call home. There is also the interaction between peoples and nations, whether through imbalances, gaps and distortions caused by the manipulation of facts, or through links of proximity created by the entanglement and interconnection of apparently unrelated facts.

It is therefore new configurations of relationships between human beings that *media* establish. In this sense the *media* are grafted onto the cultural system and would, in principle, provide a new foundation for democracy. Should they not be viewed as a unique means of building the common will with the multiple voices of all of society?

In fact, it is not so. The *media* seem to make personal communication slip backwards, replacing the contact between people by a mediated contact which isolates the individual

and groups in their closed imaginary universes. We are far from knowing what the real impact of the *media* is today. The only thing we can say is that "with the *media* system, a thinking machine of humankind has been put in place ".

The use of the word 'machine' already implies a particular kind of relationship: someone will make it work. Operating the machine and ensuring that it performs its function of a 'machine for thinking' implies it has the power to organise, manage and produce. It is not surprising that the *media* is perceived as the *fourth power*. And upon it, three sources of powers are grafted.

First, political power which, beyond ideologies, always finds the means to use the *media* and whose very exercise is profoundly conditioned by this use. (That the destiny of the world does not derive from the beliefs and decision-making abilities of a political leader but from the quality of his performance on television is frankly mind-boggling! One wonders what new kind of democracy will have to be imagined that will be able to account for such a phenomenon!)

Secondly, economic power, the significance of which no amount of discretion can hide. (Would it be possible to imagine a consumer society without *media*?!)

Thirdly, the power of those who 'run the machine' directly. The people who pull the strings of the *media*, who have the control of millions of hours of listening, are the new elite, more important than our politicians. They look after themselves; not only do they share power, but they control and use it, often in a discretionary manner.

The *media* thus pose entirely new challenges for the cultural system that are far from being resolved. As generators of symbols and information, they could be seen as additions to all the other information producers in the cultural system. Yet the reality is different: they do not limit themselves to quantitatively adding information to the systems already in place. It is the very notion of information that they take to the next level. Indeed, "the political nature of the *media* structural context is a product of a wireless universe, and therefore not just geo-graphic. There is a multiplication of voices and a fascination with the image that constitutes an *occupying force*". And this 'occupying force' is what the cultural system is having to deal with!

The result is a power struggle between the *media* and other sources of information in the cultural system. How far is it possible for the cultural system to remain free in the face of this 'occupying force'? And what are the conditions in need of being safeguarded to ensure its own freedom can be exercised? The health of democracy will depend on the answer to these two questions.

If, in the nineteenth century, the control of economic hegemony was achieved thanks to a new arrangement of the relations between economic and political power, it seems that at the end of the twentieth century it is only by putting the relationship between the power of the *media* and the power of the cultural system into order that democracy can find its balance.

The impact of the *media* can be analysed according to two distinct points:

First, *media* create new world views – 'weltanschaung' – that sneakily overlap, blur, and erase the visions of the world that the individual will have built throughout his life. The elements that make up this *weltanschaung* cannot be pinned down with any clarity. What contributes to

the sheer novelty and almost indefinable quality of the *media* is precisely its fluidity. As noted by Brukner and Finkielkraut: "What is characteristic of our modern age is this slow infiltration of the banality of daily life into the sphere of representation".

Secondly, the *media* 'formulate mental settings' that the individual did not ask for. In other words, they convey patterns of society, lifestyles, aspirations and desires. They impose themselves on the pre-existing cultural identity either by confronting it radically or by eroding it in its psycho-sociological foundations. Society (as well as the individual) is then shaped by elements that are fundamentally alien to it. As a result, the very concept of endogenous development is called into question: society loses the capacity to propagate itself from the inner forces that give it life.

The *media* world often replaces the real: "The facts speak for themselves only if they are allowed to speak". This brings us back to the question of the transmitter / receiver relationship.

First of all, it must be categorically stated that there is no such thing as a *pure* transmitter, just as there is no *pure* receiver. Transmitters and receivers are subject to multiple influences that do not allow them to assert themselves in full autonomy. Even when an individual is alone in front of his television screen, he is not the only one who reacts: he is a product of the mass mechanisms created by the *mass media* themselves.

The sender / receiver dialogue does not happen without conflict. What for the broadcaster – be it a news professional or other – is the right to 'freedom of expression' which is to be defended at all costs, for the receiver is often a violation of one's personal freedom of thought and independent judgement. How can we resolve this conflict? This, in our opinion, is another challenge posed by the *media* to the cultural system. What happens between the message and the individual is not only a question of his personal attitude as a receiver: whether he knows it or not, he is one of the masses the *mass media* is addressing. The question that arises is therefore to what extent can the individual remain an individual as a receiver of *mass media* and what are the cultural conditions for him to remain so?

In addition, the conditions for receiving the message are very closely related to the basic cultural framework of the receiver. But such a framework can be constrained by economic difficulties, by the daily grind of work, by an education which did not live up to expectations. The reception of information is always subordinate to the cultural context of the receiver. If his mental worldview is limited, and he is unable to conceive or digest the content of this or that piece of information, the message that is transmitted to him will be nothing but 'background noise' impossible to be grafted onto his mental worldview.

To a creative participation[42]

AT THE ROOTS OF PARTICIPATION: CULTURAL EXPRESSION

For one and all to play an active role in history, we must rethink the possibilities of cultural expression. Being in the world, in a conscious way, necessarily implies uttering words, doing, a *jouissance.* It is at this level that the roots of cultural participation lie.

The cultural expression within each of us retreads steps taken by humanity at different periods of history. Firstly, it is a mental *representation* of present and past reality. Cultural identity has its roots in the representation of the space-time environment where the subject awakens to life. Each individual embraces reality from a universe of representations, which determines the way in which the imagination is grafted onto the real. By events which only the history of the subject can account for, the imaginary favours certain aspects of reality at the expense of others. One gives full rein to a recapitulation / repetition / reiteration process with the subject's understanding. This process assumes not only the conscious experience of history but also the 'background noise' of life, as Edgar Morin calls it: "Our lives are saturated with background noise, swarming with insignificant events that do not grant any insight."

It is from this 'background noise' that we can begin to perceive what surrounds us. It underlines certain facts, encourages certain repetitions, and repeats the same scenarios over and over again. That is to say, in this swirling magma in which it is submerged, the subject's unconscious makes it possible for the subject to cherry-pick the information that suits one's psychic makeup. Hence the immense diversity of interpretations, even among subjects who objectively have been dealing with the same circumstances. What is at stake at the very root of identity, at the level of mental representations and of the psychic makeup that engenders them, is the primal importance of form. As in physics: "It is obviously the particular form or configuration – *gestalt* – that establishes the identity in a certain way, and not the material content".

---

42 Talk given in Paris, December 1999; Part V of a longer text. Sources unknown. [archive version].

This brings us back to certain factual evidence that any in-depth analysis of the relationship between culture and democracy cannot neglect:

— each individual's access to reality is a prerequisite of all democracies, otherwise the subject is unable to play a part in the story that is one's to live;
— since the subject's original mental interpretations condition one's choice of information, it is first at the level of the socio-cultural milieu in which one lives that the conditions of true equality must be created;
— the individual's freedom cannot be considered divorced from the "background noise" which assails our lives: it is thus less free to say or do than to be free and to think;
— recognised cultural models must be endowed with an infinite plurality of interests and sensitivities, in order to enable each individual to assume the unique interpretations of one's own identity.

Cultural expression is never an isolated act; it stems from constant *interactions* of the individual with the world around. From our first moment of awareness, we are invited to interact. The simple fact of looking, of observing, grants the object of this gaze and observation the right to be.

It may be that the act of gazing on the world is experienced passively, accepting the apparent cause-and-effect relationships as a given. But as soon as the human being looks at the world critically, as soon as one takes a step back from the object and, as it were, perceives it in its essence, one begins a process of creative interaction with the world.

In giving name, and thus distinguishing beings, things, events, this is a cognitive act of the subject and an enriching of the cultural heritage of the community. It would, however, be too simple to think that every gesture is in itself a vehicle of culture: "For there to be true culture, it is not enough to be the protagonist of social practices; these social practices must have meaning for the one who carries them out". We are from the very outset immersed in the question of meaning. There is no culture other than when the individual grasps the profoundness of things and expresses it using some kind of language. This is why culture identifies itself ultimately with critical consciousness: that which, by questioning the causal relations between events, is aware of the complexity of the real and acts on it in a significant way.

This enactment of culture has very concrete implications for democratic practice. In this context, democracy could never be reduced to the formal play of institutions and mechanisms. The cultural potentialities of any action of the subject (individual or community-oriented) make democracy, too, coextensive with any social reality and any movement that is inscribed in it. It is as a tenant, consumer and beneficiary that each person is expected to participate in the determination of the goals and ways of democracy and to exercise it daily. Living and breathing culture, both deep and full, expects the same from its democracy as a direct expression of the power of every individual in the city. If this is not the case, the political significance of events and acts dissolves.

The domain of politics does not have consistency of its own, does not go beyond pretending or suggesting an imaginary ideal in taking on the real, if it weren't for the extent it is endowed with meaning, in other words, cultural.

The cultural act also implies a third vector: *jouissance* – whether it is enjoyment before the given world or enjoyment through the creative act.

In reality, these two kinds are not entirely distinct. Those who create can do so only from the enjoyment awakened in us by the cultural heritage that has been passed down to us. That is why access to cultural heritage is a prerequisite for the development of creative capacities. Access and creation are intimately linked. Without wishing to overlook the creative potentialities hardship brings, it must be admitted that when the masses do not have access to the richness and tools of cultural participation, creation remains the domain of the privileged, where only a few are admitted.

In fact, each person's capacity for enjoyment is deeply determined by one's personal experience. There is, therefore, even at this level, profound inequalities that sectorial cultural policies will never resolve. It is the very stuff of democracy that is at stake. How to allow all humankind to enjoy beauty and to make for themselves the gratifying experience of creation?

THE PLACES OF PARTICIPATION

The individual is the first place where the act of cultural participation takes shape. Unlike natural systems, culture does not have its own existence outside man. If man does not move, culture does not move either. While the physical universe may explode in a chain reaction following its own laws, the universe of meaning, which is that of culture, changes from human intervention alone.

The participation of the individual in the culture arises by what Paulo Freire calls the exercise of the 'critical conscience'. From an original state of so-called 'naïve' or 'magical' consciousness, man becomes capable of interrogating the world and of establishing causal relations between phenomena beyond immediate relations. He becomes a critical subject for whom the world is an object of knowledge, transformation and enjoyment. By his historical intervention that we can agree to call 'participation' – the critical subject asserts him or herself as a *cultural citizen*.

Cultural participation is never an isolated act. We act with others, whether directly, through collective interventions, or indirectly, by influences of which we are simultaneously object and subject.

Collective action is a condition of social creativity and democratic cleansing. To speak of creative cultural participation beyond the possibility of the individual, isolated case, presupposes an active fabric of basic associative units: groups of interests and / or affinities. These groups are simultaneously subjects and means of cultural action. In them, the distinction between authors and beneficiaries of culture ceases to exist. The participation of as many citizens as possible in cultural associations is both a condition and a consequence of the existence of a true cultural democracy. As Etienne Grosjean says: "Strengthening associations

– while respecting their autonomy, their diversity, their alternative role and challenging of any dominant culture – is a central element of a cultural democracy policy."

The dominant cultural model is one based on centralism, if not at the organisational level then at least in terms of criteria and standards of taste. A policy that wants to encourage forms of genuine participation can only mean one resistant to any form of cultural centralism.

Instead of outsized national cultural associations and projects, it is vital to fight for the autonomy of local projects and for their insertion in lateral cultural exchange networks, capable of enriching them without smothering them, as Etienne Grosjean again says, so very clearly:

> it is advisable to avoid the setting up of centralised power structures
> which create local delegations or committees. Local and regional initiatives must be allowed
> to develop coordinated services to exchange ideas that enable the operation of support and
> research networks. Down with centralised power! Here's to local networks!

Democratic participation structures cannot transition directly from the local to the national level. The regional level must acquire its own identity and play its role in the overall democratic development.

At the regional level is where the required coordination between plans and projects of a given area can take place. But for this to happen it is imperative that the regions are not determined from on high, as 'colonial' structures of a central power. It is with local dynamics as their jumping off point that the regions must be established and revitalised. It is certainly up to the central government to harmonise national interests. But harmonisation of interests is not to be confused with guardianship, let alone domination. If we want to safeguard forms of genuine representation of regional interests, strong regional structures must be the spokespersons for the common will of citizens and at the same time be places of participation, that is to say, places dedicated to the practice of cultural democracy.

Democratic participation is still in constant renewal, as is evident, in political parties. The fact that states operate on a basis of parliamentary democracy is a decisive achievement that we do not want to minimise. We must, however, beware of believing that parties can by themselves fulfil all the requirements of democratic participation. Even at the level of the simple parliamentary machine, it is becoming increasingly clear in almost all countries of democratic tradition that parties are not enough to grant adequate expression to the needs of people and projects that should emerge from these needs.

Parties generally organise themselves as large, centralised apparatuses, formulating an ideology, directives, and guidelines to be applied by local delegations. Now, democratic participation tends today to seek other complementary means of expression with regard to traditional parties. Do not be wary of these new alternatives. It is not a 'grassroots' phenomenon. On the contrary, it is a movement of democratic and cultural affirmation that can only enrich our prospects for a better future.

Paths for a cultural democracy[43]

CULTURALISING SOCIETY

The relationship between the cultural system and democracy must be visible at all levels of social organisation. It is no longer enough to speak of 'cultural development' in terms that are identical to those used to describe the development of a sector of industrial activity. It is time to coordinate the cultural system, in its multiple elements, with the complex and diversified system of political decision-making. As we have already said, it is necessary to "recognise the political coefficient of all cultural action and to attribute a cultural foundation to political action".

Culturalising society means, first and foremost, rethinking the values that guide our daily decisions and behaviours. We live in societies that have set as goals growth and material wellbeing. The priority objectives of most governments are those of the constant increase in production, with the conviction that this growth will automatically lead to an increase in wellbeing for all citizens. But this is a mass delusion that must be denounced at all costs. Looking the cultural dimension of all social life square in the eye requires one to be able to question facts that seem obvious but are only mystifications shared by the great majority.

Only a new set of values, based on personal dignity and rooted in the diversity of peoples' cultural identities, will overcome the stalemate in which we find ourselves. A Council of Europe working document published recently said so very clearly:

> *Since the industrial revolution, economic profitability has too often swung collective opinion on cultural development, giving rise to an exclusive concern for material wellbeing, the consumption of goods and services, and leaving unsatisfied the basic cultural aspirations of men, their needs for expression, communication and participation. We must find a way to convince ourselves that the fulfilment of mankind requires the satisfaction of both spiritual aspirations as much as material needs.*

---

43 Talk given in Paris, December 1999; it is part VI of a longer text. Quotation sources unknown.[archive version].

Culturalising society also means giving back to democratic institutions their cultural significance, by affirming the primacy of society in relation to the State and by revitalising the social fabric in all its forms of cultural expression.

This implies, it goes without saying, an in-depth questioning of the role of public authorities in social life. Indeed, the centralising and bureaucratic tendencies of modern states only encourage citizens to adopt attitudes of compliance and dependence – attitudes which are the opposite of the creative cultural participation of which we have spoken in the preceding text.

The limits of the state must be exposed and a clearheaded fight be waged against the centralising powers of every apparatus. It is vital to demystify the role of giant institutions, by reducing to the necessary minimum the number of mediations between the goals to be achieved and the concrete actions that translate them. It is necessary to

> *rethink the functioning of democratic institutions and, through appropriate decentralisation of decision-making and participation, invest the citizen with effective responsibilities, thus giving them the feeling of being master of their own destiny in a successful balance between the general interest and their legitimate aspirations.*

Culturalising society is still – it has become almost a cliché to be repeating this yet again – putting the economy at the service of man by breaking the infernal cycle of production / accumulation / consumption, as we know it today.

Societies at the beck and call of economic interests are soulless institutions where competition dominates all, marketing is the norm, and the vagaries of fashion are the law. But a society that wants a cultural identity cannot be content with a kind of development in which only the indicators of production and consumption seem to count. What development is it, if we do not ask ourselves: What should we be producing? How? For who? And at what social costs?

It is only when the economy ceases to be regarded as a means to an end and resumes its role of an instrumental resource that one can speak of development in the human, therefore cultural, sense of the term. In the meantime, the workplace will be the scene of mankind's coarsening instead of a place of personal fulfilment and cultural creation. In the meantime, schools will continue to be diploma factories where outdated education models are perpetuated, instead of being a breeding ground for new mentalities capable of responding to the demands of the ever-changing world of our time.

To build a brand new cultural society, where average citizens will be more likely to come into their own and to assert themselves as creative beings, the following three factors, among others, must be taken into account:

— the evaluation of goods and tasks required for each society so that the investment of the human effort is done in a useful way, but also gratifying, for the entire social community;

— social control of the means of mass communication, so that the citizen-recipient of information is able to exercise a sense of critical judgment on the events, preserving one's personal autonomy and one's own moral conscience;
— bringing the education system and the values that support it up to date, so that today's youth can cope with the unknown world that faces them as tomorrow's adult.

SOCIALISING CULTURE

In order for culture to penetrate all sectors of social life, as we have just proposed, we must guarantee to all citizens the conditions that favour their active and creative participation at all levels of the cultural system. The basic principles of what may be called the socialisation of culture are laid out in the 'Recommendation on Participation by the People at Large in Cultural Life and their Contribution to it' adopted by the General Conference of Unesco in its 15th session, in Nairobi. We will pick up on some of its points.

First of all, it is about *participation in* and not just 'access' to culture. If for us culture is a system where 'everything fits together', it's not a question of talking about access to cultural assets, as if such assets were static possessions, which could be acquired by simply climbing the social ladder. From a systemic perspective, the subject transforms and is transformed by the reality that he or she comes into contact with. Participation in cultural life therefore only occurs when the subject is able to intervene in a deliberate and conscious way in the overall process which is the cultural system.

"Socialising culture" means making this possibility accessible to as many people as possible. The recommendation of Unesco calls to "democratise the means and instruments of cultural activity". This is without doubt an important first step. There will be true cultural participation of the mass population only when *all* citizens, including the most disadvantaged social groups, have earned the conditions of personal development that allow them to assume their full rights as cultural citizens.

The implementation of the socialisation of culture involves concrete measures that have to do simultaneously with the synergies developed in the previous texts and with the management of 'cultural policies' such as they are.

In terms of 'cultural policies', in the strict sense of the word, it is necessary to consider first and foremost:

— promoting, through legislative, administrative and financial measures, the safeguarding and enhancement of the historical heritage of each people (sites and monuments, archives, museums, libraries), so that this heritage becomes a common cultural source of replenishment;

— encouraging the creation and dissemination of traditional forms of cultural expression (literature, theatre, visual arts, music and dance, cinema, architecture), by fortifying the links between cultural creation and daily life, so that the mechanisms of production and reproduction are oriented by aesthetic and spiritual values;
— investing in the standing and betterment of cultural creators, artists and others, so that they may freely express their talents and fulfil their prophetic role in society;
— stimulating, by all means possible, the access to cultural creation in its basic form, so that the 'masses' cease to be mere consumers of cultural patrimony and take their rightful place as prime *subject* of cultural activity.

POSFÁCIO

Era frequente ouvir Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo comentar – «Que interessante!», quando alguém lhe apresentava um assunto novo, por mais aparentemente banal, tamanha a atenção que aplicava a tudo o que à condição humana dizia respeito. Lembro-me de termos um dia conversado sobre Simone Weil, para quem, igualmente, era indispensável estarmos atentos aos sinais dos outros, da vida e da Natureza, ainda que de simples sopros pudessem parecer-nos. Como se tudo estivesse em tudo e de nada nos devêssemos distrair, sob pena de perdermos o sentido das nossas vidas, de nos *perdermos*.

> *O essencial para mim é compreender; devo compreender.*

> *A necessidade da compreensão*
> *não conduz unicamente a uma satisfação intelectual:*
> *é o princípio da acção coerente e eficaz*

(MLP)

Para Maria de Lourdes viver é um desafio estimulante, arriscado e sedutor. O grande risco decorre de não nos encararmos em cada momento do presente como sujeitos activos da nossa existência, mas isso não é ainda suficiente, porque é pre-ciso pensarmos o longe de onde viemos (lições da caminhada já percorrida) para assegurarmos o longe para onde nos queremos projectar (cuidar o futuro). A sedução está no modo como soubermos cumprir este repto de militância, este desíg- nio, tão ontológico, tão político. Enquanto criaturas singulares, teremos não só de estar alerta, vigilantes na nossa individualizada cena, como de ser conscientes da nossa inscrição na grande e diversa cidade do mundo, que garante sermos um (em nós) e uma parte (na totalidade do mundo). Essa totalidade é, para a vida de cada um e para a de todos, portadora de um sentido de pertença solidária, que reforça a dignidade de se ser humano. Ser-se humano cabe, seguramente, naquela outra coisa ainda que o poeta disse ser «a que é linda» e que nos salva de nos *perdermos*.

É a pessoa humana a primeira e última finalidade de toda a decisão política.
Nela tudo nasce e para ela tudo se deve encaminhar.
Transformá-la num instrumento de objectivos científicos, económicos ou financeiros
é quebrar o esteio da política e da cidadania que reside no carácter inviolável da dignidade
humana.

(MLP)

Nesta Antologia de textos, em boa hora coligidos e editados por iniciativa da Fundação Cuidar O Futuro, encontramos, como se escritas hoje, as linhas mestras do pensamento de Maria de Lourdes Pintasilgo, alguém que incansavelmente interpelou as pessoas e o mundo, denunciando a intolerável teia produtora e reprodutora de um imenso cortejo de injustiças, exclusões e discriminações. Alguém que, com uma lucidez e uma tenacidade raras, propôs, ao seu País e à Comunidade Internacional, novas abordagens e metodologias para o entendimento da sociedade, traçando caminhos para um desenvolvimento mais harmonioso, convocando os cidadãos para um muito responsável exercício tanto dos seus direitos como dos seus deveres e anunciando modelos alternativos para uma governação outra, tão mais generosa quanto mais eficaz. A viagem da leitura proposta nesta Antologia foi mapeada, com rigoroso critério, por quatro áreas temáticas, quatro dominantes na reflexão e na acção desenvolvidas por Maria de Lourdes: Mulheres; Democracia; Desenvolvimento; Educação e Cultura. Quatro pilares fundamentais que, agora em livro, exigem uma leitura cuidadosa, feita à luz da nossa maior atenção. Deverá esta Antologia ficar sempre à mão de quem a adquirir, para poder ser lida e relida como um Breviário, na certeza de que nela encontraremos ensinamentos e inspiração suficientes para, aqui e agora, nos sentirmos capazes de não nos *perdermos*.

Maria João Seixas