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1. Introduction
On behalf of Card. Peter Turkson, I would like to thank the organisers for the invitation to participate at this important event. In particular, I would like to thank Bishop Dr Ackermann, Cardinal Marx, and all the Deutsche Commission for Justice and Peace, not only for their introductory words, but also for all the work done during the last 50 years in promoting peace, development and human rights from and in the German context.

I would like to contribute to this celebration/conference by highlighting how the message of Populorum Progressio (1967), a signpost for a just world order in its time, is still relevant for the future of the human family and for our planet. Although the message of Populorum Progressio has been actualized by successive Popes’ statements, the latest social document of the Church, Laudato Si’, on the Care for our Common Home (2015), reinforces it with new vigor. In fact, if we want to promote “integral human development” as the path for justice and peace in our days, we need to do so through the notion and practice of “integral ecology”.

2. Populorum Progressio and the question of development
Populorum Progressio - on ‘The Development of Peoples’ - appeared fifty years ago (March 1967) as a response to one of the most important signs of that time: the ‘development question’.

At the time, the dominant view treated economic growth as synonymous with development. Yet Blessed Paul VI was severely critical of reducing human development to economic measures of the acceleration and increase of the production process. Inspired by thinkers

---

1 Development, indeed, has different conceptualisations that, in turn, lead to very different socio-economic and political paths. See, among others: Alkire, S. (2002); Sen, A. (1999); Sumner, A. and Tribe, M. (2008).

2 The UN declared the 1960s as the “decade of development”, meaning a period of economic expansion, industrialisation, and unprecedented international trade. The set development (economic) goal was an annual growth of 5% of aggregate national income (UN General Assembly, 19th December 1961). For more about this historical element and the link with Populorum Progressio, see Figueroa Deck (2005).

3 See his address to the UN General Assembly (1965).
such as Louis-Joseph Lebret and Jacques Maritain.\(^4\) *Populorum Progressio* faced, head on, one of the key challenges of the global community in the post-World War II era: peace, but linked with international development.

In contrast to the mainstream approach to development of that time, the encyclical proposed a more holistic understanding of human development -hence not restricted to economic growth. It was a prophetic call that would take decades for the United Nations to catch up to -most notably with birth of the UNDP Human Development Reports and the new SDG agenda. Development, if it is to be human, needs to be for all people (not just for a few), for the whole human person (not merely his/her material dimension), and must offer feasible models of social integration (rather than fomenting inequality). This *is* a development model that can be presented as the path for peace and justice among people, as opposed to a model that cause violence, inequality and destruction.\(^5\)

Paul VI knew that, to serve for such a holistic model of development, the Church needed to contribute to finding an alternative economic and political global system.

### 3. Post *Populorum Progressio*: continue seeking IHD for a just world order

In this line of thought, Saint John Paul II, in his social encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1987), actually written for the 20\(^{th}\) anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, explained that processes of “development”, which are “not straightforward”\(^6\), require revisiting the economy of the world in itself, which had “entered into crisis” (SRS 26-27). The evidence for this, St John Paul II highlighted, was inequality in world development, because “side-by-side with the miseries of underdevelopment, themselves unacceptable, we find ourselves up against a form of super-development, equally inadmissible” (SRS 27).

And when, due to inequalities in power, the burden of immense debts is carried on the shoulders of the poor and of poor countries, when unemployment is rife despite business expansion, or when people are treated merely as a means for the growth of others, then we need to question the model. Actually, according to St John Paul II we need to delve deep into the causes of this distortion of development, where we can find what he called “structural sins”. It is the mission of the Church not just to denounce them, but to work for its conversion. In short, the Church needs to continue seeking for integral human development, which, after John Paul II, is explicitly linked with the preferential option for the poor (i.e. those left outside the development model), and with the acknowledgment that

\(^4\) Other sources of inspiration have been Joseph Cardijn, Henri de Lubac, Colin Clark, Marie-Dominique Chenu, Card. Pietro Puan, Barbara Ward-Jackson, Oswald von Nell Breuning, and Emmanuel Larrain Errazuriz (cf Figueroa Deck 2005).

\(^5\) It recognizes that, “There can be no progress towards the complete development of man without the simultaneous development of all humanity in the spirit of solidarity” (PP 43).

\(^6\) “As it were automatic and in itself limitless, as though, given certain conditions, the human race were able to progress rapidly towards an undefined perfection of some kind”.
the goods of the earth have been created by God for all (i.e. common destination of the goods).

Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI furthered the tradition of *Populorum Progressio*, and reinforced the idea that integral human development is not just an economic matter or something merely for experts, but is “first and foremost a vocation (CiV 16) … a call [for every person] that requires a free and responsible answer” (CiV 17). This responsibility, according to Benedict XVI, requires a careful evaluation of the way we produce and use natural resources, of the way we trade, and of the way we address and seek profit – so often through a short-term view- (cf. CiV 21-22, 32). Because “once profit becomes the exclusive goal [of development], it risks destroying wealth and creating poverty” (CiV 21).

Pope Benedict XVI, argues in favour not only of the correction of “grave deviations” from business (CiV 40), but he also claims for a “process of globalisation… opened up [to an] unprecedented possibility of large-scale redistribution of wealth on a world-wide scale” (CiV 42), a process underpinned by an economy that is “people-centred” so as to promote a “more humane market and society”, hence integral development (CiV 45, 47).

### 4. *Laudato Si’: IHD and Integral Ecology*

Following the tradition on integral human development of *Populorum Progressio*, in his social encyclical *Laudato Si’*, Pope Francis questions the current model of economic growth, which, he argues, has impoverished the source of growth altogether, this is, the earth and its natural environment on the one hand, and human cohesion - due to extreme inequality - on the other. In fact, “a technological and economic development which does not leave in its wake a better world and an integrally higher quality of life cannot be considered progress” (LS 194).

---

7 He considered that *Populorum Progressio* is the “Rerum Novarum of the present age, shedding light upon humanity’s journey towards unity” (CiV 8)

8 Arguably, one can see echoes of this in the UN Agenda 2013 (*The road to dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet*). Development, indeed, concerns us all, and requires a free and responsible answer from every person and every community on the planet. Still, one cannot but question how are we going to achieve, for instance, SDG 12 on ‘sustainable consumption’ if people living in affluent countries do not change their lifestyle radically. By emphasising the vocational dimension of development, the Church aims to connect people’s responsibility and development goals, with our deepest goals in life, with what actually means to be human.

9 Moreover, when the financial markets dominate development, this prompts new forms of competition between States, who have to downsize their social security systems, leaving many unprotected (cf. CiV 25). Yet “the market”, Pope Emeritus claims, “is not, and must not become, the place where the strong subdue the weak” (CiV 36). This is certainly not the path for a peaceful and just world order.

10 And, when the financial and economic crisis is linked with the energy, climate and migrant crisis, what we urgently need to promote integral human development, according to Pope Benedict XVI, is a “reform of the United Nations Organisation, and likewise of economic institutions and international finance” (CiV 67). In his view, we need a new “world political authority” committed “to securing authentic integral human development” (CiV 67).
Therefore, the Pope calls for a profound dialogue, at all levels, so as to redefine the notion of progress (LS 194), a dialogue where those most affected are heard. And one of the main contributions of the Church to this dialogue is to emphasise on the promotion of integral human development.

However, in our present time, development can neither be conceived nor promoted without consideration of peoples’ environment. In fact, nobody exists or can develop outside his or her own environment. And when we destroy it or pollute it, then human development is at risk, affecting the very poor.

**Ecology & poverty**

For example, as Pope Francis points out (LS 20), “some forms of pollution”, both in rural and urban areas, are causing among the poorest illnesses and millions of premature deaths. “Water pollution”, in particular, “affects the poor who cannot buy bottled water” (LS 20), as is the case in Freetown, Sierra Leone.

Also, "the depletion of fishing reserves especially hurts small fishing communities [lacking] the means to replace those resources” (LS 48), as is happening in Lake Turkana, Kenya. Similarly, “rises in the sea level mainly affect impoverished coastal populations who have nowhere else to go” (ibid.), as is occurring in Bangladesh and in island states. Moreover, societies are even fighting against each other in a violent competition for what we call natural “resources”\(^\text{11}\) (cf. LS 48, 57), as is happening in so many places.

**Ecological & world peace**

Also, when talking about world peace, environmental concerns are critical because ecological deterioration and human induced climate change, in themselves acts of violence against God’s creation, are causing further conflicts among societies. In Sub-Saharan Africa, for instance, droughts are driving conflicts between pastoralists and farmers, fomenting religious division, and pushing vulnerable people into the arms of terrorists, traffickers, and other criminal elements. In Latin America, environmentalist activists are being systematically killed.\(^\text{12}\) The Syrian conflict is also *somehow* related to environmental problems. Syria, indeed, suffered its worst drought and most severe crop failure in recorded history over the period 2006-10, leading to 1.5 million people migrating from rural farming communities to urban areas (Kelly et al, 2015). As climate change wreaks havoc in more and more regions, this could be the shape of things to come.

**Integral ecology**

What is the response to the ecological crisis that wreaks havoc on people and the planet? For Pope Francis, it is **integral ecology**. The notion of integral ecology (LS 137-142) is introduced in *Laudato Si*\(^\text{1}\) as a paradigm able to articulate the fundamental relationships of

---

11 As if they were merely “resources” for something else, with no intrinsic value.
12 Latin America is the most dangerous continent to be an environmental activist. According to Global Witness, 120 environmental activists have been killed since 2010 in Honduras, and more than 400 in Brazil since 2002.
the person: with ‘God’, with ‘oneself’, with ‘other human beings’, and with ‘creation’. Whilst seeking for justice and peace, therefore, we need to address all these relational dimensions.

Put differently, given that human beings are part of the Earth’s ecosystems (the webs of life), without which there is no possible life, the caring of such ecosystems is critical to promote human dignity, development and peace (cf. LS 160). Social and ecological issues go hand in hand; the cry of the earth and the cry of the poor are interrelated, and we should listen to both of them (cf. LS 49, 50). Integrating social and ecological justice is the first step to current world peace.

In this sense, the new universal Agenda 2030 proposes to integrate the five “Ps”: (i) people; (ii) planet; (iii) prosperity; (iv) peace; and (v) partnership. However, as we might discuss in the following session, the idea of “prosperity” fostered by the international community is not crystal clear. Are we talking about a prosperity based on unlimited growth and consumption, for whose sustainability we depend only on technological advancement? If so, are we not ignoring the anthropological and sociological roots of the crisis, hence not facing it head on, as Populorum Progressio and Laudato Si’ propose?

**Ecological conversion**

Integral ecology goes beyond the needed integration of social, economic, environmental and political goals. This is necessary, but not enough for a sustainable just world order. Sets of external goals need to be underpinned by internal goals (cf. Mt 5-7); the change of policies and attitudes need a change of heart.

Put differently, integral ecology includes the need to foster personal, social and ecological harmony, for which we need a personal, social and ecological conversion. This “entails the recognition of our errors, sins, faults and failures, and leads to heartfelt repentance and desire to change” and to be reconciled with others, with creation and with the Creator (LS 218).

Still, as Pope Francis points out, isolated individual conversion is absolutely necessary, but not enough. “Social problems must be addressed by community networks and not simply by the sum of individual good deeds” (LS 219). Therefore, “the ecological conversion needed to bring about lasting change is also a community conversion” (ibid.). This entails the change

---

13 Pope Francis warns us about an extreme approach to development, where “we find those who doggedly uphold the myth of progress and tell us that ecological problems will solve themselves simply with the application of new technology and without any need for ethical considerations or deep change” (LS 60). For him, it is time the international community leaves “behind the modern myth of unlimited material progress”, which is hurting our “fragile world” (LS 78).

14 It also comprises a conversion of attitude, from indifference to loving awareness, from utilitarianism to gratuitousness, from selfishness to generosity, from self-advantage to solidarity (cf LS 220). This can be expressed, for example, in a more responsible use of water, electricity, paper, plastic, or transport. It can also be expressed by as well as being attentive to the products that we buy, both in its content and packaging, and to how (and how much) we waste (cf. LS 58, 210-211).
of the structures that generate poverty, inequality, forced migration, and ecological damage. And to change structures, we need the participation at all levels of the political realm.\textsuperscript{15}

**Ecology & World Politics**

If the family of nations really wants to foster peace and sustainable development, then we sorely need “a healthy politics… capable of reforming and coordinating institutions [and], promoting best practices” (LS 181). We need a global political system that can foster integral human development through social inclusion and environmental care, a system that can enhance development processes through which we can break the perverse logic of violence and domination through the logic of care and peace (LS 196). But for that, we all need to acknowledge our own responsibility (as persons, churches, and as nations), and to realise that we must change our behaviours and structures for the sake of those left behind, for the sake of our common home.

**Conclusion**

To sum up, the “urgent” question of development raised by *Populorum Progressio* fifty years ago, is still critical to creating a just and peaceful world order. Amidst multiple conflicts that we are facing these days, the Church proposes to address them through the service and promotion of integral human development, the development for the whole person and for all people. And given that we, as human beings, cannot flourish without our environment, world development needs more than ever an integral approach to the delicate ecosystem of life and wellbeing in which we all exist, to ecology. This will not only help us to understand what it means to be human (LS 11), it will help us to live more justly and peacefully as persons and as a human family in our common home.

Thank you.

\textsuperscript{15} This participation is more needed in our days, when financial interests are trumping politics for the benefit of a few and in detriment to the common good; and when politics are ruled by a technocratic paradigm for which ruthless domination is chief; or when politics is trapped into a short-term view of the world (cf.LS 53-57, 178). All This boosts neither justice nor peace. Arguably, *Laudato Si’* and Agenda 2030 reinforce each other in terms of political participation to foster development.
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