

## **Lebret's Christian-inspired societal project and integral human development**

Nuno Martins

Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Católica Porto Business School and CEGE,

[nmartins@ucp.pt](mailto:nmartins@ucp.pt)

Vítor Teixeira

Universidade Católica Portuguesa, School of Arts and CITAR, [vteixeira@ucp.pt](mailto:vteixeira@ucp.pt)

### **Abstract**

In this article we describe how Louis-Joseph Lebret's work, propelled by his human-centered spirituality, contributed to the development of an approach aimed at the transformation of social and economic structures, so as to achieve integral human development. We discuss too the connections between Lebret's legacy and the advancement of Integral Human Development within the Catholic Church. Finally drawing on a relational ontology (and the way it is expressed in the idea of a relational community in Catholic Social Teaching) we address the similarities and differences between the approaches to human development which were adopted in, respectively, the Catholic Church and the United Nations, which is another central institution with which Lebret interacted.

**Keywords:** Louis-Joseph Lebret, integral human development, Catholic Social Teaching, relational ontology

### **1. Introduction**

Louis-Joseph Lebret argued that it is useless to preach about morality before society itself has the possibility to practice it, and he concluded that to do so usefully we must provide a structure to society that allows for human development (Malley 1997, 53).

Lebret's ideas were very influential in shaping a human-centered economy and development that takes the role of structural conditions into account. Starting from his work at a more local level, Lebret's contribution eventually became influential also at a global level, through his work with the United Nations and with the apex-levels of the Catholic Church. In so doing, Lebret's contribution helped shaping what is termed today *integral human development* (Keleher 2017, 2018).

As Keleher notes, in the idea of integral human development, *integral* refers to: (i) 'development of the whole person' and (ii) 'development of every person' (2017, 21). Integral human development became influential in Catholic Social Teaching through the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (PP) by Pope Paul VI, to which Lebret was a major contributor (Cosmao 1970; Keleher 2018). The idea of integral human development continued to be advanced in subsequent encyclical letters celebrating *Populorum Progressio*, notably *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (SRS) by Pope John Paul II and *Caritas in Veritate* (CiV) by Pope Benedict XVI. And the fundamental ideas behind integral human development are still influential in the more recent encyclical letter *Laudato Si'* (LS) by Pope Francis (Deneulin 2018) and its approach to an integral ecology.

Lebret also influenced other approaches. He inspired the project of development ethics (Keleher 2017), including through his influence on Denis Goulet. Goulet's (1971a) emphasis on human capabilities (a term which, however, Lebret did not use), in turn, also anticipates important aspects of the capability approach to human development (Gasper 2008) advanced by Martha Nussbaum (2000) and Amartya Sen (1985, 1999), and adopted within the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). There are interesting complementarities between integral human

development, inspired by Lebret, and the capability approach to human development adopted within the United Nations (Deneulin 2018; Keleher 2017, 2018)

Here we explain how Lebret's approach led to a set of lifelong projects aimed at transforming social structures so as to achieve integral human development. We focus also on how the idea of Integral Human Development was adopted in the Catholic Church. To do so, we draw on the notion of a relational ontology in order to interpret Lebret's approach, while also explaining its influence in the explanation of how social structures shape integral human development.

The next section describes Lebret's human-centered and Christocentric spirituality, and how his spirituality is expressed in his work. The subsequent section describes Lebret's societal project. We turn then to Lebret's influence on Integral Human Development as developed in the Catholic Church, drawing on the notion of a relational ontology, and explaining how it can be used to interpret Lebret's approach, before concluding.

## **2. Lebret's foundational human-centered spirituality**

To understand Lebret's perspective, it is necessary to revisit his spirituality and human-centered dimension. And to appreciate Lebret's spirituality, we must first note the underlying theology and the source of his spirituality – in other words, his understanding of God's Plan for salvation of humankind. Spirituality is the starting point of Lebret's thinking and action. Without considering his human-centered and Christocentric spirituality, as a Christian and as a priest, as well as being a Dominican friar (or 'blackfriar'), it is difficult to understand Lebret's decisive role in theorizing an economy with a human face and scope (Gerhard and Horn 2001, 33).

His writings clearly reflect his vision of this project and his attempts to participate in it. His life was driven by this vision, awakening in him two attitudes: to

go out to compassionately serve the world and to surrender himself to God. God's project for humankind, Lebreton wrote, is to unite all creation with the Father in the Son. For Lebreton, this project was gradually revealed in the Old Testament, and came to fruition with the birth of Christ. The plan of God is to draw humanity to Himself, and all men and women have the obligation to seek God and constantly walk towards Him (Lebreton 1949). Lebreton used the expression 'human ascent' (in French, *montée humaine*) to designate this process.

*Human ascent* is conceived as the growth and development of men and women individually, and of humanity in general, towards a full life in God. It has personal, social, cultural, intellectual, moral, economic, and scientific dimensions and also a strictly spiritual aspect. If human ascent is God's plan for humanity, then the objective of a Christian existence is to commit to this project and make it grow by constantly seeking God and giving oneself to God out of love (Malley 1968). However, a Christian cannot focus only on her or his own development, since following Christ implies a strongly felt concern with the development of all humanity. Lebreton emphasized the idea that our insertion in Christ allows us to value all human beings, rich and poor, since they all have in themselves seeds of their own development and, consequently, we desire their realization.

This leads to the need of globalizing solidarity, according to Lebreton, who was an early defender of ethically-based international development (Lebreton 1958a, 1958b), an idea subsequently developed by Denis Goulet (1971a) and in the field of development ethics (Gasper 2008; Keleher 2017, 2018). Thus, a central aspect of Lebreton's spirituality, as shown by Malley (1968), is accepting that our own development as human beings is deeply connected to the development of others (Lebreton 1945). Lebreton (1951) gave practical and universal recommendations so that

today's Christians can insert themselves into the project of '*la montée humaine*', the human ascent (Lebret 1945).

How was Lebret's spirituality expressed in his work? The first condition for cooperating with God's project is to spend time reflecting on it. Lebret wrote that this is the only way to enter more deeply into God's redemptive action. In chapter 9 of his book *Dans le combat du monde*, written with his Dominican colleague and companion Thomas Suavet (Lebret and Suavet 1962), they referred to several signs of sin in our contemporary world: the seduction of materialism, illusions of rationalism, and the myth of absolute independence. Lebret and Suavet (1962) described the tragedy of sin and the anguish of humanity as a consequence of the following: instead of searching for truth, most live in ignorance; instead of solidarity and collaboration we find cruelty and greed; instead of love there is hatred.

Lebret suggested that, in today's world, the worst evil that blocks human development is not so much the poverty of those who do not have the means for human development, but rather the lack of awareness of those who have those means. Because of greed and lack of awareness, the raw materials, energy sources, and other sources of potential for material production of a civilization, become dangerous means concentrated in the hands of some who have not the intention to share, and who often transform those means into the seeds of war (Malley 1968). Lebret sought to attain a solution for this state of affairs (Lebret 1958a).

Lebret consciously and effectively pursued the following solution in his own life: to achieve an attitude towards misery which should be, he felt, the attitude of all who are intelligent Christians. He referred to the episode of the Good Samaritan in the Gospel of Luke to illustrate this attitude. The Good Samaritan of today is the Christian who can discover the general and universal causes of human misery.

However, many times, Christians make no effort to identify the causes of misery and, consequently, are ineffective regarding solutions. Lebreton commented sadly on the many Christians who did not know how to interpret the problems of society in its many aspects, nor how to situate themselves in relation to institutions, structures, and techniques. Thus, they participate in partial battles using insufficient methods and anachronistic ways (Lebreton 1958a, 48).

Lebreton's spirituality, seen as an engagement in the real world, whose foundation is God's project of salvation for the universe, was clearly a spirituality that is committed to the world, rather than a withdrawal from the world. In fact, according to Lebreton, the characteristics of the true Christian correspond to the fundamentals of his approach: to be open and inserted in the world with all its complexity. Lebreton followed some texts of the Bible, inspired by the Dominican theologian Marie-Dominique Chenu (1964, 135), that provide the basis for this thesis, including Jesus's orders to his disciples: 'Go and make disciples of all nations' (Matthew 28, 19)<sup>1</sup>; 'You are my witnesses' (John 15, 27); and 'I send them into the world' (John 20, 21). When Christians are inserted into the world and working for true development (Lebreton 1961), they are following Jesus who inserted Himself totally into the human condition (Lebreton 1967).

Lebreton emphasized the Christian responsibility to discern one's own area of commitment according to one's human gifts, vocation, and circumstances. Here Lebreton alerted Christians that if they do not make this discernment and contribution, they are already less human than they should be: they are not fulfilling their vocation and uniting their efforts with the project of God; and they really do not fulfil the will of the Lord (Lebreton 1959a). He insisted too that each person and each group must integrate their efforts with those of their own generation. The generations succeed

each other, and each one gives a contribution that is different from the others. The Christian commitment for Lebret (1959a) had one objective: to help people *to be more, rather than merely to have more* (Lebret 1959b).

### **3. Lebret's societal project**

#### *3.1 Lebret's societal ideal*

Lebret's spirituality led to a human-centered view of the economy, and of economics, centered on the social scope that this discipline and type of activity can achieve, going beyond the market lens (Lebret 1959b; Bosi 2012). He gradually developed the form of a Christian social thought, placing humanity in the foreground, capable of establishing a more just world, in an economy based not only on the perspectives of profit and consumption, not only on the valuation of material possessions, but above all on the human person.

Lebret's work in the 1930s and 1940s reflected his idealistic vision of reconstructing social structures at local and regional levels. This idea was strongly articulated in his 1947 book *Découverte du bien commun – Mystique d'un monde nouveau*, especially in Chapter 24: De La Structure Economique et Sociale. The ideas expressed there point to a normative vision of how to create balance and coordination within and between regions, which should to a large degree be self-reliant. But the work undertaken in this same period showed an acute awareness of class divisions – e.g. in *Guide du Militant* (Lebret 1946a) – which highlighted Lebret's emphasis on social structures, and how they are expressed in a geographical context.

As Malley (1968) argues, Lebret was not interested only in better systems, policies, or laws. His main concern was people; starting in the 1930s with the exploited fishermen he was studying in France and then elsewhere. During this period of research, analysis, and discernment, he spent much time talking to people, learning

from them about how the crisis affected their lives and the lives of their families. In fact, this is something he did throughout his life – listening and reflecting, as recommended and discussed too in his books on social research methodology.

Lebret opened the path for projects aimed at the development and enhancement of human relations based on the Christian tradition (Lebret 1958). It was necessary to abandon the idea of the market as a quasi-deity, as it is treated by many politicians and economists. The goal of Lebret's project was to protect the citizens without resources, who desire a better life. That is, the aim was to achieve an economy of all people, and at the service of all people. Lebret was always a man of action, a kind of thinker strongly concerned with socio-economic injustices and the exclusion of many people. He found the latter unacceptable in a world that was striding ahead through technological conquests but that when driven by market forces and nationalist mindsets alone was unable to address adequately the problems of human hunger and misery.

Lebret stressed, and illustrated, how it is possible to be highly productive and technically advanced, and at the same time not have a true sense of existence and of the harmony of its fruits, which are wisdom and understanding (Lebret 1940). When this happens, there is no human development. There are three ascending categories of human needs that we must know so as to help humanity *to be* more fully human, rather than merely *to have*:

- 1) primary or basic needs such as food, clothing, home, health, and also other requisites for meaningful and dignified existence;
- 2) comfort needs such as free time and pleasant surroundings; and



3) tertiary needs related to human personal development and transcendence, cultural opportunities, enriching friendships and prayer. (Feix 2007; Lebret and Celestin 1950)

Needs are therefore divided into three classes: primary, the requisites for survival and basic dignity; secondary or comfort needs; and tertiary, related to spirituality and transcendence. This tripartition was very different from the three classic sectors (i.e.: raw materials, manufacturing, services) used to describe an economy (Pelletier 1996, 102). It is not a description of the economy, but rather a normative position based on a hierarchy of values (Pontual 2017).

In sum, his spirituality played a central role in Lebret's praxis in regard to justice, the common good, solidarity, and the integral and sustained development of human beings, revealed in his ideal of capacitated and responsible citizenship, self-sufficient and capable of building progress, configured as a dynamic process.

### *3.2 Lebret's third way*

As expounded in his books in the 1940s (Lebret 1946b, 1947a), Lebret thought that the solution to contemporary problems lay in creating a human economy, which according to Goulet, encapsulates a particular definition of human development:

Lebret defines development as the series of transitions, for a given population and all the population groups that comprise it, from a less human to a more human pattern of existence, at the speediest rhythm possible, at the lowest possible cost, while taking into account all the bonds of solidarity that exist (or ought to exist) amongst these populations and population groups. (Goulet, 2000, 13)

Thus, for a human economy, seen as a socio-economic system, to be established, would require:

[...] a planning from the elementary territorial units to the world as a whole.

Obviously, it is not a matter of proposing a single way of planning, but, on the contrary, a great variety, taking into account, in each case, the possibilities, the current structures, the types of needs, the technical and cultural stages, the quality and intensity of spontaneous or increasing efforts. (Lebret and Suavet 1962, 89)

Lebret's concept, or model, of the desirable economy is an economy based on the genuine needs of all, rather than solely on profits and excessive advantages for some. It was based on a community model, not politicized or partisan, in a world divided between the western capitalist bloc and the communist countries led by the then USSR (Bosi 2012, 7). Lebret (1946b) always rejected the totalitarianism and inhumanity of the latter solution. This led him to a path and form of action that became for many a utopia and a rare ethical inspiration.

The type of associativism preached by Lebret, according to Godoy (2016), aimed at the establishment of cooperative community institutions, solidarity, involving various social classes, against both the communist classist perspective and liberal possessive individualism. It was suggested as a third way, drawing on ideas anchored in many sources: the functionalist organicism and the notion of solidarity of Durkheim (1858-1917, opus magna *Le Suicide*, 1897); in Tönnies' basic communitarianism (Ferdinand Tönnies, 1855-1936, German sociologist) and also in Kropotkin (Peter Kropotkin, 1842-1921, Russian historian); in Lenin's anti-imperialism (Lebret, 1942); in Le Play's mathematical rationalism (Pierre G. F. Le Play, 1806-1882 French engineer and mathematician); in urban and rural analysis methods with systematic use of ethnographic studies such as by Paul-Henry Chombart de Lauwe (French sociologist 1913-1998) and Maurice Halbwachs (1877-1945,

French philosopher); and in urban research developed by the Chicago School of Sociology, from Robert E. Park (1864-1944, urban sociologist), Ernest W. Burgess (1866-1926, Canadian urban sociologist), Robert D. Mackenzie (1885-1940, Canadian-American sociologist), Louis Wirth (1897-1952, German-American sociologist), and others (Godoy 2016).

The influence of other French intellectuals on Lebreton should also be mentioned, such as Henri de Tourville (1842-1903, one of the precursors of sociology), Edmond Demolins (1852-1907, French pedagogue), Pierre Du Maroussem (1862-1936, founder of Collège des sciences sociales de Paris, in 1895), Charles Péguy (1873-1914, French poet), the anthropologist Georges Balandier (1920-2016), the geographer Yves Lacoste (1929-) and, especially from the philosopher Emmanuel Mounier (1905-1950), through the latter's personalism. Not less relevant are the references used by Lebreton from urban studies undertaken by Engels, in dealing with the situation of the working class in England, and the young Marx, particularly his writings on alienation, overexploitation of work, and surplus value, and also from analyses about the third world and on underdevelopment, by Alfred Sauvy (1898-1990, French demographer), Raúl Prebisch (1901-1986, Argentine economist, opus magna *The Economic Development of Latin America and its Principal Problems*, 1950), Ragnar Nurkse (1907-1959, Estonian economist, credited as founder of the theory of the vicious circle of poverty) and Gunnar Myrdal (1898-1987, Swedish economist) (Godoy 2016).

Lebreton's third way was presented as a pragmatic option, oriented to the development, harmony and integrity of humanity (Lebreton 1961). He outlined a path that is structured at the level of institutions, and that maintained a critical distance in relation to alignments with any partisan political forces. However, Lebreton came to

realize that his ideal of a human economy, developed when working with local communities, would not be implemented in the re-emergent post-1944 France, dominated by large businesses and international trade. He understood that all progress could be blocked through the mechanisms of international markets and global capital. So he began to work more intensely on the topic of development at a global level.

### *3.3 Integral or authentic human development*

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the UN Economic Council (1954), the United Nations Conference on the application of sciences and techniques in the interest of poorly developed regions (1962-3), and the conference that led to the foundation of UNCTAD (1964) enjoyed the involvement, support, and influence of Lebret, who served in them as a representative of the Vatican, promoting Christian ideals of solidarity.

Lebret, however, did not want to politicize his movement or the institutions he promoted (Lebret 1961), even though he brought an interface with Marxism closer to the Church's social doctrine.<sup>2</sup> Bosi even argues that Lebret used the concept of surplus value (Lebret 1947a), elaborated by Marx, as one basis of his movement, but without political or party connotations (Bosi 2012, 4). As Bosi notes (2012), instead of the mass struggle led by a working-class vanguard, Lebret proposed the creation and consolidation of grassroots communities capable of supporting themselves and each other, knowing their basic needs and claiming their fulfilment (Lebret 1959b). This was to be done through companies (through profit sharing and, ideally, a co-management system), and also in articulation with the State, through labour legislation and the implementation of mechanisms for the fair and humane distribution of national wealth (Bosi 2012; Lebret 1947b), that is, a fair distribution of the economic surplus (Lebret 1958b, 1961).

More than the United Nations, the key institution through which Lebreton advanced his ideas at a global level was the Catholic Church. Lebreton's work had long been in line with the "see, judge and act" method, advanced by Joseph Cardijn, which became central to Catholic Social Teaching after the 1961 encyclical *Mater et Magistra* by Pope John XXIII. This method entails a more inductive approach towards Catholic Social Teaching, based on intensive empirical observation, before judging and acting, in contrast with the more deductive and doctrinal approach that characterized earlier encyclicals. Lebreton's involvement with concrete communities, engaging in analysis, judgement, and action, reflected this and inspired the approach of Integral Human Development that became widely influential in Catholic Social Teaching after 1967.

The immediate predecessors of Pope Paul VI, from Pope Leo XIII in 1891 onwards, demonstrated a concern for the integral development of all human beings, with a consciousness of Christians' duties in this area, not least duties towards the less advantaged. This concern was expressed in Pope Leo XIII's encyclical letter *Rerum Novarum* (1891), Pope Pius XI's encyclical letter *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), Pius XII's radio message (June 1, 1941) on the 50th anniversary of the *Rerum Novarum*, and Pope John XXIII's two encyclical letters, *Mater et Magistra* (1961) and *Pacem in Terris* (1963).

The 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum* by Leo XIII had addressed the relations between labor and capital, the "new realities" (*rerum novarum*) emerging in XIXth century industrial capitalism. Paul VI's (1967) encyclical *Populorum Progressio* is concerned with new problems besides those inside industrial capitalism: development and underdevelopment worldwide, thus marking a new stage in Catholic Social Teaching.

Lebret's influence in Vatican-approved Catholic Social Teaching was embodied in the idea of *authentic* or *integral* human development, built from these contributions, and is seen most clearly in *Populorum Progressio*. The encyclical, finalized only after Lebret's death but reflecting his influence and direct involvement through the support of Paul VI presents the following definition of *authentic development*:

*Authentic Development*: The development We speak of here cannot be restricted to economic growth alone. To be authentic, it must be well rounded; it must foster the development of each man and of the whole man. As an eminent specialist [Fr. Lebret] on this question has rightly said: "We cannot allow economics to be separated from human realities, nor development from the civilization in which it takes place. What counts for us is man—each individual man, each human group, and humanity as a whole." (Paul VI, *PP*, no. 14; the text cited is Lebret 1961, 28)

The *Populorum Progressio* started a new stage in Catholic Social Teaching. John Paul II marked the twentieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio* with his 1987 encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (*SRS*), and the influence of the 1967 encyclical letter is still decisively felt in the 2009 encyclical letter *Caritas in Veritate* – again a celebration of *Populorum Progressio* – in which Benedict XVI wrote that '*Populorum Progressio* deserves to be considered "the *Rerum Novarum* of the present age", shedding light upon humanity's journey towards unity' (Benedict XVI, *CiV*, no. 8).

#### **4. Integral human development understood within a relational ontology**

So far, we have presented a summary of Lebret's contribution, and of how it influenced Catholic Social Teaching. We have asserted that the 1967 encyclical *Populorum Progressio* received significant (or indeed crucial) influence from Lebret,

and that it constitutes an important turning point in Catholic Social Teaching, as Benedict XVI claimed when placing it as the foundational document of Catholic Social Teaching for the present age. But it is now necessary to explain in more detail the theoretical basis, and the implications, of those claims.

#### *4.1. Personalism and relational community*

Lebret's influence on Catholic Social Teaching reflected the fact that Lebret's relations with the Vatican strengthened after the arrival of Pope John XIII in 1958 and especially during the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). His long-time friendship with the cardinal Montini, later Pope Paul VI, and the solicitous and committed mediation of D. Hélder Câmara, Metropolitan Archbishop of Olinda-Recife, gave him the opportunity to participate in the Council in the role of "peritus" (expert), with other progressive Dominican theologians, including Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895-1990), Yves Congar (1904-1995), and Edward Schillebeeckx (1914-2009). Much of the Church's international transition to more socially oriented positions, which take the perspectives of developing countries into account, can be attributed to his interventions and the support of Latin American and African bishops.

When addressing Lebret's contribution within the Catholic Church and investigating why it was accepted wholeheartedly by many important actors, it is important to note connections between Lebret's approach and the notion of *relational community*, which is present in Catholic Social Teaching. In Catholic Theology, the relational Trinity of divine Persons is seen as a model for human communities, as expressed in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC, no. 1878; no. 1890), which also notes that human persons are relational beings in concrete communities (CCC, no. 1879).

The idea of a relational community is underpinned by a *relational ontology*, which was elaborated in detail by Augustine of Hippo in the early 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, in his treatise *On the Trinity* (*De Trinitate*—DT), where the divine Persons (Father, Son and the Holy Spirit) are defined in terms of their relation to one another, rather than in terms of having a common substance (in which case they would not be different Persons after all), or in terms of any accidental properties (DT, V.5.6). This definition of the divine Persons in relational terms places the category of *relation* at center stage in Catholic (and perhaps all Christian) theology. It lies behind the analogy between the Trinitarian union of divine Persons and the fraternity that human persons should establish in a community, as stated in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC, no. 1878; no. 1890).

This relational ontology was emphasized by Benedict XVI in *Caritas in Veritate*, an encyclical which pays tribute to *Populorum Progressio*, as noted above. Benedict XVI wrote: ‘The Trinity is absolute unity insofar as the three divine Persons are pure relationality’ (Benedict XVI, *CiV*, no. 54). And he adds: ‘Relationships between human beings throughout history cannot but be enriched by reference to this divine model’ (Benedict XVI, *CiV*, no. 54). Benedict XVI also notes: ‘The Christian revelation of the unity of the human race presupposes a *metaphysical interpretation of the “humanum” in which relationality is an essential element*’ (Benedict XVI, *CiV*, no. 55). This analogy, between the Trinitarian union of divine persons and the fraternity between human persons in a community, is clearly in line with Lebreton’s vision.

Relational ontologies raise the question, however, of how to define the human individual or person. In order to answer this question, a relational ontology can be fruitfully articulated with the idea of *personalism*, which had been developed in the



political philosophy of Jacques Maritain (1881-1973) and his integral humanism (Maritain 1936), and in the philosophy of action of Emmanuel Mounier (1905-1950). We find a personalist philosophy both in Mounier (1936, 1949) and Maritain (1936, 1947), and their ideas were very influential for Lebreton. Maritain too was close to Pope Paul VI, and influential for the encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, not least because his (1936) *integral* humanism is a central element of *integral* human development, within a humanism which is open to spirituality and a transcendental dimension (Deneulin 2018).

Maritain's (1947) distinction, following Thomas Aquinas, between a person (with a spiritual nature) and an individual (defined in terms of matter) is relevant for understanding how to define individuals and persons within a relational ontology. Human beings are constituted also by matter, and according to Aquinas, who is the definitive authority within Dominican circles, we are different human beings because we are constituted by different matter (*materia signata*). This solution for individuation stands in contrast to some Franciscan philosophy where, following John Duns Scotus, 'form' is the criterion of individuation rather than matter (Martins 2013, 246; Russell 1996, 431). However, Aquinas' solution has for long been the dominant one within Catholic theology and was also the one adopted by authors close to Lebreton and Paul VI like Maritain.

Further, a 'human being' is not only a 'human organism', but also a 'human person' (Lawson 2019, 246), and the spiritual nature of human beings springs from their personhood (Maritain 1947). The connection between the human organism and the human person can be expressed through the term 'embodied personality' (Bhaskar 2016, 162), which means that human beings are a totality of matter and spirit (as already noted by Augustine of Hippo) and possess an identity open to both material

and spiritual relations with others. This constitutes a rejection of the idea of a self-contained individual, which has been the starting point of mainstream economics since at least the marginalist revolution in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (Martins 2013), and in which human agency is characterized in terms of the individual's pursuit of his/her own subjective utility.

Lebret cut any connexions with 'marginalism', as an economic theory of the subjective choice of commodities, since it presumes and promotes an unconditional freedom of the subject that can lead to an economic perversion both with regard to the unrestrained demand for superfluous goods (consumerism) and in the search for money as a supreme good. Aristotle and Aquinas had already noted how the unconditional freedom of the subject when choosing commodities could slip into avarice and the accumulation of money, where the latter becomes an end and not a means.

To avoid this, the principle of the common good must prevail, as stated in *Populorum Progressio*, recentering Catholic Social Teaching around this key principle from Aristotle and Aquinas. It springs, like all the principles of Catholic Social Teaching, from human dignity, as stated in the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (CSDC, no. 160). Within Catholic Social Teaching, the common good is seen as the set of social conditions that allow groups and their members to achieve perfection in the most complete and adequate way (CCC, no. 1906). Lebret's ideal is aimed at achieving such a set of social conditions, so as to achieve integral human development.

#### *4.2. Comparing and connecting different conceptions of human development*

We saw that the idea of integral human development refers to: (i) 'development of the whole person' and (ii) 'development of every person'. The latter aspect means that

integral human development should concern every person, regardless of their religious convictions and other circumstances. Thus, integral human development should engage with other approaches to human development that share similar goals, even if developed outside the Catholic Church, for example within secular approaches to human development ('secular' in the sense of being separated from religious or theological terminology and connotations). Thus, Lebret extended the engagement of the Catholic Church with the United Nations, within a perspective where integral human development is aimed at the development of every human being.

Lebret directly and strongly influenced Denis Goulet, one of the fathers of developmental ethics (Gasper 2008; Keleher 2017). The literature that has explicitly called itself development ethics is an example of 'secular' work concerned with human development, and fruitful interaction can occur between it and Catholic Social Teaching, within what could be termed 'integral human development ethics' (Keleher 2017, 21). Goulet himself referred to the idea of *authentic development* expressed in *Populorum Progressio*, and went on to say: 'Authentic development aims at the full realization of human capabilities'. (Goulet 1971b, 206-207)

This emphasis on human capabilities anticipated subsequent secular approaches to human development, such as the capability approach to human development of Sen (1985) and Nussbaum (2000), as Des Gasper (2008) notes. Sen's capability approach has been adopted in a section of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the term *human development*, when applied to the field of international development, is currently mostly associated with this project. It is, thus, natural for an integral approach to human development, in the sense of engaging with every person and all the person, to engage with the wide-ranging capability project as well.

S  verine Deneulin (2018) provides an interesting analysis of how to link the capability approach to human development with Catholic Social Teaching. To do so, she provides a reading of ‘integral human development’ through the lens of Sen’s capability approach (Deneulin 2018). One could refer also to Martha Nussbaum’s (2000) development of the capabilities approach, not least given her emphasis on Aristotle, who is central for the Thomistic approach within Catholic Social Teaching. However, while engaging with the capability approach to human development is in line with the second meaning of integral human development (development of every person) as highlighted by Keleher (2017), and stated repeatedly by Lebret, it is important to see whether the capability approach can also help in addressing, or can accommodate in any way, the first meaning of the term integral human development (development of the whole person).

Thus, when Deneulin (2018) suggests augmenting Sen’s capability approach with integral human development, she notes that a central aspect to take into account is human freedom and the relationship with the Transcendent. While a relationship with the Transcendent, which is central to Lebret’s spirituality, will not be accepted by all those engaged in a ‘secular’ approach, the emphasis on human freedom seems a plausible common ground to start a dialogue.

It must be noted that Sen opens the door to spirituality to some extent (even if only indirectly), when arguing that a ‘capability is also a kind of power’ that brings an associated ‘duty or obligation of effective power’, for he traces this line of reasoning, related to the ‘responsibility of effective power’, to the teachings of Gautama Buddha (2009, 270). Sen notes that ‘if someone has the power to make a difference that he or she can see will reduce injustice in the world, then there is a strong and reasoned argument for doing just that’ and adds that this ‘is a line of reasoning that I traced to

Gautama Buddha's analysis of obligations that go with effectiveness of one's ability and power (the cited argument is presented by Buddha in *Sutta-Nipata*)' (2009, 271).

In fact, Sen interprets the human development approach of the UNDP in line with Buddha's thought. Thus he writes: 'I remember thinking immediately of Buddha in 1989 when my friend, the visionary thinker Mahbub ul Haq, wanted me to join him in initiating his great brain child, the Human Development Report, which became an annual publication of the United Nations from 1990 onward' (2014, 16). Sen further adds: 'The human development approach concentrates on such indicators as longevity, education, removal of abject poverty, and other concerns that have an uncanny closeness to the problems that had engaged the attention of young Buddha twenty-five hundred years earlier' (2014, 16).

The idea of a relational ontology is connected to various forms of experiencing spirituality, and certainly underpins the Buddhist idea that the whole universe is deeply interconnected. Sen's own interpretation is one where Gautama Buddha is seen as 'the agnostic champion of the "path of knowledge"' (Sen 2009, xiv), while also drawing on other traditions such as the 'Lokayata school (committed to relentless scrutiny of every traditional belief' (Sen 2009, xv). This means that, unlike Lebrat, Sen seems to adopt an agnostic attitude towards Transcendence (Sen 2005, 2009, 2014) – or at least one where any claims on the matter must be subject to relentless scrutiny – even when drawing on contributions that advance a (seemingly) non-theistic approach to spirituality.

It is also important to note that Sen's (2009, 271) 'argument on the responsibility of effective power' points towards a conception where the notion of obligation, stemming from the capability or power to effect a change, must be understood in terms of our responsibility towards other human beings, and also

towards non-human beings, as relational beings. As Sen notes when referring again to Gautama Buddha: ‘Since we are enormously more powerful than other species, we have some responsibility towards them that links with this asymmetry of power’ (2009, 251). The recent developments of the Catholic doctrine of *Integral Human Development* towards the idea of *Integral Ecology* by Pope Francis (2015) also highlight obligations towards both human and non-human beings.

Ballet, Bazin, Dubois and Mahieu note the need to take into account the notion of responsibility when developing Sen’s capability approach, but argue that Sen does not go far enough in this direction, for ‘rather than attempting to elucidate the link between commitment and freedom, he [Sen] settles for simply noting the existence of this type of behaviour, and does not see that by highlighting this fundamental fact he opens a breach in his own concept of freedom’ (2014, 56). They argue, drawing on Mounier’s (1936, 1949) personalist analysis of the ‘relationship between freedom and responsibility’ (Ballet, Bazin, Dubois and Mahieu 2014, 50), that the notion of freedom must be more clearly articulated with such notions such as commitment, responsibility, and obligation. Seeing capabilities as a power that brings responsibility and obligations towards others, as Sen emphasises in more recent writings (e.g., 2009), is an important step in this direction.

This raises the question of how to structure a community, with rights for and also obligations towards each member, and towards Nature, while allowing for human freedom, which is the central notion of Sen’s approach?. Deneulin (2018) notes the attention that Catholic Social Teaching pays to the role of social structures in constraining integral human development, including the notion of *structural sin* (Deneulin, Nebel and Sagovsky 2006). The question one may ask at this stage is whether and how far Sen’s capability approach, which is certainly concerned with

human freedom, can address, or be strengthened by combination with an approach that addresses the role of social structures in integral human development.

Various contributions to the capability approach have noted how social structures can be considered as conversion factors that shape capability sets (Robeyns 2005, 110), for example when addressing the role of grassroots communities in local development (Alkire 2002; Crocker 2007). However, since individual freedom lies at the core of the capability approach, entering into a community with its social structures and social relations must, from its viewpoint, be also an act of individual freedom, whenever possible.

Pelenc, Lompo, Ballet and Dubois advance a conception of freedom which ‘implies considering agents as subjects able to impute responsibility to themselves before acting, something that may lead them to curtail their own freedom voluntarily’ (2013, 85). As noted above, this idea is in line with Sen’s (1999, 2009) emphasis on ‘commitment’ (as a form of agency) and ‘responsibility of effective power’ (Sen 2009, 271), through which individuals deliberately constrain their freedom, accepting a social structure (or set of social relations) constituted through rights and obligations (Lawson 2019). Pelenc, Lompo, Ballet and Dubois (2013, 85) note that responsibility is exerted by a free agent, where freedom ‘is a power of initiative embedded in the world’, while also writing: ‘This conception of freedom as the power of initiative is equivalent to the interpretation of the CA [Capability Approach, in which capability is seen] as a causal power (Martins, 2006, 2007; Smith and Seward, 2009)’.

The notion of capabilities as causal powers highlights how freedom exists within social structures that shape human capabilities (Martins 2006, 2007, 2013, 2020; Oosterlaken 2011; Smith and Seward 2009). It is consistent with a conception where social structures are constituted through social positions connected through

rights and obligations (Lawson 2019) which govern social relations. This understanding employs a relational ontology, where human beings are constituted by their social relations (while retaining and/or thereby attaining their individuality and personhood).

Albeit Sen (2009, 270) refers to capability as a power, as noted above, the idea of seeing capabilities as a power remains unelaborated in Sen's writings, and his references to 'ontology' have not engaged in an explicit analysis of the idea of a relational ontology, while focusing instead on the metaphysics of 'what ethical objects exist' (2009, 41). A possible step towards a more integrated view of the notions of capability, power, responsibility, and obligation is the development of a relational ontology where capabilities are a power that arises through a given structure, including biological and social structures.

Some leading contributors to critical realism – on which see Archer (1995), Bhaskar (2016), Lawson (1997) or Porpora (1987) – have seen the idea of reconciling a relational ontology with the capability approach in a favourable light. Thus Roy Bhaskar, the originator of the philosophy of critical realism, suggested augmenting 'the capability approach of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum' (2016, 67) with a critical realist relational ontology. Tony Lawson also notes the similarities between his own relational (and realist) approach to human development and 'Amartya Sen's capability approach to ethics' (2015, 385), albeit noting that Sen's writings on ontology are insufficiently developed and perhaps even misunderstand the connections between ontology and ethics.

Approaching the capability approach through this angle could lead to interesting connections to the relational ontology presupposed in Catholic Social Teaching, its personalist philosophy, and notions such as *structural sin*. Bhaskar



wrote that ‘*critical realism*, at least as elaborated in and for the human sciences, *must also be or entail a personalism*’, while pointing out that ‘in our societies, and indeed in most of human history *the social has tended to dominate the personal*, a fortiori our capacities as agents to dominate our human being and powers’, through ‘the presence of *structural sin* or fossilised master-slave-type social relations’ (2016, 68, original emphasis). It is important to note, however, that while some leading proponents of critical realism have highlighted the relations between critical realism and Christian thought (Archer, Collier and Porpora 2004), most contributions to critical realism have been disconnected from Christian thinking and can be said to constitute a ‘secular’ approach to philosophy and to the idea of a relational ontology.

Whatever specific route is followed, it seems that interpreting the capability approach in terms of a relational ontology, a notion which is strongly present in Catholic Social Teaching, could be a fruitful route for addressing possible complementarities between integral human development and Sen’s capability approach. Studies on Lebret’s legacy, and the philosophical basis for the sort of approach he proposed, including the ontological and ethical issues that underpin this approach, can be an important step for elaborating those complementarities.

It is important to note, though, that there are significant differences between the approach of Lebret and the approach to human development advanced within the UNDP. The UNDP has focused more and more on developing indicators for measuring human well-being, with a relative neglect of the concrete productive and social systems that generate what is measured by those indicators (Martins 2020). Lebret, in contrast, was strongly concerned with the concrete social systems through which production takes place, within a relational community (Becker, Missehougbe and Verdin 2007). His contributions to the United Nations and to the debates within

the Catholic Church were driven by this concern. Lebreťs emphasis on a relational community through which human development can be advanced contains ideas that are still relevant (and often missing) within “secular” approaches to human development, but which remain influential within Integral Human Development.

## **5. Conclusion**

Fr. Louis J. Lebreť died on June 20, 1966, at the end of a life rich in experience. He was always open to new possibilities through his ability to accept any circumstance of life as well as asking ‘why’ when he saw misery and injustice. This question was always accompanied by his compassion for the victims of that misery and injustice. His life, always open to new possibilities, was an expansion of his deep Christian spirit but never turning only inwards, always exploring the realities and complexities of the world (Malley 1968).

Lebreť was situated in a movement of rupture with sacral Christianity, the conception in which religion and politics are one so that religion dictates appropriate political behaviour. He preferred the name ‘Economy and Humanism’ for his movement, founded to promote the combination between political economy, social science, and the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. It was within the frame of social Catholicism, but with the desire to introduce all the dimensions of political economy, sociology, and field surveys, and without (at least partisan and restrictive) political connections and limitations.

The political (in a non-partisan sense) influence of Lebreť appears in projects connected to the institutions he chose to advance his vision at global level: the Catholic Church and also the United Nations. There are interesting connections—manifest, hidden, and potential--between the lines of human development (‘integral’ and ‘secular’) that are advanced in these two institutions (Deneulin 2018; Keleher

2018), which can be illuminated with reference to Lebret's thinking. The transformation of social structures (Deneulin, Nebel and Sagovsky 2006), for example, is perhaps more clearly articulated in integral human development than in the UNDP approach to human development. But understanding their connections, established and potential, requires further studies of their philosophical bases – both at the ontological and ethical levels – and of their implications for several fields including economic theory, ethnographic studies, social theory, and development studies, amongst others. Lebret's voluminous works still provide a relevant starting point for such comparison and enrichment, but much important work remains to be done.

Copy Editor/Production people will place your Notes here (only 2 of these now).

You can add "Acknowledgements" here if you wish.

You should also add a 150-200 word bio here (for each of you) – called "Notes on contributors".

Put your ORCIDs here. If you don't have one, then perhaps get one.

Acknowledgements: for extremely valuable and helpful comments on earlier drafts, the authors are most thankful to the editors of this special issue, Des Gasper and Lori Keleher, and to the co-lead editor of the journal, Christine Koggel.

Nuno Ornelas Martins has a PhD in Economics by the University of Cambridge, and a licenciatura in Economics by the Universidade Católica Portuguesa (Porto), where he also obtained his habilitation in History of Economic Thought. He is currently Full Professor of History of Economic Thought at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa, where he teaches various courses, such as History of Economic Thought and Social Philosophy and Ethics. He also taught at the University of Cambridge and the

University of the Azores. He is a member of the Cambridge Social Ontology Group (CSOG) interdisciplinary research network, and of the editorial board of various academic journals. He published the book *The Cambridge Revival of Political Economy* in 2013 (London and New York, Routledge), and has also published numerous articles in academic journals on the topics of Political Economy, Social Ontology and Human Development.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7966-6435>

Vitor Teixeira is Professor at the Catholic University of Portugal, Porto – School of Arts and Visiting Professor at the University of S. José, Special Administrative Region of Macau (People's Republic of China). Degree in History (1991), Master in Medieval History (1996) and PhD in History in 2004, always at the University of Porto, Faculty of Arts. Professor at the Portuguese Catholic University (UCP) since 2000, at the Escola das Artes, as well as at other UCP units, in addition to other educational institutions. Integrated researcher at the Center for Research in Science and Technology of the Arts (CITAR) at UCP. Professor at the University of S. Joseph, Macau Special Administrative Region (RP China) between 2013 and 2015. His research domains relate to the History and heritage of Portuguese expansion in Asia and the study of intercultural relations between Europe and Southeast Asia, China and Japan). He is also dedicated to Art, Heritage and Urbanism influence in Portugal and the Portuguese-speaking world. The cultural influence of the Religious Orders is an essential emphasis of his studies.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8496-8964>

## References

- Alkire, S. 2002. *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Archer, M. S. 1995. *Realist Social Theory The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, M. S., Collier, A. and Porpora, D. (eds.). 2004. *Transcendence: Critical Realism and God*. London: Routledge.
- Augustine of Hippo 2007. *De Trinitate*, Prior Velho: Edições Paulinas.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 1993. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Ballet, J., Bazin, D., Dubois, J.-L., and Mahieu, F.-R. 2014. *Freedom, Responsibility and Economics of the Person*. London: Routledge.
- Becker, C., Missehougbe, P.-P. and Verdin, P. 2007. *Le père Lebre, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957 - 1963)*, Paris: Karthala.
- Benedict XVI. 2009. *Encyclical Letter Caritas in Veritate*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Bhaskar, R. 2016. *Enlightened Common Sense: The Philosophy of Critical Realism* (edited with a preface by Mervyn Hartwig). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bosi, A. 2012. "Economia e humanismo". *Estudos Avançados*, 26 (75): 249-266
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 1993. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Chenu, M.-D. 1964. *L'Évangile du Temps*. Paris: Cerf.

- Cosmao, V. 1970. "Louis-Joseph Lebre, O.P. 1897-1966: From social action to the struggle for development." *New Blackfriars* 51(587): 62-68.
- Crocker, D. 2007. "Deliberative Participation in Local Development." *Journal of Human Development* 8(3): 431-455.
- Deneulin, S. 2018. "Integral Human Development via Sen's Capability Approach and a Faith Community at the Latin American Urban Margins." *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 15(2): 275-315
- Deneulin, S., Nebel, M. and Sagovsky, N. (eds.). 2006. *Transforming Unjust Structures: The Capability Approach*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Feix, M. 2007, "Du juste prix dans la réflexion sur l'économie du père Lebre et dans l'encyclique *Populorum progressio*", *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* 1(243): 9-48.
- Francis. 2015. *Encyclical Letter Laudato Si*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Garreau, L. 1997. *Louis-Joseph Lebre, 1897-1966. Un homme traqué*. Villeurbanne: Éditions Golias.
- Gasper, D. 2008. "Denis Goulet and the Project of Development Ethics: Choices in Methodology, Focus and Organization", *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 9(3): 453 – 474.
- Godoy, J. H. A. 2016. "A práxis de Lebre: economia humana, desenvolvimentismo católico e a industrialização do nordeste". *Religião e Sociedade* 36(2): 188-219.
- Goulet D. 1971a. *The Cruel Choice*, New York: Atheneum.
- Goulet, D. 1971b. "An Ethical Model for the Study of Human Values", *Harvard Educational Review* 41(2): 205-227.

- Goulet, D. 2000. "Changing Development Debates under Globalization", Working Paper #276, The Helen Kellogg Institute For International Studies.
- Horn, G.-R. and Gerrd, E.. 2001. *Left Catholicism 1943-1955: Catholics and Society in Western Europe at the Point of Liberation*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Houée, P. 1997. *Louis Joseph Lebret. Un éveilleur d'humanité*, Paris: Éditions de l'Atelier.
- John XXIII 1961. *Encyclical letters Mater et Magistra*, Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- John XXIII 1963. *Pacem in Terris*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- John Paul II 1987. *Encyclical Letter Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Keleher, L. 2017. "Towards an Integral Human Development Ethics". *Veritas* 37 (August): 19-34.
- Keleher, L. 2018 "Integral human development", in Jay Drydyk and Lori Keleher (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Development Ethics*, 29-34. London: Routledge.
- Lavigne, Jean-Claude. 1996. *Les écrits spirituel du Père Lebret*, Paris, Cerf et Éditions de l'Atelier.
- Lawson, T. 1997. *Economics and Reality*. London: Routledge.
- Lawson, T. 2015. Critical ethical naturalism: an orientation to ethics, in Pratten, S. (ed.), *Social Ontology and Modern Economics*, 359–387. London: Routledge.
- Lawson, T. 2019. *The Nature of Social Reality: Issues in Social Ontology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1942. *Manifeste d'Économie et Humanisme*. Paris: Édition Économie et Humanisme (numéro spécial, Fev.-Mars).
- Lebret, L.-J. 1945. *Principes pour l'Action*. Paris: Édition Économie et Humanisme.

- Lebret, L.-J. 1946a. *Guide du Militant*. Paris: Édition Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1946b. *Le Mouvement Ouvrier*. Paris: Édition Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1947a. *Principes et perspectives d'une économie humaine*. Paris: Édition Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1947b. *Découverte du bien commun: mystique d'un monde nouveau*. Paris: Edition Economie et Humanisme.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1949. *Action, marche vers Dieu*, Vol. 4 of *Spiritualité*, Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1951. *Montée humaine*, Vol. 5 of *Spiritualité*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1958a. *Dimensions de la charité*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1958b. *Suicide ou survie de l'Occident?* Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1959a. *Dimensions de la Charité*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1959b. *Manifeste pour une civilisation solidaire*. Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières,
- Lebret, L.-J. 1960. "Editorial," *Développement et civilisations*, 1 (March 1960): 3.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1961. *Dynamique concrète du développement*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme, Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1967. *Action marche vers Dieu*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme, Les éditions ouvrires.
- Lebret, L.-J. 1967. *Développement—Révolution solidaire*, Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.



- L.-J. Lebreton, and Célestin, G. 1950. “D’“Économie et Humanisme” à l’économie humaine.” *Revue économique*, 1(5): 571-572.
- Lebreton, L.-J. and Suavet, T. 1962. *Dans le Combat du Monde*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme - Les Éditions Ouvrières.
- Leo XIII. 1891. *Encyclical Letter Rerum Novarum*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Malley, F. 1968. *Le Père Lebreton: L’économie au service des hommes*, Paris: Cerf. [In this article, when referring to page numbers, we use the Portuguese edition of the work of François Malley: *Lebreton: A economia ao serviço dos homens*. Lisboa: Gráfica Lisboa.]
- Malley, F. 1997. “Ethics and Economics in Father L. J. Lebreton” in Gaburro, Giuseppe (ed.) *Ethics and Economics: Catholic Thinkers in the 20th Century*, 53-70. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Maritain, J. 1936. *L’humanisme intégral*, Paris: Aubier ([Eng. tr. *True Humanism*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1938)]).
- Maritain, J. 1947. *The Person and the Common Good*, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons (translated by John J. Fitzgerald).
- Martins, N. O. 2006. “Capabilities as causal powers”, *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 30(5): 671–685.
- Martins, N. O. 2007. “Ethics, Ontology and Capabilities”, *Review of Political Economy* 19(1): 37-53.
- Martins, N. O. 2013. *The Cambridge Revival of Political Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Martins, N. O. 2020, “Human Development: Which Way Now?”, *New Political Economy* 25(3): 404-418.

- Mounier, E. 1936. “Manifeste au service du personnalisme. *Esprit*, 49: 129-164.
- Mounier, E. 1949. *Le Personnalisme*. Paris: Alcan.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oosterlaken, I. 2011. “Inserting Technology in the Relational Ontology of Sen’s Capability Approach”, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 12(3), 425-432.
- Paul VI. 1967. *Encyclical Letter Populorum Progressio*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pelenc, J., Lompo, M. K., Ballet, J, and Dubois, J.-L. 2013. Sustainable Human Development and the Capability Approach: Integrating Environment, Responsibility and Collective Agency. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 14(1): 77-94.
- Pelletier, D. 1996. *Économie et humanisme: de l’utopie communautaire au combat pour le tiers-monde, 1941-1966*, Paris: Cerf.
- Pius XII. 1931. *Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pontifical Council Justice and Peace. 2004. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Porpora, D. 1987. *The Concept of Social Structure*, Santa Barbara CA: Greenwood Press.
- Robeyns, I. 2005. “The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey”, *Journal of Human Development* 6(1): 93-114
- Russell, B. 1996 [1946]. *History of Western Philosophy*. London: Routledge.

- Sen, A. K. 1985. *Commodities and capabilities*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. K. 1999. *Development as Freedom*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. K. 2005. *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity*, London: Allen Lane.
- Sen, A. K. 2009. *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. K. 2014. “The contemporary relevance of Buddha.” *Ethics and International Affairs* 28(1): 15-27.
- Smith, M., and Seward, C. 2009. “The relational ontology of Amartya Sen’s capability approach: incorporating social and individual causes”, *Journal of human development and capabilities* 10(2): 213–235.

---

<sup>1</sup> This need not include missionary activity, at least not in the context of Lebreton’s contribution.

<sup>2</sup> Lebreton’s use of Marx’s theories was selective. Although there are clear references to Marx’s studies, he did not accept or adopt the idea of alienation, highlighted by the German author.