# Human Development and the Catholic Social Tradition

Towards an Integral Ecology

**Séverine Deneulin**

First published 2021

ISBN: 978-0-367-63961-7 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-63963-1 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-12153-4 (ebk)

# 1 The concept of development



DOI: 10.4324/9781003121534-2

The OA chapter is funded by: Laudato Si' Research Institute

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

# 1 The concept of development

## Sen's capability approach to development

When Amartya Sen introduced the term 'capability' to the academic literature in his *Tanner Lectures in Human Values* delivered at the University of Stanford in 1979 (Sen 1980), he did not realize the extent to which it would take on a life of its own years later.[1] Today, hundreds of students throughout the world are conducting master's and doctoral dissertations using what is now known as the capability approach in fields as varied as education, philosophy, sociology, politics, economics, geography, law, engineering, and theology.[2] The *Human Development Reports*, published annually since 1990 by the UNDP, have served as a main vehicle to bring the ideas of the capability approach into wider academic and policy circles, as has Sen's book *Development as Freedom*, published in 1999 and based on a series of lectures he delivered at the World Bank (Sen 1999).

The literature on the capability approach is now vast. Dozens of books and hundreds of articles have been written, including those which are now considered to be classic works. These include *Commodities and Capabilities* (Sen 1985a), *Inequality Re-Examined* (Sen 1992), the edited collection *The Quality of Life* (Sen and Nussbaum 1993), *Women and Human Development* (Nussbaum 2000), *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Project* (Nussbaum 2011), *Valuing Freedoms* (Alkire 2002), *The Capability Approach: Concepts, Measures and Applications* (Comim, Alkire and Qizilbash 2008), and the recent *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach* (Chiappero-Martinetti, Osmani and Qizilbash 2020). These books provide a state-of-the-art overview of key topics and policy areas analysed through the lens of the capability approach. The open-access book *Wellbeing, Freedom and Social Justice: The Capability Approach Re-Examined* (Robeyns 2017) is one of the most comprehensive accounts of what the capability approach is, what it is not, and what it has been used for.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003121534-2

Given the existing literature, it would be somewhat redundant to provide an overview of what the capability approach is and the distinctive vision it offers for thinking about development. Sen's classic article 'The concept of development' (Sen 1988) offers an excellent introduction in that regard. Yet there has been little discussion so far of Sen's capability approach and its contributions for thinking about the concept of development from within the context of dialogue with religious traditions.[3] This section highlights some key features of the approach that make it a well-suited conversation partner for dialoguing with religious traditions on development concerns: its assessment of development in the kinds of lives that people live, its open-endedness as an evaluative framework, and its attention to the marginalized.

### *The kinds of lives that people live*

Robeyns (2017: 24) summarizes the capability approach as a 'conceptual framework for a range of evaluative exercises'. What Sen has argued for is to broaden the informational basis on which situations are assessed. Information about 'utility', often reduced to information about income and consumption, had long been the dominant criterion in economics to evaluate situations and rank them according to which one is better or worse. Reducing the informational basis to income would, for example, lead to the assessment that an indigenous family that lives in an informal settlement of the Amazonian city of Manaus and makes an income of 100 US dollars per month is better off than a family that lives in the rainforest and has no monetary income. Such evaluation does not take into account whether the latter may have access to clean water from a river or to food through the forest, and the former no access to clean water or a healthy diet.

Sen has also strongly criticized the so-called criterion of 'Pareto optimality', which is central to utilitarian economics, and according to which a situation is optimal if it is no longer possible to increase the utility of some without decreasing the utility of others. As he notes, using only information about utility could lead to the conclusion that an economy is doing well

> when some people are rolling in luxury and others are near starvation as long as the starvers cannot be made better off without cutting into the pleasures of the rich. . . . [A] society or an economy can be Pareto optimal and still be perfectly disgusting.
>
> (Sen 2017: 68–9).

Introducing information about the kinds of lives that people live would yield different conclusions about how well an economy or society is doing. This has been one of Sen's main contributions in thinking about what counts

as development, or what constitutes good change. It is because of this concern for the kinds of lives that people live that he introduces the concept of capabilities.

Considerations about incomes may be important, but they should not be the only sources of information to use when assessing the kinds of lives that people live. Sen argues for judging how well societies are doing 'in terms of what people are able to be or able to do, rather than in terms of the means or resources they possess' (Sen 2017: 357). What people are able to be and do are what he calls 'capabilities'. This concept is closely linked to that of 'functionings', which are simply people's 'beings' and 'doings', such as being in good health, participating in the life of the community, being well nourished, making decisions about one's life, travelling, pursuing education, meeting other people, and so on. A capability is 'the set of combination of functionings from which the person can choose any one combination' or 'the actual freedom of choice a person has over the alternative lives that he or she can lead' (Sen 2017: 357).

Readers familiar with Sen's works would have heard oftentimes the example of the fasting monk and starving child, to illustrate how the concepts of functioning and capability are connected. Both show the same functioning deficit in that both experience being malnourished but one has the capability to be well nourished and the other does not, that is, the fasting monk has a choice of an alternative life he could lead but the starving child does not. For the capability approach to development, both types of information – functionings and capabilities – are equally important for evaluating how people's lives are doing but often, given practical considerations, data availability and relevance, it is information about the kinds of lives that people live – whether they are adequately sheltered, adequately nourished, are in good health, and so on – rather than their actual freedom over alternative lives that will be the primary concern (Sen 1992).[4] It would make little sense to assess how well the lives of residents of an informal settlement are doing by looking at whether their living in a neighbourhood with high level of violence and inadequate services and infrastructure (such as unsafe gas connections, broken sewage, and no waste collection) is a choice or not. There may be a difference between a family that has chosen to live in such a neighbourhood because of the close-knit social networks and one which has not because it cannot afford to live in a safer neighbourhood. For the purpose of assessing how people in the neighbourhood live, information about people's functionings is more relevant than information about their capability set, in the sense of their actual freedom of choice over the alternative lives they can lead, to paraphrase Sen. Such choice has also been referred to by Sen as a person's agency, which he defines as 'the pursuit of whatever goals or values he or she regards

as important' (Sen 1985b: 203). In the example here, the family that has chosen to live in an informal settlement despite being able to afford to live in a better neighbourhood is considered to have exercised agency – that is, pursuing something they regard as important, such as living in a close-knit community despite the poor conditions of public services in the neighbourhood.

It would however be a misinterpretation to conclude that Sen's capability approach conceives of development as being about human freedom, as suggested by his book title *Development as Freedom* (Sen 1999). He once commented that 'development as freedom' was just the title of one book – which his publisher chose – and not a summary of his arguments about the concept of development.[5] His concern for human freedom has to be put in its context, which is broadening the informational basis for evaluating states of affairs beyond information about utility (Sen 1970). It would also be misinterpretation to conclude that Sen's capability approach is about choices, which is how the *Human Development Reports* translated the term 'capabilities' until recently.[6] What can appear as a choice may not be as much the result of the exercise of human freedom as the result of indirect coercion. For example, for workers to work for less than the minimum wage may appear to be a 'choice', but the workers may have no other alternative than work in these conditions. As Sen (2017: 177) puts it, '[w]orkers may agree to accept sub-human wages and poor terms of employment, since in the absence of a contract they may starve, but this does not make that solution a desirable outcome in any sense'. Outcomes, that is, the actual lives that people live, matter too. A person could choose to work for below the minimum wage out of solidarity with those who cannot find better paid employment,[7] but this does not make these employment conditions desirable even if she has chosen them when alternatives were available.

One can already see, in this feature of Sen's capability approach to development, why it has a special resonance for religious traditions. It puts a similar emphasis on the centrality of the human person, of her inalienable dignity and her flourishing, as the ultimate end of socio-economic processes (PCJP 2005: 108–14). The inclusion of agency gives space to account for the pursuit of the objectives one values, especially in relation to changing situations which undermine human dignity or destroy nature, even at the cost of one's own well-being, and sometimes one's own life, such as for those who have chosen to continue denouncing illegal deforestation in the Amazon in the face of death threats rather than remain silent.[8] Here, as will be discussed later, the Catholic social tradition would refer to solidarity, commitment to the common good, or 'the way of love' (PCJP 2005: 205–8).

***An open-ended framework for evaluation***

Sen has strongly objected to his contributions to questions of development being reduced to the capability approach. When he first proposed the idea of capabilities in his *Tanner Lectures* in 1979 (Sen 1980), it was in response to the limits of utility, income, and resources to provide an answer to the question of how one's life is going. Something else was needed, and he called it 'capabilities'. Never did he imagine then that the concept would 'escalate' the way it has today. It was about 'opening up a line of thinking'. His intention was not to create a school of thought, or a scholarly community, around the capability approach.[9] To the question whether he was a 'capability theorist', he vehemently replied in the negative:

> Capability is not a formula, 'it's pointing towards a certain space'. . . . I'm saying this – the capability space – is a relevant space in a way that the utility space is not, the commodity space is not. That's it.
>
> (Sen quoted in Baujard and Gilardone 2017: 7)

Sen (2017: 358) has also cautioned against using information about capabilities or functionings as the sole criterion for assessing development. The informational basis can be extended to how ecosystems are doing and how well they are functioning, for example, whether the spotted owl is at risk of extinction and how well it is doing (Sen 2004), and to considerations about processes beyond outcomes, for example, whether nobody has been intimidated or coerced into doing or being something.

In some ways, one could infer from Sen's own statements that talking of Sen's capability approach to development is a misinterpretation of his original intentions, as he never intended to propose 'a capability approach' in order to think about questions of development, progress, and social change. His intention was to open up a line of thinking that displaces the primacy of income growth when thinking about these questions and to point out that considerations about what people are able to do and be matter and should not be lost amidst considerations about growth of economic output. Sen's argument may be a statement of the obvious for many, but there is no dearth of examples of situations where human lives continue to be lost amidst considerations of growth of economic output. In Latin America, the agribusiness and mining sectors, which have strongly been supported by government policies through tax incentives, have often left those who live in the regions of their business operations with worsened quality of life, especially in the area of health, and in some cases have led to deaths caused by pesticide poisoning or mine wastewater contamination. Soya production, which has brought higher levels of economic output in Paraguay, has been particularly damaging for

people's health (Correia 2019; Ezquerro-Cañete 2016),[10] as has mining in Peru, Argentina, and elsewhere (Svampa 2019; Valencia 2016); it is estimated that about 50 per cent of the population and 64 per cent children of the Peruvian Amazon show higher levels of mercury in their blood' beyond the maximum health level, and 64 per cent of children do (UNDP 2020: 68).

While putting people and their flourishing at the centre of socio-economic processes, Sen's capability approach remains open-ended regarding what human flourishing might entail. He has left the matter of what a good, or flourishing, human life is open to debate. He uses, instead, open-ended expressions such as 'freedoms that people have reason to value' (Sen 1992: 81) and has famously abstained from specifying which valuable capabilities, or functionings, should constitute the benchmark against which development or progress is to be assessed, as the selection depends on what is being evaluated and for what purposev (Robeyns 2017). An example could be the challenge in comparing a situation where people in an informal settlement have a brick house with piped water, a separate kitchen, and a bathroom with a situation where a house is built with less durable material and poor sanitary conditions but has the potential to be extended to accommodate future family needs. The conclusion will depend on the context and aim of the evaluation exercise. If the aim is to evaluate a government housing programme in an informal settlement, then the relevant functioning to consider may need to be different from simply living in a house with piped water. Frediani (2015) tells the story of a housing programme in Brazil which assumed that what people valued was living in a solid house with a kitchen and a bathroom. However, the programme failed because it did not take into account a functioning the residents valued – that of living in a house they could extend. The prefabricated houses provided by the government started to crack when people began to build extensions for their expanding families, and the residents soon abandoned their new houses to go back to the shacks they could extend. In contrast, if the aim of the evaluation is to assess poverty at the global level, the functioning of 'living in a house with access to piped water and a solid floor' is more relevant than that of living in a house one can extend.[11]

Within the literature on the capability approach, there have been many discussions about the specification of valuable functionings/capabilities and a division between what is perceived as Sen's version, which is open-ended, and Martha Nussbaum's version, which specifies a list of central human capabilities (Nussbaum 2000, 2011).[12] According to Robeyns (2017), this division reflects different aims and uses of the approach and is not about two different versions. Nussbaum's aim is to develop a theory of justice, similar to that of John Rawls, with the difference that his list of primary goods is replaced with a list of central human capabilities to inform redistributive

principles. Sen's aim is not to offer a theory of justice, but an evaluative framework to compare states of affairs as a basis for thinking about questions of development and redistribution.

This open-endedness of Sen's capability approach to development creates a space for spiritual considerations to be included. For example, the functioning of being in relation to a higher source of value, or being in relation to one's ancestors, land, and animals, could be included in the evaluation of how well a country is doing. For example, Bhutan has included spirituality within the dimension of psychological well-being in its Gross National Happiness Index.[13] Different societies will hold different value judgements about which information should be included or excluded in the evaluation of how well their societies are doing given their contexts, but this raises questions about who decides what is important and how such value judgements are made.

The centrality of value judgments within Sen's capability approach to development goes together with a dynamic perspective on values. Different values do not only co-exist alongside each other but also interact and change as a result of interaction. There is also a strong connection between values and policy changes. Policies change when what people regard as important changes. Discussing the threats of climate change and environmental degradation, Sen highlights the role of value formation in changing policies:

> The [environmental] threats that we face call for organized international action as well as changes in national policies. . . . But they are also dependent on value formation, related to public discussions, both for their influence on individual behaviour and for bringing about policy changes – through political processes.
>
> (Sen 2017: 40)

In that regard, religious traditions have contributions to make to wider public debates on values. How a religious tradition values, for example, an animal species, not as something to serve human needs, but as something that has value in itself, could contribute to public debates on the protection of biodiversity.[14] On the question as to why an endangered animal species should be protected, such as the spotted owl, Sen (2004) alludes to the reason the Buddhist tradition gives, namely that 'since we are enormously more powerful than other species, we have some responsibility towards them that is linked with this asymmetry' (Sen 2004: 11). However, for Sen, these values are to be critically examined, scrutinized, and vigorously debated with others (Sen 2017: 39, 281), especially in the light of what is happening to the lives of the most vulnerable.

### *Attention to human suffering and to the marginalized*

Sen's capability approach proposes a concept of development that bridges the global South/global North or developing/developed country divide. It offers a framework for evaluative exercises in many different contexts – for example, from assessing how an East London borough is doing, and whether its residents live better lives in 2020 than they did in 2010, to assessing how an entire country is doing. The approach has fed into policy evaluation frameworks such as the OECD's *How's Life?* (OECD 2013) and the New Zealand government's *Living Standards Framework* (Hall 2019), in addition to offering alternatives to gross domestic product measures such as the Human Development Index and its related family of indices.[15]

In the midst of the multiple uses to which the capability approach has been put, such as to think differently about education (McGrath 2018; Walker and Unterhalter 2007), disability (Mitra 2016; Terzi 2020), gender equality (Agarwal, Humphries and Robeyns 2008), and health (Venkatapuram 2011), attention to human suffering, to those who are marginalized and disadvantaged, has been a running theme throughout Sen's works and in applications of his capability approach. It is probably not a biographical underestimation to say that the Bengal famine of 1943 that Sen lived through as a ten-year old boy had a long-lasting imprint on his intellectual work, such as his childhood experience of finding a stabbed Muslim man at the door or of sharing some rice in the school grounds with children from families who were affected by the famine (Sen 2015; Hamilton 2019). It is around that time that Sen read the story of the life of Buddha which also inspired him and influenced his later works (Sen 2014). Among these influences, he highlights human suffering as a starting point for reflection and action, non-parochialism (the sufferings of the distant others do not matter less than those in immediate surroundings), and dialogue and reasoning as key for taking actions to remove suffering.

A consequence of situating the objective of development in enabling people to live good lives – or to put it in Sen's terms, to live lives that they have reason to value – is the policy concern of identifying and responding to shortfalls in the ability to live such lives. Sen's concept of development may be summarized as 'development as capability expansion' (Sen 2003), but it is reducing 'capability deprivation' – that is, 'a lack of opportunity to lead a minimally acceptable life' (Sen 2017: 26) – which is its main policy concern. Characteristically, Sen leaves the issue of what counts as a 'minimally acceptable life' open-ended, stating that it involves 'elementary functionings', such as 'being alive, being well-nourished, and in good health, moving about freely', and 'more complex functionings', such as 'having

self-respect and respect for others, and taking part in the life of the community' (Sen 2017: 357).[16]

Many initiatives are currently being undertaken worldwide to identify and measure deficits in leading such a 'minimally acceptable life'. At the global level, a Multidimensional Poverty Index considers shortfalls in the dimensions of health, education, and standard of living.[17] The difference between measuring poverty in terms of income (those living on less than $1.90 per day) and capability deprivation can in some countries be significant.[18] At the national level, multidimensional poverty measures have been developed to reflect national contexts, such as the inclusion of freedom of movement as an indicator of capability deprivation in Palestine[19] or crime incidence and physical safety in El Salvador.[20] There is also research on developing multidimensional poverty measures in urban settings using indicators of capability deprivation in housing, health, education, employment, and safety (Mitchell and Maccio 2018).

The idea of capability was introduced in the context of the question 'Equality of what?' If one is concerned about equality, about every person being granted equal dignity by virtue of her birth, in which space should equality be measured? Sen's answer to that question was that the space of functionings/capabilities is more appropriate than that of income. The moral problem is not so much that one person in one country may earn 100 dollars a month and another 10,000 but that the person who earns only 100 dollars may not have the same opportunity to live in decent accommodation; be adequately nourished; afford decent healthcare; and have quality education, time to relax, and play; receive attention in courts; or enjoy other valuable functionings. The development of a multidimensional inequality index, which would complement income inequality indices, is still work in progress (Anand et al. 2020; Seth and Santos 2020; Vizard and Speed 2016). It is within the concern for human suffering and the marginalized and disadvantaged – in other words, concern for those who are unable to live a 'minimal acceptable life' – that income inequality, and having too much income, is a moral problem that needs to be addressed. In examining what might be wrong with extreme wealth within the normative evaluative framework of the capability approach, Robeyns (2019) argues that extreme wealth is not morally justifiable because it undermines the democratic process, with the wealthiest people influencing policies for their own advantage,[21] and because high-consumption lifestyles linked to extreme wealth further accelerate climate change and in consequence further damage the lives of the most vulnerable.[22] She also makes the argument that climate justice requires a shift of resources towards low-carbon technologies and that there is therefore a moral justification for reorienting excess wealth to that end.

Putting the concern for the marginalized, and the human person and her flourishing, as the objective of development has been Amartya Sen's main contribution to discussions on the concept and meaning of development. Development is about 'human development'; it is about humans living in dignity and enjoying a 'minimally acceptable life'. There have been many critiques of Sen's work, and this present chapter may appear to the reader to be one among such 'hagiographic renditions of his work' (Fischer 2018: 131). There are critiques that the idea of capability is a confusing and 'beguiling concept' (Dean 2009), that it focuses excessively on freedom with its end never questioned and its assumption that freedoms never conflict (Corbridge 2002) – such as the freedom to be healthy and the freedom to travel to work or socialize with others in Covid times, that there is far too much optimism in the reach of what human reason can achieve and an underappreciation of power dynamics (Hamilton 2019), that it does not help us to understand structural transformation and how social change happens (Fischer 2018), that it does not question the neoliberal economic order (Bagchi 2000), and that it is too human-centred (and individual-centred) and may not be able to incorporate views that see humans as part of a wider web of life as is found in indigenous cosmologies (Van Jaarsveld 2020; Watene 2016).

Some concerns raised by these critiques will be discussed in later chapters (such as the reach of human reason and its anthropocentrism), but one has to bear in mind that Sen's aim was never to propose a theory of development which would help understand how change happens, how to make it happen, or to propose a comprehensive system for evaluating how well people's lives or societies are doing. What he has proposed is simply an evaluative framework that puts people's lives at the centre, opens up conversations about the ends and means of development, and does so with special attention to the lives of the marginalized. The question remains, therefore, as to what Sen's capability approach to development, as an evaluative framework to assess how people's lives are doing, can offer to the lives of the marginalized. What can it offer to, for example, the Yanomami people in northern Brazil who are being displaced from their land by thousands of illegal gold miners encroaching onto their territory, or to those who live near soya fields in Paraguay affected by pesticides, or to the hundreds of thousands of street vendors in Latin America who have lost their livelihoods due to Covid-19 lockdown restrictions? One could answer that it offers a framework to evaluate the consequences of illegal gold mining for the lives of the Yanomami and the loss of what they value being and doing, or the consequences of soya agribusinesses for the lives of peasant communities, or the consequences of Covid-19 for street vendors' lives. But it does not go beyond evaluation. The next section explores how a religious

tradition brings to bear some perspectives that go further than Sen's capability approach to development in that respect.

## Integral human development

Soon after the emergence of the development era in the early 1960s, the Catholic Church issued a reflection on the concept of development and the meaning of progress in a document published by Paul VI in 1967, entitled *Populorum Progressio*, or the *Progress of Peoples*. It was based on the experience of development in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The document was drafted by Dominican priest, theologian, and economist Louis-Joseph Lebret. He had travelled extensively in the newly independent countries to study their economies and had founded in Paris a research centre on economy and humanism which was dedicated to socio-economic analysis from a humanist perspective.[23] *Populorum Progressio* coined, what has become to this day, a term, namely 'integral human development', by which the Catholic social tradition refers to its vision of development. The term has been used ever since, with its meaning evolving with the social context and as new challenges arose. In 2017, Pope Francis created the Dicastery for Promoting Integral Human Development – a dicastery is to Catholic Church governance what a government ministry is to state governance – to replace the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, which had been created in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. One could compare the creation of this new Dicastery with the creation of the Human Development Report Office by the UNDP in 1990, an office dedicated to analysing situations globally from the perspective of Sen's capability approach to development and to promoting the approach in policy and practice. The Dicastery for Promoting Integral Human Development has been set

> to promote the integral development of the human person in the light of the Gospel,[24] 'to propose a humanism that is up to the standards of God's plan of love in history, an integral and solidary humanism capable of creating a new social, economic and political order, founded on the dignity and freedom of every human person, to be brought about in peace, justice and solidarity'.[25]

The Catholic social tradition thus does not solely advocate a human development approach like the UNDP but an *integral* one. But what is meant by 'integral'?

*Populorum Progressio* defines integral human development as follows: 'The development We [*sic*] 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 [wo]man and of the whole [wo]man' (PP 14).[26] The original version of the encyclical was written in French, and it reads: 'Le développement ne se réduit pas à la simple croissance économique. Pour être authentique, il doit être intégral, c'est-à-dire promouvoir tout homme et tout l'homme', which would be better translated as 'development cannot be reduced merely to economic growth. To be authentic, it must be integral, that is, promote the development of the person and the whole person.' When John Paul II quotes this definition in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, the word 'integral' was translated as 'complete' (SRS 9).

The word 'integral' is a reference to French philosopher Jacques Maritain's writings on 'Humanisme Intégral', a humanism open to the transcendental dimension, and for which the realm of human affairs and the spiritual realm are autonomous without being separated, each influencing the other (Catta 2015). The wording also derives from the writings of Henri de Lubac on the relation between the 'natural' and the 'supernatural'. He argued that 'a natural desire for the supernatural was built into the very concept of the human' and that humans found their fulfilment in what transcends nature, in communion with God.[27] The French version of *Populorum Progressio* reads:

> C'est un humanisme plénier qu'il faut promouvoir. Qu'est-ce à dire, sinon le développement intégral de tout l'homme et de tous les hommes? . . . Il n'est donc d'humanisme vrai qu'ouvert à l'Absolu, dans la reconnaissance d'une vocation, qui donne l'idée vraie de la vie humaine. Loin d'être la norme dernière des valeurs, l'homme ne se réalise lui-même qu'en se dépassant.
>
> (PP 42)

This can be translated as:

> It is a full humanism that needs to be promoted, that is, the integral development of the whole person and all the people. . . . A true humanism is one that is open to the Absolute, in the recognition of a vocation, which gives to human life its true meaning. Far from being the ultimate standard of values, human persons realise themselves only by going beyond themselves.

Today, 'integral' has acquired the meaning of integration or wholeness. In an address to the participants of a conference celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, Pope Francis asked:

> What is meant, today and in the near future, by 'integral development', that is, the development of each man and of the whole man?

> In the footsteps of Paul VI, perhaps in the very word *integrate* – so dear to me – we can identify a fundamental direction for the new Dicastery.[28]

In his talk, Pope Francis highlighted the integration of peoples, which implied a 'duty of solidarity which obliges us to seek just ways of sharing, so there may not exist that tragic inequality between those who have too much and those who have nothing', the integration of different dimensions of social and economic life, the integration of the individual and the community, and the integration of 'body and soul' as 'no work of development can truly reach its goal if it does not respect that place in which God is present with us and speaks to our heart'.[29]

This section concentrates on three aspects of this view of integration: the integration of all the dimensions of human life, including the spiritual; the integration of the earth among those suffering and marginalized; and the integration of oneself as the subject of development. The discussion will draw mainly on some central documents of the Catholic social tradition, namely papal encyclicals, and on the lived experiences of marginalized communities that form the ground of the theological reflection contained in these documents.[30] In each aspect, it discusses how such an integral perspective could add to Sen's.

### *The kinds of lives that people live: integrating the spiritual*

Within Sen's capability approach, the central concern of development is the kinds of lives that people live and the opportunities they have to function well as human beings. But it chooses to leave the question of what counts as functioning well as a human being, or what it is to live a 'minimal acceptable life', undetermined, beyond specifying some basic functionings like being healthy, being well nourished, or, indeed, being alive. Religious traditions have been more prescriptive in that regard. For the Catholic social tradition, being open to something beyond oneself is a key dimension of functioning well as a human being. For *Populorum Progressio*, this transcendental or spiritual[31] dimension of human life was about being open to 'values of love and friendship, of prayer and contemplation,' for 'this is what will guarantee man's authentic development – his transition from less than human conditions to truly human ones' (PP 20). Lives that lack access to safe water or adequate food reflect dehumanizing conditions, but lives that lack a capacity for love and friendship and are closed to others and self-centred are no less dehumanizing.

Pope Benedict XVI emphasizes and develops this argument further in *Caritas in Veritate* in 2009. It opens with the statement:

> Charity in truth . . . is the principal driving force behind the authentic development of every person and of all humanity. Love – caritas – is an extraordinary force which leads people to opt for courageous and generous engagement in the field of justice and peace. It is a force that has its origin in God, Eternal Love and Absolute Truth.
>
> (CV 1)

It affirms that '"Caritas in veritate" is the principle around which the Church's social doctrine turns' (CV 6), and it highlights that the promotion of justice and the common good are forms that express this 'charity in truth', or love, which are of 'of special relevance to the commitment to development in an increasingly globalized society' (CV 6). In other words, a human development that is integral is one which is motivated by and orientated to that 'love in truth', 'to which Jesus Christ bore witness by his earthly life and especially by his death and resurrection' (CV 1). The striving to improve human conditions is incomplete without that orientation to 'love received and given' (CV 5). Pope Benedict XVI continues to argue in *Caritas in Veritate* that 'Development, social well-being, the search for a satisfactory solution to the grave socio-economic problems besetting humanity, all need this truth' (CV 6). For the Catholic social tradition, development cannot be complete when limited only to the material dimension, in the sense of better health conditions, better nutrition, better quality housing, more decent employment, and so forth. It becomes complete, or integral, when it also integrates the interior dimension and the growth in our capacity to give and receive love. As John Paul II had affirmed in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 'Development which is not only economic must be measured and oriented according to the reality and vocation of man seen in his totality, namely, according to his interior dimension' (SRS 29). This is why, like Paul VI in *Populorum Progressio*, both John Paul II and Benedict XVI talk of integral human development as a 'vocation', as a response to God's calling to love and to express that love towards our brothers and sisters in humanity through our work and lives (CV 1, CV 22, SRS 28–29).

Pope Francis extends this vocation to love in *Laudato Si'* to the non-human creation (LS 85). Integral human development implies growth in our love towards not only fellow human beings but also the entire cosmos. *Laudato Si'* talks of the 'mystical meaning to be found in a leaf, in a mountain trail, in a dewdrop, in a poor person's face' (LS 233), of nature being 'filled with words of love' (LS 225). It sees any person who gives herself out of love to help others and protect nature as a manifestation of the divine.

Any person who lives a life open to the wonders of creation, who lives a sustainable lifestyle, and who works at bringing economic and social processes into harmony with creation is involved in integral human development (LS 225). Such 'social love' is 'part of spirituality' and is 'key to authentic development' (LS 231). In *Fratelli Tutti*, Pope Francis develops this notion of social love or 'social friendship' further as a love that seeks the best for other people's lives, that recognizes the equal worth of every person, and that transcends boundaries (FT 94, 98, 106).

An integral human development perspective gives some direction to the freedom and agency in Sen's capability approach, thus answering some of the critiques that its account of human freedom lacks purpose. From a religious tradition perspective, there are some ways of exercising freedom which are 'better' than others, in the sense of fulfilling more of our humanity, namely the ways which express more love for others and for nature. From Sen's capability approach perspective, there is nothing that allows one to distinguish whether, for example, choosing a diet that is meat-heavy versus one that is more plant-based is better or worse, or whether choosing a kind of life that generates high carbon emissions and electronic waste is better or worse than a kind of life that generates low-carbon emissions and little waste, except the reasoning and self-examination process that the person undertakes to make her decision. An integral human development perspective is more prescriptive in the sense that it brings more elements for consideration in the reasoning process, such as the impact of meat consumption on deforestation, soil erosion, and contamination,[32] or the impact of one's high carbon emissions on climate change, or the impact of one's electronic waste on soil contamination and people's health.[33] These other-related considerations are not absent from Sen's capability approach to development, but they are not explicit – though as the conclusion will discuss, the 2020 *Human Development Report* makes these considerations explicit in the exercise of our freedom, the choices we make, and the actions we take, whether individually or collectively.

In the development studies literature, this spiritual dimension has been accounted for by adding an extra dimension alongside others, such as in Bhutan's Gross National Happiness Index or the 'Light Wheel' approach pioneered by Tearfund (2016) for monitoring and impact evaluation. However, the concept of integral human development is not easily translatable into a user guide, as some development organizations, like Catholic Relief Services, have sought to do (Heinrich et al. 2008). Rather, like Sen's capability approach, it is an analytical lens, a conceptual normative framework, through which social realities are analysed. It is more about opening a distinctive line of thought for thinking about development than proposing a formula for evaluation or blueprint for action.

Integral human development adopts a similar multidimensional perspective to that of Sen's when considering each person: her flourishing in all her dimensions is the ultimate concern of development. It similarly does not specify an exhaustive list of dimensions which constitute human life. These could include, like in Sen's, among others, being healthy, pursuing knowledge, and being able to shape one's life and to participate in the life of the community – what *Populorum Progressio* calls 'being an artisan of one's destiny' (PP 65). However, the Catholic social tradition brings more to the fore the intuitive idea of human dignity, which in many ways echoes the anchoring of Sen's capability approach in human rights.[34] Every person is born with equal dignity. As Pope Francis put it in *Fratelli Tutti*,

> the mere fact that some people are born in places with fewer resources or less development does not justify the fact that they are living with less dignity. . . . Every human being has the right to live with dignity and to develop integrally.
>
> (FT 106–107)

Both reject situations in which 'some people are rolling in luxury and others are near starvation' (Sen 2017: 68–9) on the ground that this violates human dignity. However, the Catholic social tradition goes further than Sen by affirming that living a life in luxury in indifference to the suffering of others is dehumanizing. *Fratelli Tutti* discusses at length in that regard political ideologies which fail to consider those who are in a situation of need as our neighbours towards whom we have responsibilities.

### *Attention to suffering and marginalization: integrating the earth*

Like Sen's perspective, the Catholic social tradition gives priority to those who are unable to live a 'minimally acceptable life', those who are unable to have the basic requirements of human dignity like access to food, water, decent housing or decent work. In the wordings of the Second Vatican Council in 1965:

> The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the [wo]men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ.[35]

In its translation of the Second Vatican Council to its reality, the Latin American Church adopted a 'preferential option for the poor',[36] which Pope John Paul II subsequently put at the core of the Catholic social tradition in

his encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* in 1987.[37] The original term in Spanish (*opción*) suggests a commitment, a firm and deliberate decision, and not an option in the sense of a choice among others as in English. It is about opting to orient one's life and decisions according to the realities of those who suffer:

> This love of preference for the poor, and the decisions which it inspires in us, cannot but embrace the immense multitudes of the hungry, the needy, the homeless, those without medical care and, above all, those without hope of a better future. It is impossible not to take account of the existence of these realities. . . . [This option] applies equally to our social responsibilities and hence to our manner of living, and to the logical decisions to be made concerning the ownership and use of goods.
>
> (SRS 42)

*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* makes a strong connection between the preferential option for the poor and the ownership and use of goods, known as the principle of the 'universal destination of goods' (PCJP 2005: 171–84), according to which the earth is destined for all. Our ownership of goods is therefore not absolute but has to be shared and be at the service of others so that each person can have access to a minimum of conditions that will ensure her development as a human being (FT 118–127). Addressing poverty is essential to integral human development, but addressing extreme wealth is no less important. Already in 1968, *Populorum Progressio* asked a stark question:

> What are less than human conditions? The material poverty of those who lack the bare necessities of life, and the moral poverty of those who are crushed under the weight of their own self-love; oppressive political structures resulting from the abuse of ownership or the improper exercise of power, from the exploitation of the worker or unjust transaction.
>
> (PP 21)

Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis all have continued to emphasize this connection between the two: 'side-by-side with the miseries of underdevelopment, themselves unacceptable, we find ourselves up against a form of superdevelopment, equally inadmissible, because like the former it is contrary to what is good and to true happiness' (SRS 28); 'we have a sort of super-development of a wasteful and consumerist kind which forms an unacceptable contrast with the ongoing situations of dehumanizing

deprivation' (CV 22, LS 109). *Populorum Progressio* and *Caritas in Veritate* talk of the 'The scandal of glaring inequalities' (PP 9, CV 22).

From the aforementioned, one can conclude that integrating a spiritual dimension into the concept of development implies a specific way of attending to human suffering and poverty, one which connects the life of a person who lives in poverty with that of the one who lives in plenty. But this is not its only implication. Integral human development also implies integrating what *Laudato Si'* calls, following Boff (1997), 'the cry of the earth and the cry of the poor' (LS 49). For the Catholic social tradition, as it has evolved today, nature is not something that is external to human living, 'as something separate from ourselves or as a mere setting in which we live', something that one can use and control, for '[w]e are part of nature, included in it and thus in constant interaction with it' (LS 139). Attention to the poor and marginalized can therefore not be separated from attention to the earth and from the damage that humans are inflicting on it. As mentioned earlier, integrating a spiritual dimension within development means openness to the values of 'love, friendship' not only with others, especially the poor, but with all of nature, or God's creation.[38]

An integral human development perspective is neither anthropocentric nor biocentric. It sees human beings and ecosystems in constant interaction. Degradation of people's lives and of ecosystems goes hand in hand, as the people consulted for the Amazon Synod expressed:

> The Amazon today is a wounded and deformed beauty, a place of suffering and violence. Attacks on nature have consequences for people's lives . . . appropriation and privatization of natural goods, such as water itself; legal logging concessions and illegal logging; predatory hunting and fishing; unsustainable mega-projects (hydroelectric and forest concessions, massive logging, monocultivation, highways, waterways, railways, and mining and oil projects); pollution caused by extractive industries and city garbage dumps; and, above all, climate change. These are real threats with serious social consequences: pollution-related diseases, drug trafficking, illegal armed groups, alcoholism, violence against women, sexual exploitation, human trafficking and smuggling, organ traffic, sex tourism, the loss of original culture and identity (language, customs and spiritual practices), criminalization and assassination of leaders and defenders of the territory. Behind all this are dominant economic and political interests, with the complicity of some government officials and some indigenous authorities. The victims are the most vulnerable: children, youth, women and our sister mother earth.[39]

From Sen's perspective, the focus remains on what human beings are able to do and be, such as the ability of indigenous people in the Amazon to avoid an easily preventable death, eat food from the forests, drink water from the rivers, and express their cultures. An integral human development perspective extends this to an evaluation of what is happening to the earth and also extends the evaluation of environmental degradation to an analysis about its possible causes, such as powerful economic and political interests, corruption, and lack of love and care towards nature and people. Policies and government and international action have to change, but, from an integral human development perspective, it is not only policies that need to change, 'it is we human beings above all who have to change' (LS 220), and change so that our lives reflect more that openness to love and friendship with others and nature, that orientation to 'love in truth'.

### *Broadening the evaluation of states of affairs: integrating oneself*

Sen's capability approach broadened the evaluation space of development beyond income to include considerations about the kinds of lives people live and what they were able to be and do. Integral human development broadens it further to include considerations about what it called the 'interior dimension' (SRS 29), that is, the extent to which our very selves are open to what is happening to the lives of others and to the earth, the extent to which our lives and decisions express love for others and the earth.

*Populorum Progressio* already talked of every human person's self-fulfilment as bound up with the development of human society as a whole (PP 14–17), for 'we are the heirs of earlier generations, and we reap benefits from the efforts of our contemporaries' (PP 17), and future generations will inherit the earth and society we will have bequeathed them. *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* takes this argument further by stressing the need for 'a change of behaviour or mentality or mode of existence' (SRS 38), for development does not only have a socio-economic dimension but also a moral dimension. Overcoming the socio-economic obstacles to the development of each person is also about 'inner growth' or 'inner transformation' (SRS 38), a journey where one grows and deepens love in one's relationship to self, neighbour, including distant ones, and nature. *Laudato Si'* talks of a 'change of heart' (LS 218).

This emphasis on inner growth and change at the personal level, of turning away from habits and actions which harm others and nature, is not unique to religious traditions. Interestingly, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC (2014: 29)) made a similar argument about personal and structural responses to climate change being both essential and

mutually reinforcing. This integration of the self as a subject of development and growth at the moral level is also increasingly talked about in development studies. The move to decolonize is leading to greater self-reflexivity and critical examining of one's own position of power and privilege (Schöneberg 2019), and of one's own contribution to the problems of inequality, poverty, and environmental degradation.

In a plenary lecture at the UK Development Studies Association conference on leadership for global challenges, Batliwala (2020) argued for the integration of the psychic level into the global challenges. In addition to change in ideas and how we relate to each other and the planet, she contends that a similar attention needs to be paid to our inner selves, our internal harmony and emotional world, and that there can be no divide between personal and social transformation. As she expressed it succinctly, 'We are ready to fix the world, but not to question our own internalized sense of power and privilege'; 'new leaders are people who have to be ready to work on themselves and recognize themselves as sites of change'.[40] In other words, development practice is something that happens not only 'out there' in the so-called developing world but also in our very selves, our personal lives, and the organizations in which we work – for example, an organization which works on addressing gender inequality has to examine how it itself embeds patriarchal attitudes and treats women.

## Concluding remarks

This chapter has discussed how integrating a spiritual dimension into development, in the sense of openness to the values of love and friendship, could extend further the concept and meaning of development derived from Sen's capability approach. This could be by, among other things, integrating concerns for the earth and the whole web of life into concerns for those who live in poverty and making oneself the subject of development and inner transformation. This integral human development perspective has implications for the SDGs. Not only do they have to be addressed holistically – for example, addressing poverty in all its dimensions cannot be separated from nurturing life in water and on land – but they also have to be addressed through a critical self-reflection about our own place and situation of power and privilege in economic, social, and political systems, and about our responsibility in causing social and environmental degradation. This makes an integral human development framework more prescriptive than Sen's. Both function as conceptual frameworks for a range of evaluative exercises, but integral human development links these evaluative exercises to a vision of what states of affairs are to reflect, a vision of harmonious relations

between people and nature, or what Pope Francis called in his post-synodal apostolic exhortation after the Amazon Synod, *Querida Amazonia* (QA), a kind of 'personal, familial, communal and cosmic harmony' (QA 71).

Given this tying of the evaluative exercise to a certain overall normative vision, an integral human development perspective makes a stronger denunciation of situations which contrast with this vision. Within Sen's capability approach, there is an implicit moral evaluation that situations in which, for example, such as India in the late 1990s, half a country's children are malnourished or a large share of the population does not have access to a toilet, reflect indifference from those in policy decision-making processes to what happens to the life of the vulnerable (Drèze and Sen 2013). An integral human development approach expresses a more pronounced value judgement on such states of affairs. In his apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (EG), Pope Francis talks of rejecting an 'economy that kills', of saying 'No to an economy of exclusion', 'No to the new idolatry of money', 'No to a financial system which rules rather than serves', 'No to the inequality which spawns violence' (EG 53–60).

Both perspectives see markets as exchange mechanisms, but when such exchange mechanisms lead to human exploitation, to profits taking priority over concerns for human dignity and care for the earth, Sen's perspective limits itself to evaluating the impact of lack of market regulation on the lives of peoples. It would then submit this information to 'public reasoning' to discuss whether remedial action needs to take place and which action best to take. But as such, it does not prescribe stronger market regulations beyond pointing out the effects of market liberalization on people's lives. It leaves it to processes of public reasoning to judge the situation and act if need be (cf. Chapter 3). For example, it would evaluate the impact of the lack of regulation of agribusiness activities and of the use of pesticides on the health and lives of children who live close to soya fields; it would evaluate the impact of the lack of regulation of extractive industries, or the impact of policies incentivizing the extraction and export of natural resources, on the lives of those who live near the extractive sites. An integral human development perspective goes, however, further than mere evaluation when the lack of regulation and the search for quick profits undermine the lives of people and of ecosystems. As the bishop in charge of the archdiocese that includes one of the world's most contaminated cities, La Oroya evaluated the health situation of its residents: 'It is the money which commands.'[41] Pope Francis similarly evaluated the current situation of the Amazon rainforest and of its inhabitants:

> The businesses, national or international, which harm the Amazon and fail to respect the right of the original peoples to the land and its

> boundaries, and to self-determination and prior consent, should be called for what they are: injustice and crime. When certain businesses out for quick profit appropriate lands and end up privatizing even potable water, or when local authorities give free access to the timber companies, mining or oil projects, and other businesses that raze the forests and pollute the environment, economic relationships are unduly altered and become an instrument of death.
>
> (QA 14)

As Sachs (2017) has argued, in relation to *Laudato Si'* and the SDGs, the Catholic social tradition provides a deeper interrogation of processes of social change and a discussion of the root causes of social and environmental degradation, which it situates in a misuse of human freedom, a freedom which has been used to harm the environment instead of caring for it, a freedom that has been used to be indifferent to what is happening to vulnerable people and to the earth and choose financial gains instead.

In bringing Sen's capability approach to development in dialogue with the Catholic social tradition and its conception of development, this chapter has focused on contributions from the latter to the former. However, like any dialogue between two equal partners, the conversation can be mutually transformative for both. Sen's capability approach, and its open-ended nature and indeterminacy, and its focus on evaluation of states of affairs rather than diagnosis, could also bring some significant contributions to the Catholic social tradition, especially with regard to gender equality.

A paradox of the Catholic social tradition is, on the one hand, its teaching on human dignity and equal moral worth of each human person, and, on the other hand, its lack of attention to gender inequality. Although *Laudato Si'* has adopted gender inclusive language unlike in previous papal documents, it makes no mention of the fact that women disproportionally suffer from environmental degradation and that women are often at the forefront of care for our common home (Cahill 2018). In addition, the latest encyclical is titled in a way which ignores women (*Fratelli Tutti – To All Brothers*), though it adopts inclusive language throughout its text. It is beyond the scope of this book to engage in a discussion on how the position of the Catholic Church on the equal dignity of women and men, whatever their sexual orientation, is currently being debated and evolving (Beattie 2020; Bracke and Paternotte 2016). But one can highlight that the Catholic social tradition is far from being static and homogenous. It is in development, responding to the historical context and reflecting on the current reality of societies. Its thinking on the concept of development started in the historical context of decolonization. It has evolved to integrate a preferential option for the poor following contributions from theological reflections on the social

reality of poverty and inequality, and to integrate care for the earth following contributions from theological reflection on the reality of environmental degradation. The Pope may be the signatory of an encyclical which shapes the Catholic social tradition, but it is the work of a large group of people, and some voices may be louder than others, or listened to more than others.

The Catholic Church, like any other institution, whether religious or not, is not homogenous and is not immune to abuses of power, money, and corruption, or, of course, to patriarchy and sexism. Although religious leaders may make decisions through what is called in religious language 'discernment', this does not eliminate politics and power dynamics at play in any human relationships.[42] Sen's capability approach to development, with its focus on women's agency and gender justice and closer attention to every member being able to participate in matters that affect her life, could contribute to bringing the concerns of marginalized women to the core of the Catholic social tradition. The Church's own writings on solidarity and how we are to live in relation to others and nature may help in that regard, to which the next chapter turns.

## Notes

1 The term 'capability' is also linked to Sen's works on poverty and famines (Sen 1981), in which he saw poverty as an entitlement failure, that is, a lack of command over a bundle of commodities due to institutional factors. For a critical discussion on Sen's entitlement approach, see Devereux (2001). For a comparison between his entitlement and capability approaches, see Reddy and Daoud (2020).
2 In 2004, a dedicated academic association, the Human Development and Capability Association, was formed to support research around the ideas of the capability approach; see https://hd-ca.org.
3 For an overview of Amartya Sen and Nussbaum's works on religion, see Deneulin and Zampini-Davies (2020).
4 A lot has been written on the distinction between functionings and capabilities; see Robeyns (2017) and Wolff and De-Shalit (2013) for introductory critical discussions.
5 A question-and-answer session after a public lecture given by Amartya Sen for the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative in Oxford (year not remembered by the author).
6 Since 2016, the *Human Development Reports* have moved from translating 'capabilities' as 'choices' to using the full conceptual apparatus of functionings-capabilities-agency (UNDP 2016: 2).
7 The French intellectual Simone Weil took leave from her work in education as philosopher to take employment as a factory worker out of solidarity with factory workers. For an account of Weil's life, see Plant (2007).
8 The civil society organization Global Witness reported 212 killings worldwide in 2019 for opposing environmental destruction and 33 deaths in the Amazon region. See www.globalwitness.org/en/press-releases/global-witness-

records-the-highest-number-of-land-and-environmental-activists-murdered-in-one-year-with-the-link-to-accelerating-climate-change-of-increasing-concern/, accessed 6 January 2021.

9 The words in inverted commas are Sen's own during a public lecture for the launch of *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*, 18 January 2017, Oxford.

10 Ezquerro-Cañete (2016) also talks of peasants in Paraguay appearing to 'choose' to sell their land to agribusinesses, but they have little choice of not doing so when their land is being poisoned by air-sprayed pesticide in neighbouring soy plantations and unfit for subsistence food cultivation.

11 The global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) has included a dimension of access to water and housing quality; see www.ophi.org.uk.

12 Her ten central human capabilities are (Nussbaum 2000: 77–78, 2011: 33–34) to live a life of normal length; to have bodily health; to have bodily integrity; to think and reason (such as guarantees of freedom of expression); to express emotions; to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's life; to engage in social interaction and have the social bases of self-respect; to live with concern for the natural environment; to laugh and play; to control one's environment (such as participation in choices that govern one's life and work).

13 The questions used to develop the index are: 'How spiritual do you consider yourself?'; 'Do you consider Karma in the course of your daily life?'; 'How often do you recite prayers?; 'How often do you meditate?' (Ura et al. 2012: 116).

14 See paragraph 33 of *Laudato Si'*: 'It is not enough, however, to think of different species merely as potential "resources" to be exploited, while overlooking the fact that they have value in themselves. Each year sees the disappearance of thousands of plant and animal species which we will never know. . . . . Because of us, thousands of species will no longer give glory to God by their very existence, nor convey their message to us. We have no such right.'

15 See www.hdr.undp.org/en/data, accessed 6 January 2021.

16 For discussions on poverty from a capability perspective, see, among others, Alkire et al. (2015), Alkire (2020) and Wolff (2020). See also Sen (1985c), where he discusses poverty as a failure to achieve certain minimum capabilities.

17 For how the Index is calculated, see https://ophi.org.uk/publications/mpi-methodological-notes/. See also www.hdr.undp.org/en/2019-MPI, accessed 6 January 2021.

18 See https://ophi.org.uk/global-mpi-report-2020, accessed 6 January 2021.

19 See https://mppn.org/multidimensional-poverty-profile-in-palestine, accessed 6 January 2021.

20 See https://mppn.org/paises_participantes/el-salvador, accessed 6 January 2021.

21 An Oxfam report has, for example, estimated that, between 2005 and 2010, the mining companies in Colombia paid the government annually USD 456 million in taxes but that they received in return USD 925 million in fiscal exemptions (Oxfam International 2015).

22 For how climate change disproportionately affects poor and marginalized communities, see, for example, Alston (2019), UNDP (2019), Islam and Winkel (2017).

23 For the historical background of *Populorum Progressio* and the influence of Joseph-Louis Lebret, see Catta (2015) and Rapela Heidt (2017). See also the Special Issue on 'Louis Joseph Lebret and the development of peoples', *Journal of Global Ethics,* edited by Des Gasper and Lori Keleher, forthcoming in 2021.

24 See www.humandevelopment.va/en/il-dicastero/motu-proprio.html, accessed 6 January 2021.
25 Paragraph 19 of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (PCJP 2005), quoted on the Dicastery's website; see www.humandevelopment.va/en/sviluppo-umano-integrale/fede-e-sviluppo-integrale.html, accessed 6 January 2021.
26 For the secondary literature on integral human development, see, among others, Bertina (2013), Catta (2015, 2019), Keleher (2018), Kraemer (1998), Pfeil (2018), Pope (2019).
27 See Townsend (2017), '5.3.4 Henri de Lubac and Louis-Joseph Lebret', at https://virtualplater.org.uk/module-b/b-unit-1-contents/5-3populorum-progressio/5-3-4-henri-de-lubac-and-louis-joseph-lebret/ (accessed 6 January 2021), quoting Avery Dulles SJ, 'Henri de Lubac: In Appreciation', America, 28 Sept. 1991. For a summary of de Lubac's works, see Kerr (2006).
28 www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2017/april/documents/papa-francesco_20170404_convegno-populorum-progressio.html, accessed 6 January 2021.
29 Ibid.
30 See Dorr (2016) for an analysis of how the key documents of the Catholic social tradition are a response to changing socio-economic contexts.
31 For a discussion on the relationship between spirituality and religion, see Schneiders (2003).
32 See editorial of *The Lancet*, 'We need to talk about meat', volume 392, issue 10161, P2237, 24 November 2018, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32971-4.
33 See, for example, the World Health Organization's work on bringing more awareness of the health consequences of electronic waste; www.who.int/activities/raising-awareness-on-e-waste-and-children-s-health, accessed 6 January 2021.
34 For discussions on the relation between human dignity and human rights, and implications for development, see Carozza and Sedmak (2020), Clark (2014), and Gilabert (2018); for a discussion on the relation between the capability approach and human rights, see Elson, Fukuda-Parr and Vizard (2012), Vizard (2006, 2020), and Sen (2005); see also Nussbaum (2000, 2011) for an anchoring of the capability approach into a notion of human dignity.
35 *Gaudium et Spes,* Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, par. 1, www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html, accessed 6 January 2021.
36 The expression was coined in 1979 at the third Latin American Bishops' Conference in Puebla, Mexico. The previous conference in 1968 at Medellín, Colombia, already affirmed that the defence of the poor was the essential task of evangelization of the Latin American Church. For the concluding documents of the two conferences (in Spanish), see, respectively, www.celam.org/doc_conferencias/Documento_Conclusivo_Medellin.pdf; https://celam.org/documentos/Documento_Conclusivo_Puebla.pdf
37 For discussions on the preferential option for the poor, see, among others, Groody, Gutierrez and Aylwin (2014), Gutierrez (2013), Schlag (2019).
38 *Laudato Si'* distinguishes between nature and creation: the latter as seeing nature as a gift and the former as something that can be studied (LS 76).
39 Paragraph 10, final document of the Amazon Synod, October 2019, www.sinodoamazonico.va/content/sinodoamazonico/en/documents/final-document-

of-the-amazon-synod.html, accessed 6 January 2021. For a report on the impact of logging, extractive activities, and infrastructure megaprojects on the Amazon region, see Bebbington et al. (2019).

40 Author's notes from Batliwala's lecture.

41 Bishop Pedro Barreto, comment made at a conference on Religions and the Sustainable Development Goals, 6–8 March 2019, Vatican City. His words were in Spanish 'Es el dinero que manda' (author's conference notes).

42 For a discussion on how discernment is at the core of Pope Francis's leadership and decision-making, see Ivereigh (2019). For a political analysis of power dynamics in the Vatican, see Reese (1996).

## References

Agarwal, Bina, Jane Humphries and Ingrid Robeyns (eds). 2008. *Amartya Sen's Work and Ideas: A Gender Perspective*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Alkire, Sabina. 2002. *Valuing Freedoms*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2020. "The Research Agenda on Multidimensional Poverty Measurement," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 417–36, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335741.024.

Alkire, Sabina et al. 2015. *Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, https://multidimensionalpoverty.org.

Alston, Phillip. 2019. *Climate Change and Poverty: Report of the Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights*, Geneva: Human Rights Council, https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3810720.

Anand, Paul et al. 2020. *Multidimensional Perspectives on Inequality: Conceptual and Empirical Challenges*, Luxembourg: European Union, https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/multidimensional-perspectives-inequality-conceptual-and-empirical-challenges.

Bagchi, Amiya. 2000. "Review: Freedom and Development as End of Alienation?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 35(50): 4408–20, www.jstor.org/stable/4410058?seq=1.

Batliwala, Srilatha. 2020. "Rethinking Leadership for Global Challenges," Development Studies Association Conference, Forthcoming in Oxford Development Studies, Video Lecture at, www.devstud.org.uk/conference/conference-2020/plenaries/.

Baujard, Antoinette and Muriel Gilardone. 2017. "Sen Is Not a Capability Theorist," *Journal of Economic Methodology* 24(1): 1–19, https://doi.org/10.1080/1350178X.2016.1257821.

Beattie, Tina. 2020. "Human Dignity and Rights in the Context of Gender and the Sacramental Priesthood," *Interdisciplinary Journal for Religion and Transformation in Contemporary Society* 6(1): 140–57, https://doi.org/10.30965/23642807-00601009.

Bebbington, Denise et al. 2019. *Extractive Industry and Infrastructure in the Amazon*, www.climateandlandusealliance.org/reports/impacts-of-extractive-industry-and-infrastructure-on-forests/.

Bertina, Ludovic. 2013. "The Catholic Doctrine of 'Integral Human Development' and its Influence on the International Development Community," *Revue Internationale de Politique de Développement* 1(4): 115–27, https://doi.org/10.4000/poldev.1402.

Boff, Leonardo. 1997. *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Bracke, Sarah and David Paternotte. 2016. "Unpacking the Sin of Gender," *Religion and Gender* 6(2): 143–54, doi: 10.18352/rg.10167.

Cahill, Lisa Sowle. 2018. "The Environment, the Common Good, and Women's Participation," in Celia Deane-Drummond and Rebecca Artinian-Kaiser (eds), *Theology and Ecology Across the Disciplines: On Care for our Common Home*, London: T&T Clark, pp. 135–48.

Carozza, Paolo and Clemens Sedmak (eds). 2020. *The Practice of Human Development and Dignity*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Catta, Grégoire. 2015. "God For Us' in the Challenge of Integral Human Development: Theology in Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching," PhD, Massachusetts: Boston College.

———. 2019. *Catholic Social Teaching as Theology*, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Chiappero-Martinetti, Enrica, Siddiq Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds). 2020. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Meghan. 2014. *The Vision of Catholic Social Thought*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Comim, Flavio, Sabina Alkire and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds). 2008. *The Capability Approach: Concepts, Measures and Applications*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corbridge, Stuart. 2002. "Development as Freedom: The Spaces of Amartya Sen," *Progress in Development Studies* 2(3): 183–217, https://doi.org/10.1191/1464993402ps037ra.

Correia, Joel. 2019. "Soy States: Resource Politics, Violent Environments and Soybean Territorialization in Paraguay," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 46(2): 316–36, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1384726.

Dean, Hartley. 2009. "Critiquing Capabilities: The Distractions of a Beguiling Concept," *Critical Social Policy* 29(2): 261–73, https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018308101629.

Deneulin, Séverine and Augusto Zampini-Davies. 2020. "Religion and the Capability Approach," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 689–708, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335741.039.

Devereux, Stephen. 2001. "Sen's Entitlement Approach: Critiques and counter-critiques," *Oxford Development Studies* 29(3): 245–63, https://doi.org/10.1080/13600810120088859.

Dorr, Donal. 2016. *Option for the Poor and for the Earth*, Revised edition, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Drèze, Jean and Amartya Sen. 2013. *An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradictions*, London: Allen Lane.

Elson, Diane, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and Polly Vizard (eds). 2012. *Human Rights and the Capabilities Approach: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, London: Routledge.

Ezquerro-Cañete, Arturo. 2016. "Poisoned, Dispossessed and Excluded: A Critique of the Neoliberal Soy Regime in Paraguay," *Journal of Agrarian Change* 16(4): 702–11, https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12164.

Fischer, Andrew. 2018. *Poverty as Ideology: Rescuing Social Justice from Global Development Agendas*, London: Zed Books.

Frediani, Alex. 2015. "Space and Capabilities: Approaching Informal Settlements," in C. Lemanski and C. Marx (eds), *The City in Urban Poverty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–84.

Gilabert, Pablo. 2018. *Human Dignity and Human Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gutierrez, Gustavo. 2013. "The Option for the Poor Arises from Faith in Christ," in M. Griffin and J. Weiss Block (eds), *In the Company of the Poor: Conversations with Paul Farmer and Gustavo Gutierrez*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, pp. 147–60.

Groody, David, Gustavo Gutiérrez and José Aylwin (eds). 2014. *The Preferential Option for the Poor beyond Theology*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Hall, David. 2019. "New Zealand's Living Standards Framework: What Might Amartya Sen Say?" *Policy Quarterly* 15(1), 38–45, https://openrepository.aut.ac.nz/handle/10292/13098.

Hamilton, Lawrence. 2019. *Amartya Sen*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heinrich, Geoff et al. 2008. *A User's Guide to Integral Human Development*, Baltimore: Catholic Relief Services, www.crs.org/sites/default/files/tools-research/users-guide-to-integral-human-development.pdf.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2014. *Fifth Assessment Report: Summary for Policy-Makers*, www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5_SYR_FINAL_SPM.pdf.

Islam, Nazrul and John Winkel. 2017. *Climate Change and Social Inequality*, DESA Working Paper No. 152, United Nations, Department of Economic & Social Affairs, www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2017/wp152_2017.pdf.

Ivereigh, Austen. 2019. *Wounded Shepherd: Pope Francis and his Struggle to Convert the Catholic Church*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Keleher, Lori. 2018. "Integral Human Development," in J. Dydryk and L. Keleher (eds), *Handbook of Development Ethics*, London: Routledge, pp. 29–34.

Kerr, Fergus. 2006. *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kraemer, Barbara. 1998. "Development: Principles for Integral Human Development in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*," *International Journal of Social Economics* 25(11/12): 1727–38, https://doi.org/10.1108/03068299810233394.

McGrath, Simon. 2018. *Education and Development*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Mitchell, Ann and Jimena Maccio. 2018. "Same City, Worlds Apart: Multidimensional Poverty and Residential Segregation in Buenos Aires," *Anales de la Asociación Argentina de Economia Politica*, https://repositorio.uca.edu.ar/bitstream/123456789/9376/1/same-city-worlds-apart.pdf.

Mitra, Sophie. 2016. "The Capability Approach and Disability," *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 16(4): 236–47, https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073060160040501.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2000. *Women and Human Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2011. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Project*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

OECD. 2013. *How's Life? 2013: Measuring Well-being*, Paris: OECD, www.oecd.org/sdd/3013071e.pdf.

Oxfam International. 2015. *Privilegios que Niegan Derechos. Desigualdad Extrema y Secuestro de la Democracia en América Latina y el Caribe*, Oxfam International, www.oxfam.org/es/informes/privilegios-que-niegan-derechos.

Pfeil, Margaret. 2018. "Fifty Years after *Populorum Progressio*: Understanding Integral Human Development in the Light of Integral Ecology," *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 15(1): 5–17, https://doi.org/10.5840/jcathsoc20181512.

Plant, Stephen. 2007. *The SPCK Introduction to Simone Weil*, London: SPCK.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (PCJP). 2005. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, Rome. www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html.

Pope, Stephen. 2019. "Integral Human Development: From Paternalism to Accompaniment," *Theological Studies* 80(1): 123–47, https://doi.org/10.1177/0040563918819798.

Rapela Heidt, Mari. 2017. "Development, Nations, and 'The Signs of the Times'," *Journal of Moral Theology* 6(1): 1–20, https://jmt.scholasticahq.com/article/11330-development-nations-and-the-signs-of-the-times-the-historical-context-of-populorum-progressio.

Reddy, Sanjay and Adel Daoud. 2020. "Entitlements and Capabilities," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 677–85, doi: 10.1017/9781316335741.038.

Reese, Thomas. 1996. *Inside the Vatican: The Politics and Organization of the Catholic Church*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2017. *Wellbeing, Freedom and Social Justice: The Capability Approach Re-Examined*, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, www.openbookpublishers.com/product/682.

———. 2019. "What, if Anything, Is Wrong with Extreme Wealth?" *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 20(3): 251–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2019.1633734.

Sachs, Wolfgang. 2017. "The Sustainable Development Goals and Laudato Si': Varieties of Post-Development?" *Third World Quarterly* 38(12): 2573–87.

Schlag, Martin. 2019. "The Preferential Option for the Poor and Catholic Social Teaching," in G. V. Bradley and E. C. Brugger (eds), *Catholic Social Teaching: A Volume of Scholarly Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 468–82.

Schneiders, Sandra. 2003. "Religion vs. Spirituality: A Contemporary Conundrum," *Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality* 3(2): 163–85, https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1087&context=jst.

Schöneberg, Julia. 2019. "Imagining Postcolonial Development Studies: Reflection on Positionality and Research Practices," in Elisabetta Basile, Isa Baud, Tina Kontinen and Susanne von Itter (eds), *Building Development Studies for the New Millennium*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 97–116.

Sen, Amartya. 1970. "The Impossibility of a Paretian Liberal," *Journal of Political Economy* 78(1): 152–57, doi: 10.2307/1829633.

———. 1980. "Equality of What?" in S. McMurrin (ed), *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 197–220, https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/s/sen80.pdf.

———. 1981. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1985a. *Commodities and Capabilities*, Amsterdam: North Holland.

———. 1985b. "Well-being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984," *Journal of Philosophy* 82(4): 169–221, doi: 10.2307/2026184.

———. 1985c. "A Sociological Approach to the Measurement of Poverty: A Reply to Professor Peter Townsend," *Oxford Economic Papers* 37(4): 669–76.

———. 1988. "The Concept of Development," in Ch. Hollis and T. N. Srinivasan (eds), *Handbook of Development Economics*, Volume 1, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 9–26.

———. 1992. *Inequality Re-Examined*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1999. *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2003. "Development as Capability Expansion," in S. Fukuda-Parr and A. K. Shiva Kumar (eds), *Readings in Human Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–16.

———. 2004. "Why Should We Preserve the Spotted Owl," *London Review of Books* 26(3): 101, www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v26/n03/amartya-sen/why-we-should-preserve-the-spotted-owl.

———. 2005. "Human Rights and Capabilities," *Journal of Human Development* 6(2): 151–66, https://doi-org.ezproxy1.bath.ac.uk/10.1080/14649880500120491.

———. 2014. "The Contemporary Relevance of Buddha," *Ethics and International Affairs* 28(1): 15–27, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000033.

———. 2015. *The Country of First Boys*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*, London: Allen Lane.

Sen, Amartya and Martha Nussbaum (eds). 1993. *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seth, Suman and Maria Emma Santos. 2020. "Multidimensional Inequality and Human Development," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*,

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 392–416, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335741.023.

Svampa, Maristella. 2019. *Neo-Extractivism in Latin America*, Elements in Politics and Society in Latin America Series, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tearfund. 2016. *An Introductory Guide to the LIGHT Wheel Toolkit*, https://learn.tearfund.org/en/resources/impact_and_effectiveness/the_light_wheel/.

Terzi, Lorella. 2020. "Capability and Disability," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 544–61, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335741.031.

Townsend, Nicholas. 2017. *Virtual Plater: Catholic Social Teaching Gateway, Module B: Living in a Just and Free Society*, Birmingham: Newman University, https://virtualplater.org.uk/module-b/outline-of-module-b/.

UNDP. 2016. *Human Development Report: Human Development for Everyone*, www.hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2016_human_development_report.pdf.

———. 2019. *Human Development Report: Beyond Income, Beyond Averages, Beyond Today: Inequalities in Human Development in the 21st Century*, www.hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2019.pdf.

———. 2020. *Human Development Report. The Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene*, http://hdr.undp.org/.

Ura, Karma et al. 2012. *An Extensive Analysis of GNH Index*, Centre for Bhutan Studies, https://ophi.org.uk/policy/national-policy/gross-national-happiness-index/.

Valencia, Areli. 2016. *Human Rights Trade-Offs in Times of Economic Growth: The Long-Term Capability Impacts of Extractive-Led Development*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Jaarsveld, Jessica. 2020. "Nussbaum's Capability Approach and African Environment Ethics," *Oxford Development Studies* 48(2): 135–48, https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2020.1759037.

Venkatapuram, Sridhar. 2011. *Health Justice: An Argument from the Capabilities Approach,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Vizard, Polly. 2006. *Poverty and Human Rights: Sen's Capability Perspective Explored*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2020. "The Capability Approach and Human Rights," in Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds), *Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 624–42, doi: 10.1017/9781316335741.035.

Vizard, Polly and Liz Speed. 2016. "Examining Multidimensional Inequality and Deprivation in Britain Using the Capability Approach," *Forum for Social Economics* 45(2–3): 139–69, https://doi.org/10.1080/07360932.2014.997267.

Walker, Melanie and Elaine Unterhalter (eds). 2007. *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watene, Krushil. 2016. "Valuing Nature: Māori Philosophy and the Capability Approach," *Oxford Development Studies* 44(3): 287–97, https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2015.1124077.

Wolff, Jonathan. 2020. "Beyond Poverty," in V. Beck, H. Hahn and R. Lepenies (eds), *Dimensions of Poverty. Philosophy and Poverty*, Volume 2, Cham: Springer, https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-31711-9.

Wolff, Jonathan and Avner De-Shalit. 2013. *Disadvantage*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.