

EUR Research Information Portal

L.-J. Lebet

Published in:

Journal of Global Ethics

Publication status and date:

Published: 01/01/2021

DOI (link to publisher):

[10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051](https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document License/Available under:

CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for the published version (APA):

Gaspar, D. (2021). L.-J. Lebet: a human development ethics grounded in empirical social research and a global perspective. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 17(2), 146-166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051>

[Link to publication on the EUR Research Information Portal](#)

Terms and Conditions of Use

Except as permitted by the applicable copyright law, you may not reproduce or make this material available to any third party without the prior written permission from the copyright holder(s). Copyright law allows the following uses of this material without prior permission:

- you may download, save and print a copy of this material for your personal use only;
- you may share the EUR portal link to this material.

In case the material is published with an open access license (e.g. a Creative Commons (CC) license), other uses may be allowed. Please check the terms and conditions of the specific license.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this material infringes your copyright and/or any other intellectual property rights, you may request its removal by contacting us at the following email address: openaccess.library@eur.nl. Please provide us with all the relevant information, including the reasons why you believe any of your rights have been infringed. In case of a legitimate complaint, we will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website.



L.-J. Lebert: a human development ethics grounded in empirical social research and a global perspective

Des Gasper

To cite this article: Des Gasper (2021) L.-J. Lebert: a human development ethics grounded in empirical social research and a global perspective, *Journal of Global Ethics*, 17:2, 146-166, DOI: [10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051](https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2021.1954051>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 18 Nov 2021.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 313



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

L.-J. Lebrete: a human development ethics grounded in empirical social research and a global perspective

Des Gasper 

International Institute of Social Studies (The Hague), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Three themes in the work of Louis-Joseph Lebrete (1897–1966) have especial relevance for current development ethics: first, the importance of counterbalancing a disciplinary philosophical or theological orientation with strong bases in empirical life-experience, practical learning and social sciences; second, the necessity to study capitalism not only ‘development’, and concrete life-needs not only a generalised notion of ‘freedom’; and third, the imperative to employ global and cosmopolitan frames besides national and ‘community’ ones. These themes came to distinguish Lebrete as a development ethicist. He began with the first and second from the 1930s, under his banner of ‘Économie et Humanisme’. The third emerged later in consequence of his studies across an interconnected world. The paper elucidates and discusses the three themes in turn. The subsequent sections then briefly consider Lebrete’s legacies, influence and continuing relevance: directly, within the Catholic Church’s perspectives since the 1960s on human and global development; and indirectly, for secular work on ‘human development’ and in Anglophone development ethics.

GUEST EDITOR REVIEW PROCESS

Received 24 November 2020
Accepted 4 July 2021



KEYWORDS

Development ethics; Louis-Joseph Lebrete; ethics methodology; global ethics; Catholic social thought

1. Introduction

L.-J. Lebrete was described by his associates as always busy observing both situations and people, with a warm heart but alert cool head and open eyes; thus, as characteristically always carrying, besides his beret and pipe, his notebook and camera. This paper examines Lebrete’s observation-centred, practice-oriented approach to ethics and planning, and where it led him: to concerns with the details of all aspects of daily life, the specifics of capitalist societies and global markets, and eventually to an emphatic global development ethic. He did not remain confined within categories and frames established in philosophy and religion one or two millennia earlier, or two generations earlier in social sciences; he used them but connected, amended and extended.

The paper proceeds in five stages. First, it outlines Lebrete’s methodological stance and practice. Working outside conventional university or seminary settings, he and his

CONTACT Des Gasper  gasper@iss.nl  International Institute of Social Studies, Kortenaerkade 12, 2518 AX The Hague, The Netherlands

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

associates were not dominated by particular disciplinary or doctrinal frameworks. Their investigations – of French artisanal fisher communities, of living standards in many localities in post-war Europe and then in Latin America and around the world, of possibilities in regional development in various countries, and of ethical perspectives to both nourish and learn from this huge range of work – aimed to update the thinking of governments and the Catholic Church and to upgrade the mutually separated and alienated social, policy and human sciences, and, not least, ethics.

Second, Lebreton emphasised that relevant realistic Catholic social teaching must address economics, production, economic classes and the specifics of capitalist systems and of the varieties of human need, including needs downgraded or distorted under capitalism. Underlying the movement ‘*Économie et Humanisme*’, founded in 1941, was a commitment too to understand the strengths, contributions and failings in Marxist and socialist thought and action, in order to both withstand and learn from them.

Third, the central and longest section of the paper presents how Lebreton’s picture of human community and the common good evolved, from concerns with family, profession, locality and nation, to also and increasingly stress all humans worldwide. Thus the development ethics that he called for and began to articulate in the 1950s was a cosmopolitan and ecumenical ethics of global human development. It expressed a global span of concern and sympathy, a recognition of global interconnectedness and shared fate, and an awareness of how modern technological and economic systems now both allowed and jeopardised basic needs fulfilment worldwide.

Fourth, the strongest explicit continuing impact of Lebreton’s work and the features just mentioned is in parts of Catholic social thought. He was one of those who introduced and instituted an empirical and practical ‘See, Judge, Act’ orientation, and who stimulated and shaped the Catholic Church’s new attention to socio-economic development worldwide, including in its doctrine of ‘Integral Human Development’.

Fifth and last, the paper briefly considers how his work anticipated and indirectly influenced much later secular thinking on human development and development ethics.

While agreeing with Lebreton that useful development ethics must be well integrated with social sciences and with practice, the present paper focuses on Lebreton as development ethicist more than on details of his work as social scientist or planner. A sister paper (Gasper 2021) looks more closely at his work from those perspectives.

2. Life-based not doctrine-based; practice-oriented not academe-oriented

Practiciens plus que théoriciens ... [Practitioners more than theorists ...]. (Pelletier 1996, 8; on the Economy & Humanism group)

Être neutre, c’est trahir. [To be neutral is to betray]. (Lebreton 1946a, 108)

Lebreton could be described as a radical Christian Democrat and Christian activist. For him, to stand neutral in an unjust world was treason towards humanity and towards his religious principles. Devout Christians had for generations shunned politics, disgusted. ‘Having forgotten the virtue of social justice and devotion to principles of the common good’ (Lebreton 1946b, 72), they had allowed conservatives and opportunists to rule; they should not. When taking a stance for social justice and the common good, however, they must shun fanaticism and intolerance, and steep themselves in the sciences of complex modern society (1946a, ch. 50: *La Neutralité*). From early in

his 1930s work in French fisher communities, Lebret had insisted, in contrast to his Church colleagues, on attention to economics and not only evangelism, and on watching and listening not only preaching (Houée 1997, 26–29). His style became practice-led and bottom-up.

Garreau notes that one of Lebret's favourite Thomistic phrases was 'La soumission à l'objet' (e.g. Lebret 1947a), respect for reality as observed, reflecting the empirical spirit of a seaman pursuing his objectives in relation to forces beyond his control (at least currently), forces that he needs to observe, monitor, respect and try to understand. Various commentators, such as his closest associate in the 1940s Henri Desroche, called him 'le capitaine' (Garreau 1997, 411–412), who steered successive vessels, adapted to changing currents and knew when he needed to wait.¹

Often in Lebret's books, one encounters listings of the huge number of empirical research studies that he and his groups had undertaken. For example, the manual *Guide Pratique* enumerated 97 studies carried out since 1929 by him and/or associates, and recorded more (1952a, Annex 4). Later he could write of 'several hundred systematic studies' in four continents and at all scales (1959, 5). Such lists were given not only to underline the credentials of an unconventional priest-researcher and his group but reflected his beliefs that life is more complex than theory, that most theory was based on grossly insufficient empirical exposure, and that this was particularly true in discussions of development strategy. The treatise *Dynamique concrète du développement* declared that it was written to share insights from large-scale studies in a variety of countries in four continents, in contrast to development theories that were derived only from abstract models, rich-country conditions and/or exposure in a single (type of) underdeveloped country (Lebret 1961, 23).²

The strong priority to empirical realities was articulated already in his 1930s writings. Lebret had been struck by the contempt that Breton fishermen had for priests who knew almost nothing of the specific requirements and challenges of fishing. It was part of a broader contempt, he wrote, for a style of religion fit for children and for the Middle Ages that was still being presented to modern people despite containing little or no reflection of modern science and modern society; a religion that did not face contemporary realities but recited formulae and sided with property-holders (Garreau 1997, 27–28). He attacked reactionary Catholicism that stood against religious innovation, against modernity, against self-reflection and self-criticism; and observed how its clumsy anti-Communism fed de-Christianisation. Lebret shared the widespread impatience and revulsion at this outdated Church, and called for 'a religion without illusion, without naivety, freed from "infantilism"' (Garreau 1997, 29). In his view, the Church traditionalists' stance stemmed from arrogance but also from an inferiority complex due to their lack of worldly knowledge and skills, itself a result of totally unbalanced seminary education (Garreau 1997, 412). Not only priests were ignorant about fisheries though; so too, found Lebret, were most socialists and economists. He warned of 'sectors completely different from what socialism and dirigisme expect' (1947b, 10); and insisted that serious attention to economics required a detailed study of economic life not only of economics textbooks.

Throughout his career, he argued that ignorance by the Church of complex modern social and economic realities undermined its authority and led to failure to promote its declared values effectively. Already in 1926, tiring of abstracted theological studies

during his training as a Dominican, Lebret proposed to his professor Sertillanges to establish a journal that would engage priests and laity in discussion jointly of modern sciences and classic theology (Pelletier 1996, 36–38). In 1935–1936 he revived such a plan but was told by his Dominican superiors that a priest's tasks lay in the spiritual world, not in reforming society. In 1940–1941 he tried again and sought permission to establish the 'Économie et Humanisme' group and journal.³ This brought a debate with the theologians who reviewed his proposal. His call for a theology enriched by insights from modern sciences, natural and social, clashed with their insistence on subordination to Thomism (the philosophical and theological tradition established by Thomas Aquinas, 1225–1274) and to supposedly indisputable established truths. Inspired by the example of the Jesuit Teilhard de Chardin (1881–1955), who had rethought theology in relation to the findings of natural sciences, though with theology still providing a meaning-giving interpretive frame, Lebret declared that he wished to similarly engage the social sciences. His perspective on knowledge as always limited and revisable was opposed by traditionalists' foundationalism; his stress on how Aquinas had been open to engage with and learn from Aristotelianism met the response that the truth had by now been found or revealed, in Scripture or by Aquinas and other giants of the Church, so that further investigations could only add details not modify core truths (Pelletier 1996, 39–43). Theology withers if it isolates itself from life and its extreme diversity, wrote Lebret, but his views were suspect to the then Dominican authorities. They imposed strict rules for screening and approval of the new group's work.

Denis Pelletier (1995) considers Lebret to have been the final conscious heir of a French Catholic tradition of empirical social inquiry founded by Frédéric Le Play (1806–1882). Lebret was probably even more influenced by what we can call the action-research tradition of a related line of Catholic thinkers who moulded a bottom-up approach, studying together with working people the latter's social realities, culminating in the so-called JOC method: 'See, Judge, Act'. JOC was the Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne (Young Christian Workers) movement, founded in 1919 by the Belgian priest Joseph Cardijn (1882–1967).⁴ In contrast to starting from doctrine, the method started by studying the world, real lives, then responding through action, then learning further from that practical experience. Lebret was inducted into the approach in 1930 (Houée 1997). He began immediately to use it and remained faithful to it. In contrast to a traditional Catholic approach to social problems, starting with articulation of selected classic doctrinal principles, when Lebret was asked to prepare the first draft of *Populorum Progressio* for Paul VI he began with an assessment of the world situation (Lebret 1964). Only after considerable struggle in the Vatican Second Council was this sort of approach substantially adopted for the encyclical *Gaudium et Spes* (1965) on the Church in the modern world, in which Cardijn, Lebret and others played a role, and later in *Populorum Progressio*.⁵ Such a procedure of seeking to articulate ethical ideas after, and in conversation with, detailed review of the contemporary world, is evident again in, for example, Pope Francis's 2015 encyclical *Laudato Si'*.

Throughout Lebret's career, this line of tension continued in relation to traditional theology and philosophising. In the 1950s he was still repeatedly interrogated by some Church superiors and opponents, who could see no reason for clerics, theologians and Christian ethicists to study, let alone research, social sciences. Research, if required, could supposedly be left entirely to others, in part due to expectations that focus and

interpretation are never guided partly by philosophical and ethical choices, and that ability to commission and use research intelligently does not require a good understanding of content. These expectations are misplaced but fit readily with an acceptance of prevailing power structures and policy habits. Any ethics and ethics-guided policy analyses that seek to reflect the needs of those downgraded by prevailing power structures require something different.

Some later work in development ethics has followed Lebret's approach. His pupil Denis Goulet rejected standard relatively abstracted ethical theorising, such as exemplified by, for example, John Rawls. We should instead:

[look] at real cultural and historical settings not some supposedly timeless 'everywhere'. This context-specificity and the resultant comparative dimension are characteristic features in development ethics, even if not universal in nor unique to it. ... Goulet ... called for ethical investigation and debate that are driven by experience, not primarily based in academic philosophy and pre-set academic frameworks; and thus for field-based identification and reflection on values and value conflicts and on societal, corporate and global responsibilities. (Gasper 2008, 456, 458)

Pelletier notes that, while one starting point for the 'Économie et Humanisme' movement was the initially anti-modernist Catholicism articulated by Jacques Maritain and others (e.g. Maritain 1922), the movement's commitment to explore economic and social life in comprehensive detail gave it an inbuilt dynamism that led it far beyond its origin, theoretically and empirically (Pelletier 1996, 34). In Lebret's case, his explorations extended across all socio-economic spheres in France, to across Europe, to around the world. In contrast, his 'Économie et Humanisme' co-founder Gustave Thibon remained solely in the worlds of Christian and European philosophy and became an ever more conservative French nationalist. Garreau too underlines how Lebret's insistence on empirically applying and testing his ideas meant they were always in evolution. He moved gradually to see that the social Catholic vision of reorganising society on a neo-Thomist model was obsolete. The balance of his work became less evangelical and more development – and economics-oriented (Garreau 1997, Conclusion). The openness to be led by reality and to engage in fundamental dialogue with non-Christian traditions brought a perennial problem for, and even within, Lebret's movement: the fear by some that the work was not sufficiently emphatically and predominantly Christian (Garreau 1997, ch. 6).

Lebret's insistence on starting from and studying in detail actual systems of living led to a series of more specific emphases given his historical-political setting. Emile Poulat (1920–2014) – a worker-priest until the Vatican suppressed the movement and later a leading historian of religion in France – summarised these emphases as follows. First, religion, ethics and politics must respect the fundamental importance of the economy and of an empirically based study of economics. Catholic social teaching had been too narrowly 'social' and had at most covered the ethics of exchange, not seriously considered production. Second, we must try to understand and avoid the deficiencies and inhumanities of capitalism, a system not primarily guided by human needs and instead often crassly indifferent or hostile towards them. Third, the neglect of both these points in much conventional Catholicism and its social doctrine had contributed to the feebleness of its response in counterbalancing and correcting capitalism (Poulat 2011, 10).

To Poulat's list we should add two related features. One concerns Lebret's insistence on the need to study, learn from, critique and transcend Marxism, which in the mid-twentieth century presented itself in France and worldwide as the path for understanding and displacing capitalism. Only serious engagement with Marxism, not casual demonisation, could suffice to respond to its challenge and its strengths. Without real knowledge in this and other areas clerics only made themselves ridiculous to many important audiences. Also absent from Poulat's list of emphases was Lebret's evolution, following the dynamism inbuilt to his approach, towards a global perspective and to become a leading student and spokesman of post-war and post-colonial national and international development. We now consider in turn these two additions to Poulat's list, together with the call for specific attention to capitalism.

3. The necessity to study capitalism, Marxism and human needs

Studying and critiquing capitalism, and seeking to surpass it, became a distinctive plank in Lebret's work. It grew together with an associated priority to study Marxism, with an open mind and to draw from as well as criticise, resist and seek to surpass it too. He had wished in the 1930s to form a Catholic study centre on Marxism but eventually chose the title 'Économie et Humanisme' for his organisation so as to include that focus yet avoid, for both intellectual and strategic reasons, a fixation on Marxism (Malley 1968). The group spread to have teams in a score of French regions and partner centres in many other countries, for example the Centro Latino Americano de Economía Humana (CLAEH), established in 1957 in Uruguay (Berthelot 2018).

The theologian Marie-Dominique Chenu, a famous Dominican contemporary, stressed that Lebret's criticism of capitalism arose in the first instance not from doctrinal debate but from empirical observation (Feix 2007). Lebret was shocked then by what he considered the Church's abandonment of the working classes under capitalism (Garreau 1997, 162). He could see already from the early 1930s that merely aiming for re-Christianisation of fisher communities was insufficient, for their sufferings were determined by a global market-system and a capitalist environment that were in ongoing destructive (as well as creative) crisis. In 1937–1939, he travelled around Europe and the Mediterranean and read on maritime fisheries worldwide. He concluded that 'economic liberalism had in nearly all fisheries generated chaos and poverty' (Lebret and Sauvée 1950, 12).

Further, it proved futile to try to save just one sector from capitalism's grip, one had to tackle the entire system (Pelletier 1996, 33). As in parts of the Catholic worker-oriented movement, Lebret and associates became determined to learn from socialist and Marxist thought where appropriate, taking their rivals seriously and seeking to restore the Church's credibility with working people (Houée 1997, 30).

Horn and Gerard (2001) describe how Lebret read Marx in detail in the late 1930s. After his years of observing fisher communities' lives, he now gradually warmed to Marx: a 'genius', he noted, who had said what Catholics should have been saying for the past century (cited by Pelletier 1996, 114). Lebret concluded that 'there is a lot of truth in Marxism' (1946a, 27). Under capitalism 'greed becomes the law of all activity. We establish an antihuman civilisation' (1946a, 13). Capitalism had led to an inverted hierarchy of values that ignores that 'Truth, goodness, trust, concord, peace, are superior values, which are not measured in money' (1946a, 75). We should not use the same measures

for values of different orders but 'The capitalist regime has universalised the quantitative measurement of values' (1946a, 75). The term 'value' had become disastrously reduced and equated to what has a money valuation. Lebret considered that the West had abandoned its inherited Christian scale of values. Economists thus often remained casual on meanings of 'cost', equating it to only money cost and ignoring most values, even values like trust that are central in economic life (1946a, 125–127).

Lebret championed the tradition in Catholic teaching that property used without reference to the common good was illegitimate and rightfully subject to State intervention (Garreau 1997, 155).⁶ But he went further, for unlike Catholic social teaching he did not stop at criticism of market liberalism. He theorised the specifics of capitalism and its evolution (e.g. Lebret 1946a, 1946b, 1959): the legal granting of predominance to capital, as seen in its retention of net surplus, the right of private banks to create purchasing power, and the emergence of 'omnipotent' financial trusts. Under capitalism, property rights had become inflated into assertions of absolute entitlements without corresponding social obligations. 'Money has all rights' and capitalists come to think they can buy anything (Lebret 1956). In such a system, Catholic moralism – Be a good worker! Be a good employer! – was totally insufficient (Garreau 1997, 219). But he had less faith in the State than did Communists: 'Catholicism trusts the person, Communism trusts Society' (cited by Garreau 1997, 157).

Related to their criticisms of capitalism's treatment of values, Lebret and colleagues employed a theory of human needs. They used it for explanatory as well as evaluative and prescriptive purposes. It deserves further attention in development ethics, for much current human development theory has grown out of critiques of conventional welfare economics but retains its style of abstract theorisation of reasoned choice. In contrast, as we saw, Lebret's approach grew out of engagements with the lives of people, in communities of fisher people, industrial workers or peasants. He adapted the Marxist principles for distribution, including need, as follows: 'From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work, according to his needs and according to his human value' (1946b, 45). For reasons of length, this paper does not consider needs theory in detail.⁷ Suffice it to suggest the space for further work, including to explore how a needs-based approach can be life-based as well as theory-based, and how Lebret emphasised freedom but not in an idealist way divorced from an understanding of need.

He considered that Christians had responded in simplistic ways to Marxism, not sifting out what is strong, and not understanding its dynamism. But Marxism remained, for Lebret, distorted by an exclusive and reductionist materialism that misunderstood human nature and potentials ('distorting the whole system', 1946a, ch. 7). It was essential to replace it with 'the dynamism of the doctrines of human flourishing, the common good and universal salvation brought by Christ' (1946a, 27). The core difference between Christian and Communist thought was, he argued, the former's awareness and solicitude regarding the fragility and yet continuity of the person and the community (1946a, 43). He was strongly critical of Communist practice (e.g. Lebret 1957, 1958b), and expected that, given its lack of insight into human personality, needs and motives, Communism would neither survive in its then locales nor prove successful elsewhere; it would, however, cause severe disruption in various countries (1961, 423–425).

So, Lebret was a radical but not a revolutionary regarding societal reconstruction. He repeatedly endorsed Sweden's achievements (e.g. 1957). For post-war France he initially

proposed a multi-form mixed economy, with sectors of small proprietors, community enterprise, cooperatives and other producer-run enterprises, nationalised industries, and no more than medium-scale private firms. He saw a case for suppressing large capitalists, but not for suppressing the *patronat* in the strict sense, the owners of small and medium enterprises. Such proprietors only required coordination, training and regulation (1946b, 43). In contrast, large-scale capitalism was immoral in its present form. One should decide case-by-case what format of social control was appropriate for large enterprises. His assumption was of a capable paternal developmentalist state. Later, he quietly accepted that his path had not been taken. In the face of both the evolution of the world and instructions from the Catholic hierarchy, Lebret became quiet on mega-capitalism, other than for seeking some forms of social regulation.⁸

In 1947 Lebret spent five months in Brazil (including short visits to her southern neighbours), observing capitalism in operation in a very different environment from Western Europe. He was astonished by the levels of poverty, inequality, exclusion and social antagonism. His lecture course at the Free School of Political Sciences in São Paulo included extensive engagement with Marxism, and he spoke vigorously on the radical implications of the Church's social teaching. This message was not welcome amongst those he described as 'sleeping Christians' (Garreau 1997, 177). His four volumes of lecture notes (including a detailed treatment of the history of ideas relevant to *l'économie humaine*) were never published as such, and return visits to Brazil were prevented during the next four or five years by conservative Church leaders. After intense work there again during 1952–1954, he was impeded once more for some time from returning after the fall of Getulio Vargas in 1954 (Silva Leme 2016; Villas Boas and Folloni 2021). But his long visits had dramatically influenced his perspective and his future trajectory.

4. From family-community-nation to a cosmopolitan globalism

Lebret grew up in a tradition of Catholic communitarian thought that extolled local community and national community. The global community of Christian believers, under the hierarchy of the Church, was real too but the Church's main focus was, in principle, on eternity rather than earthly affairs other than for creditworthy but super-erogatory charity. Earthly authority lay in the family, the professions and in the national State and its laws. Lebret subscribed at the time to the Vichy Government's statement of *Principes de la Communauté*, of which the first was this: 'Man derives his fundamental rights from nature. But they are only guaranteed to him by the communities that surround him: the family that brings him up, the profession that nourishes him, the nation that protects him' (Pétain 1941). Later he remained committed to these ideals of community and the common good, but his frames evolved beyond only local and national to a form of cosmopolitan globalism: people should exercise solidarity not only within family, locality and nation but worldwide. He came by the late 1940s to advocate very seriously the tradition from the Fathers of the Church that 'man is in solidarity with the whole human race' (cited by Garreau 1997, 154) and to extend to the level of nations the rule that the rich should share their excess with the poor (cited by Garreau 1997, 160). This became central in what he meant by 'une éthique du développement'.

4.1. Communitarianism and 'le bien commun' (the common good)

Until the late 1940s, Lebreton's work was overwhelmingly on France and he originally drew partly, like many intellectuals of the period, on an idealised image of mediaeval European society (Houée 1997, 25). The goal was to restore imagined lost equilibria: 'The great problem of civilisation for our time is to restore balance, to restore balance to man and to human communities' (Lebreton 1946a, 122). People were viewed as like plants, suggest Astier and Laé (1991, 87): they need to be rooted and sheltered in a balanced ordered local community. The corporatism of trades and professions was seen as providing a basis for such communities even in urban settings. But at the same time, the individual person was unique and precious: 'society is a society of persons, i.e., absolute, inviolable beings who nevertheless are not secondarily but intrinsically social' (Calvez 2004, 314). Communitarianism was presented as a third way between the selfish individualism of capitalism and the centralised collectivism of Communism (see. e.g. Cohen 2004; Maritain 1946).

Lebreton was a devotee of the fecund Aristotelian-Thomist notion of 'the common good' (Lavigne 2007). This term evoked an entire Thomist philosophy and in his usage could refer or link to any of many related themes besides the well-being of a community and a principle of collective benefit; for example: our shared providential inheritance of a bountiful universe, and of local and national communities; specific public goods, some of them material and some spiritual/cultural; the entirety of conditions which promote the well-being of a community and of its members; and more (cf. Houée 1997, 20–21; Lebreton 1947b, chs. 1, 2, 14, 28). Since persons are seen not as isolated individuals but as only able to flourish in community, in relation with other persons, the well-being of a community must be conceived as not merely a sum of independently determinate states of individuals. In addition to our shared dependence on shared conditions and on each other, the community is more than the sum of separate parts because each person's identity is linked to the community and our key source of meaning is through interactions with others.

In 1946 Lebreton was focused still on the nation and intra-national arrangements. People were members of a nation, that had made them ('La Patrie ... [est] ce qui nous a faits': 1946b, 64), indeed they were members of a national family ('par analogie avec la famille'). 'It is normal that we defend our homeland up to shedding our blood, even our life' (1946b, 64). 'Better and more than the Nazi, the Christian knows the providential role of nations, but he asks that nations, like men, have constant concern for the common good' (1946a, 47–48). Lebreton's elaboration of what this required focused at that time on restoration of 'intermediate communities', rather than a reference to other nations. While he declared that within a nation 'All its riches are for all men', and that resources belong across all generations not just to this one (1946b, 74, 77), he remained in that period a loyal French nationalist and benevolent colonialist. In a chapter on 'Hérités et Traditions' he remarked that while some families are better than others, 'everyone should keep ... his traditions [*sang pur*]' (1946a, 66); but also that 'A race that has reason to believe itself superior must not exploit other races, but serve with them the common cause of advancing humanity' (1946a, 66). A few years later, however, he spoke of the sin of 'having few children and yet being closed to immigration' (1952b, 179).

So, given a perspective of territorial communities, the Catholic notion of the common good seen as good of the community had initially for Lebreton primarily a territorial

character. As his perspective evolved to be global, the common good became a principle of global scope and the core of his ethics for development. Like Maritain, one of his inspirators, he evolved into a globalist and thought of a global common good (cf. Barbieri 2001). He not only frequently cited the parable of the Good Samaritan, he demanded its application at the world-scale (e.g. Lebet 1957).

4.2. *Becoming a globalist*

From his early days, Lebet had a strong international awareness (Houée 1997, part 1; Pelletier 1996). A naval officer with experience in World War One and later in Lebanon, he was a product too of the milieu of Breton fishers and sailors, people who crossed the world. His 1930s work on fisheries made him a globalist in some types of analysis. The livelihoods of French fishing communities could not be sensibly addressed without studying the global fisheries industry and understanding it as part of global capitalist systems.

From the late 1940s he quite rapidly became an ethical globalist too, like various contemporaries inside and outside the Church. While the unity of humanity had been a theological theme since at least the early nineteenth century (Koshy and Santa Ana 2006), growing global interconnection and destructive conflicts made the theme more vivid and urgent. Further, 'belonging to [i.e., working in] the Catholic Church opened many doors on to the entire world' (Tablada Pérez 2018, 602). Lebet's long Latin American visits and his travels elsewhere transformed his mindset and emphases. Between 1947 and 1958, he visited more than 40 countries in five continents (Lebet 1958b).

He came to emphasise, first, how globalisation had already produced a global society (1956, 17). Second, he became preoccupied with the world situation as revealed by the new systems for social statistics coordinated by the United Nations: unprecedented population growth, widespread hunger and sickness, high and growing inequality, rapid emergence of huge slums (Lebet 1957, 1958a). Helder Camara, the radical Brazilian Archbishop, wrote that both Lebet and Cardijn came to think that 'the social struggle of our time has taken on planetary dimensions' and that the North–South division was more important than East–West divisions (Camara 1974). Third, he came to see how isolated his own Church was from this emerging reality and from the circuits of relevant global secular institutions (Garreau 1997, 243), and how it had crippled itself intellectually by its habit of sweeping proscription of new schools of thought, leaving itself unable to convincingly counterbalance the dominant materialisms.

Fourth, Lebet (1952c) asserted the need for an ethics of development and a 'new civilisation'. His 1957 paper 'Requirements and conditions for a new civilisation' articulated the foundational issue of development ethics: humankind's expanding technical powers and ability now to provide, for example, sufficient food and clean water for everyone, yet the continuing or increasing deprivation for huge and growing numbers (1957, 80). This formulation combined a focus on local specifics with a global frame of reference. It was no longer tolerable to dismiss poor countries as 'backward; now they must be seen as underdeveloped' (Lebet 1966). A new world ethic was needed because, facing these challenges and opportunities, as surveyed in great depth in *Suicide ou Survie de l'Occident?* (Lebet 1958a), we see prevailing national and personal selfishnesses: a 'politics of the shopkeeper ... of small grocers discussing their profits' (1957, 84). He called for 'universal

solidarity before self-enrichment' and held that the term 'civilisation' was empty if rich countries did not prioritise helping the poor worldwide (cited by Garreau 1997, 275).

So, fifth, he insisted the ethics of development should be a global ethic: 'a message of universal justice and solidarity' (1954; cited by Garreau 1997, 261). His writings from the mid-1950s onwards were full of calls for 'a new international politics, oriented towards a civilisation of development of the whole earth' (Lebret 1952c; cited by Garreau 1997, 262). A 1956 special issue of *Économie et Humanisme* was devoted to 'International solidarity and global wealth', and from then on, all his books advocated the ethical necessity of global solidarity. Jean-Claude Lavigne highlights how 'In a book that [would] catch the attention of Mamadou Dia and Léopold Sédar Senghor [the emergent leaders of Senegal], *Suicide ou Survie de l'Occident?*, Lebret pleads for global thinking, a vision of the issues on a global scale' (2007, 11).⁹ He used international comparisons not merely to say that less fortunate nations should seek to imitate more fortunate ones but to argue for global responsibilities, given the unity of humanity both causally and ethically. 'There is no solution except in an ethic of the Universal. There is no longer a solution in the ethics of small groups, nor *a fortiori* in ethics of individuals' (Lebret 1957, 88).

Sixth, his perspective became increasingly ecumenical. Until the 1950s, Lebret would argue that the notion of 'the human person' was by origin Christian not Marxist, associated with ideas that God had made man in his image and had become human (1946a, part 13; 1951). It had been rearticulated in reaction to capitalism by a line of Christian humanist thinkers, including well before Marx, such as his fellow Breton de Lamennais (1782–1854) (Garreau 1997, ch. 8; Gigacz 2021). But later, as in his 1959 Manifesto, he became emphatic that 'l'économie humaine' and integral development were not specifically Christian notions and could appeal to all people of goodwill, Christian or not, religious or not. His work with non-Christians, in France, Senegal, Lebanon and elsewhere, showed him that not only could these ideas be translated and absorbed (or already found) in non-Christian traditions but that they must be, in order to become widely accepted and used.

4.3. Elements of globalism and a global development ethic

Speaking at a memorial event for Lebret in Dakar, his Dominican colleague Moreau commented that 'What is striking in all [his] texts ... is this stress on totality ... Father Lebret, departing from the small port of St. Malo, experiencing the interweaving of all things' (1966, 53), came more and more to stress universal connections and interdependence. Since the 1940s he had shared Thibon (1945)'s theme of 'community of shared fate' (*communauté de destin*), meaning any group whose members' lives are intertwined such that none can flourish in the long term if some of them are neglected: a notion of common (shared) human security. As summarised by Astier and Laé, 'only the community of destiny can bring solidarity to men who share spiritually or materially the same existence, when they are subject to the same risks ...' (1991, 91). Unlike Thibon, Lebret went on to recognise all humanity as a community of fate. He warned, not least in *Suicide*, that humanity's present path jeopardised its entire future, for the rich as well as the poor. For 'humanity wears itself out in a multitude of ridiculous little fights, while there is one great fight that humanity can only win by being united' (1957, 87). From at least the mid-1950s he argued that material

improvement in the South was essential for international peace (Garreau 1997, ch. 9: 'L.-J. Lebreton et la promotion d'une éthique moderne du développement'). He helped then to prepare the way for *Populorum Progressio's* declaration that 'development is the new name for peace'.

Second, the required new ethics of development involved both a personal level and a policy level. Marc Feix notes how the second manifesto of 'Économie et Humanisme', published in 1959 under the title 'Pour une civilisation solidaire', called for changing individuals' thinking to recognise and respond to the challenges in the post-war world such as population growth. He summarises as follows:

It is about acquiring a new "personal ethic" in developing and developed countries alike. But this ethic is not enough: it will have to move to the collective level. This level is that of groups, of power, of international cooperation. (Feix 2007, 32)

Third, the required universalist perspective must not attempt imposition of uniformity. Universal solidarity will only be possible through intercultural respect (Garreau 1997, 319). While Lebreton's book on the common good (1947b; first published in 1940) was still a Christian missionary statement, he later realised the insufficiency of relying on Catholic vehicles for social and global change and the futility of expecting to Christianise the world (Garreau 1997, 424). Instead, Catholics, seriously knowledgeable Catholics, had to participate intensively in wider fora, towards the goal of full development of all people, via solidarity between all people. Lebreton remained a devout Catholic but respectful of other doctrines' resilience and bases of strength. He came to accept ecumenism: 'We must accept a pluralist civilisation, but of international solidarity' (from a 1964 panel discussion quoted by Garreau 1997, 327). In his end-of-life 'testament' to Roland Colin, his successor in IRFED, he considered 'it is essential to widen Ecumenism beyond the Christian world' (cited by Colin 2010). In *Suicide* (1958a) he made much reference to Gandhi and in the 1960s he often cited Tagore, as done at length in his final editorial. This declared that development must build from and work with the values in each civilisation (Lebreton 1966). The Lebreton-IRFED Centre proceeded in that spirit, and its journal was emphatically titled *Développement et Civilisations*, the latter term in plural.

Fourth, fundamental reorientations were required in the North, for the sake of peace, for facilitation of the South, for ethical decency, and for its own flourishing. *Suicide* was one of the studies that contributed to the partial move beyond colonial relationships and to creation of the intellectual and organisational infrastructure and budgetary machinery of international development cooperation. Lebreton advocated the term 'cooperation' not 'assistance', for he saw solidarity as involving recognition, treating people with respect, giving them the feeling and reality of independence, not of being a dependant or beggar (Garreau 1997, 350, 380).

Further, he noted disintegrative cultural impacts of the West on the South and in the West itself. He feared that false materialist values from the West and the preoccupation with having endlessly more were corrupting elites in the South, displacing 'family values, values of solidarity, values of simple joy, sometimes also spiritual values ... these cannot be replaced by counterfeit and imitated values' (1961, 426). While he steadily criticised Communism, which was another sort of materialism, one that threatened all respect for persons (1958b, 11), he bestowed special critical attention on groups from

whom he expected more, excoriating Western selfishness and blindness, ‘the scandal of the greed of affluent nations’ (1962a, 16). In his view, the revolts in the South were by peoples who had not been loved, against those who should have loved them (1958b, 15–16).

So, for Lebreton: ‘The internal dynamics of development are closely dependent on a generalised ethical renewal. ... all purely materialistic efforts will fail. Saving the world can only be accomplished by creating conditions of friendship. Friendship is communion, between equals, in an authentic good’ (1961, 427). An appropriate global system required not only *Économie Humaine* as defined by him (an ethics-guided practice-oriented economics), but also *Politique Humaine* and *Civilisation Humaine*: as in his fuller sense of *Économie Humaine*, a desired social order.

Fifth, expressed the other way round, reforming the colonial world system required not just sentiments of solidarity but reforms of the systems of relations between rich and poor countries, including the economic and trading structures. At the first meeting of UNCTAD, representing the Holy See, Lebreton declared: ‘The totality of the world’s resources must be exploited in such a way that all humanity is the beneficiary’ (cited by Berthelot 2018, 9). He drew on the work of Raul Prebisch and associates in UNECLA and later UNCTAD, on how underdeveloped countries were subject to low and often relatively declining primary product prices in global markets. Later he introduced into *Populorum Progressio* a call for just prices and argued for guaranteed minima (Garreau 1997, 375–381; Feix 2007).

Lebreton could speak so boldly because he felt confident that Popes John XXIII and Paul VI were committed to global solidarity, across as well as within nations. Attacked as a ‘Marxist’ in the 1940s and 1950s, he was safe after 1958 under John XXIII and invulnerable from 1962 when made head of the Vatican delegation to UN negotiations on development (Garreau 1997, Conclusion). During Vatican II, he became a major adviser to progressive prelates such as Camara, who openly assailed the Council’s initial relative neglect of the lives of the majority of humankind. We should ask now how far that new perspective survived, and how far Lebreton’s other emphases, including on a methodological shift to starting from life rather than from theory, and on deep study of economy, capitalism and Marxism, were absorbed and have endured.

5. A legacy within Catholicism

To Poulat (2011), Lebreton was a faithful but innovative inheritor of the tradition of Catholic social ethics established in the late nineteenth century, notably by the 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. He had emerged as a Catholic intellectual in the era of Pope Pius XI (1922–1939), who sought to re-Christianise increasingly secular societies, had warned against both socialism and uncontrolled capitalism, and had supported co-operative and communitarian approaches. However, from intense interaction with non-believers and other non-Catholics, Lebreton was clear already by the 1940s that the ideal of ‘l’économie humaine’ rested on a natural-law type ethic that could be shared with non-Christians and non-believers (Garreau 1997, 210). He aimed to create ‘a Catholic social discourse that everyone could understand’ (Garreau 1997, 418).

Pelletier’s notable intellectual biography (1996) put more stress than did Poulat on the innovative dynamic in Lebreton’s work. ‘Économie et Humanisme’ was a movement of loyal Catholic practitioners who yet came, in Pelletier’s view more through experience than

through theorising, to develop radical new perspectives. Writing in the 1990s in an era of Western triumph and the dominance of John Paul II, Pelletier judged the movement though as a thing of the past. It had always been marginal in relation to both Roman power and Parisian power and even had according to him a provincial Lyonnais character! (1996, 8). Possibly Poulat and Pelletier, both of whose work focused within France, somewhat misjudged Lebret. 'Économie et Humanisme', Pelletier's focus, was the second but not the last of the vehicles Lebret worked through. It arose after the fishermen's movement but before his writings and institution-building on global development and before his final period of articulating development doctrine for the global Catholic Church. Seen from today, in the time of Pope Francis, and viewed globally, Lebret may seem less a man of the past. Paul VI saw him as 'a man arrived from the future' (Poupard 1987, 3).

In terms of both method and content, Lebret and associates had an important impact on Catholic social doctrine. Stefan Gigacz stresses Lebret's meeting with Paul VI on 25 September 1963 that gained the latter's support for starting a new study for the Second Council

[from] the realities of the world rather than with an exposition of the doctrine of the Church. The outcome was that Lebret was appointed as a peritus to work on Schema XIII [that grew into *Gaudium et Spes*] in March 1964 (Houée: 178), a role in which he would continue until the end of the Council ... (Gigacz 2017; see also Bordeyne 2005)

His language of 'other forms of social control over goods' besides private property, for example, entered *Gaudium* (Calvez 2006, 51).

Thanks to the 'diagnosis' paper that Lebret wrote for Schema XIII about the changing world, Paul VI asked him to make the first drafts of what became *Populorum Progressio*.¹⁰ Even after the contributions of the Pope himself, his secretary Poupard, and others, Lebret's imprint is very evident. Not only are 'Portions of at least 11 paragraphs of [the finalised encyclical] ... taken nearly verbatim' from his book *Le Drame du Siècle* (1960) (Heidt 2017, 12), but much else of his thinking is prominent (Bosi 2012 provides an itemisation; see also Poupard 1987).¹¹ In terms of contents, the encyclical highlighted the concept of Integral Human Development, and the formula of 'all people and all of the person' that Lebret had continuously promoted. In terms of approach, it is far more concrete and less abstracted than traditional Catholic teaching, offering 'a new language' (Garreau 1997, 418) that has inspired much of the engagement since then by Catholic development agencies (see, e.g. Heinrich et al. 2008). '*Populorum Progressio* was structured around a see, judge, act framework. The [explanation] becomes pretty clear when we consider the people principally involved in the drafting of the document, beginning with the French Dominican Louis-Joseph Lebret' (Gigacz 2017).¹²

Despite major resistance inside and outside the Catholic Church (*The Wall Street Journal* called it 'warmed-up Marxism'), *Populorum Progressio* took root and was built on by Papal encyclicals in 1987, 2009 and 2015. There was, however, lesser and a less lasting impact regarding Lebret's other priorities: studying capitalism, learning from Marxism, and recognising needs for societal transformations. In other words, he and his associates did not create a breakthrough that would have led the mainstream Catholic Church to acceptance of the liberation theologians. François Houtart suggested that Catholic reformists – as he too was in the 1950s to 1970s – have followed the Church's social teaching by

analysing in terms not of class but merely of social strata, even when they called those 'classes' (Tablada Pérez 2018, 106). They promoted cross-class collaboration rather than autonomous Christian worker movements; 'the common good was considered as an alliance between social groups' (73).¹³

Lebret himself was from the JOC tradition and drew conclusions for system-change both at national and international levels, expressed in his writings of the 1940s and 1950s. Like Houtart, he was against reducing the Church's 'social' activities to charity which did nothing to change social structures and instead legitimated ruling elites (Tablada Pérez 2018, 76). 'The social palliative appears insufficient; we must go further and prepare structures more favourable to the human development of workers', he wrote (Lebret 1953; cited by Garreau 1997, 415). His fishermen's movement had launched 1500 legal actions against capitalist groups and his advisory work in Latin America advocated agrarian reform (Berthelot 2014). Garreau argues that Lebret's work made many Catholics realise, at least intellectually, that the social doctrine implied by the Gospel could not be limited to giving alms and running schools and clinics but must focus on remedying unjust structures. Regarding the forms of remedy, Lebret had moved beyond any fixed blueprint and beyond medieval-inspired dreams, to a pragmatic focus on whatever was feasible and promoted human development in a given situation.

His goal was to guide the Church 'towards a dialogue with the world' and to make it no longer archaic but 'dynamic, in solidarity, close to the excluded' (Garreau 2011, 15). However, unlike some liberation theologians, he was not willing to confront the Church hierarchy or to align himself with revolutionary movements, in the years before his premature death in 1966. He distrusted the aggressive atheism of most Communism and some socialists. And under inquisition from the hierarchy in the 1950s he retreated sometimes to the stance that 'The essential mission of the Church is ... not the revolution for justice' (cited by Garreau 1997, 285). But nor did he accept mainstream contemporary capitalism. Instead, he was deeply impressed by Swedish social democracy (Lebret 1957; Garreau 1997, 220): a society without classes, by his standards, which had promoted justice and well-being without taking a Leninist path.

6. Lebret, human development and Anglophone development ethics

At the end of his life, Lebret was confident that 'l'homme et la durée', the human person and a long-term perspective (Lebret 1966), were now inserted into the conception of economic development in United Nations circles. His group's work and his involvement in UN activities during the previous 15 years had contributed. Already in the 1950s, 30 and more years before the UNDP 'human development' wave, IRFED and the associated journals, book series and sister organisations had been founded explicitly as promoters of humane and people-centred development. They drew on and extended 20 preceding years of work by Lebret and his associates to 'put the economy at the service of man', and to promote 'integral development' ('development for all persons and of all the person') and, more grandly put, the human ascent ('la montée humaine'; Lebret 1951): a historically and ethically situated notion of human development and the development of peoples. While far from the only source or channel for such ideas of 'human development', Lebret and his group were major contributors and communicators regarding the guiding values, themes, language and policy perspectives. We can review these in turn.

Guiding values. Anglophone development ethics and UN human development work have absorbed principles that Lebrét articulated strongly from the 1940s, for rejection of 'the autonomy of economic science': in explanation (because 'man is at the origin of both production and consumption'); in evaluation, by 'orienting economics entirely towards its human ends' (cited by Garreau 1997, 205); and in prescription, by increasing emphasis on human agency – development must be the result of an aspiration from below as well as impulsion from above (Lebrét 1962b, 143). Aspirations may need to be stimulated, educated, animated, but we start from the universal human aspiration to be more and to be worth more (Lebrét 1956, 17).

For Mahbub ul Haq and Amartya Sen, main articulators of the later UNDP version of human development, one of their teachers at Cambridge had connected them to such ideas. 'Haq, Sen and their closest colleagues all acknowledge that the [proximate] origin of the [UNDP] human development idea is in the work of their most important teacher in the 1950s, Barbara Ward' (Murphy 2015, 165). Ward was a progressive Catholic, deeply involved in both United Nations and Catholic policy circles, for example as lead author of *Only One Earth*, the background document for the first UN conference on environment and development (Ward and Dubos 1972). She and Lebrét worked together in 1966 in the preparatory committee for the Vatican's Justice and Peace Commission (Gartlan 2010, 141).

Themes: freedom, agency, democracy. Lebrét shared the emphases characteristic of later Anglophone human development thinkers, in a nuanced form. 'Our greatness is to be able to understand and choose, to be masters of our actions and of matter, responsible for the construction of our lives' (1947b, 73). This emphasis on freedom was always linked to reasoning. The more one gains self-control, reflective capacity, the more one is free (1946a, Section 31); duty 'is in fact the conquest of freedom, ... the momentum towards the better, ... the law of the being who is eager to grow' (1946a, 83). Democracy exists in many types, including economic democracy not only electoral democracy. Essential for all forms to prosper is education. Dangerous is 'demagogic democracy', the notion that 'the people are always right' (1946a, 114).

Language. Not only were the principles those of human development, so was the language that Lebrét used. It anticipated that adopted later by Haq, Sen or Martha Nussbaum: 'the human economy, as a regime, would be an economy whose very functioning, in countries of different development in the short and the long term, would not only not hinder, but promote human development' (Lebrét 1956, 16).

In the case of man, a being endowed with freedom, development also includes the blossoming of properly human, voluntary, spiritual faculties. The development of man is the blossoming of everything in himself, in a partially determined harmony and partially dependent on his free choices. (Lebrét 1966)

Policy perspective. Compared to later Anglophone human development writings, including in most of the academic strands and not only in necessarily inhibited UN publications, Lebrét was more outspoken against predominant economic and social systems. We need 'a total revolution' (1956, 28), to establish an appropriate global system. He was notably critical of mainstream Americanism and what he considered its crass materialism, myth of endless economic growth and assertion that it represented the universally appropriate model (see, e.g. Lebrét 1958b). His diagnosis of required shifts away from consumerism and

individualism matches the sort of perspective articulated later by, for example, the Great Transition Initiative group (Raskin et al. 2002; and <https://greattransition.org/>).

Of the emphases in Lebret's work – on understanding economic systems, human needs, and capitalism not only 'development'; on learning from and critically confronting Marxism; and on adopting a global frame for human solidarity – some but not all are found in later work that identifies as being on human development or development ethics. Pursuing these comparisons in more depth requires other papers than the present one.¹⁴

7. Conclusion

Lebret was a man of the mid-twentieth century, who addressed a world prior to our contemporary super-charged 'turbo-capitalism' (Luttwak 1998) and who assumed the presence of States and other actors who were able to sufficiently steer. He was very aware, though, that technique alone was completely insufficient. By late career he had become strongly preoccupied with needs for 'une éthique du développement' (Garreau 1997, chs. 12, 13). His 1963 article with that name (Lebret 1963b) warned, however, of the general contempt for ethics talk that he found prevalent amongst practitioners in the worlds of affairs, given the shortage of ethicists who had sufficient knowledge of any of those practical worlds. His life-project was to counteract that.

There has perhaps been no other development ethicist with Lebret's degree of practical orientation and experience. Besides his emphasis on the necessity for ethicists to be deeply grounded in social sciences, not least economics, and in social and economic practice, his insistence on the importance of studying the specifics and dynamics of capitalism continues to be strongly relevant. Insofar as development ethics' role lies in functioning as an inter-disciplinary practice-oriented intellectual meeting-ground (Gasper 2012), greater familiarity with the legacy of Lebret and his group will be valuable. Even if one does not accept all his formulations and judgements, there is much to be learnt from revisiting his career, his research agenda and his impressive works.

Notes

1. This paper draws extensively from Garreau's intellectual biography because of her detailed use of the full range of Lebret's publications, correspondence, notes and journal.
2. A famous example was a 1958 textbook on economic development by MIT professor Charles Kindleberger; its Preface admitted that he had never visited a low-income country.
3. This article uses italics when referring to the journal and quotation marks when referring to the group and publication house.
4. See, Gigacz (2021) and, e.g., <http://cardijnresearch.blogspot.com/2013/09/the-emergence-of-jocist-method.html>. For details on JOC methods see: <http://www.josephcardijn.fr/1930---la-methode-jociste>. On how Lebret was influenced by and applied the approach, see <http://cardijnresearch.blogspot.com/2017/04/louis-joseph-lebret-architect-of.html>. For more on these streams of work, see <http://www.stefangigacz.com/>
5. This was despite earlier adoption of the principle of 'see-judge-act' in John XXIII's 1961 encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (paragraph 236). The Belgian priest and radical developmentalist François Houtart (1925–2017) was secretary of a working group for *Gaudium et Spes* and underlined the continuing battle required, and how compared to traditional Catholic theologising – proceeding deductively from declared axioms and supposed revealed truths – *Gaudium et Spes* started from study of the world (<http://cardijnresearch.blogspot.com/>

- 2017/06/marx-houtart-wojtyla-and-see-section-of.html). Houtart drafted the introductory section on The Human Condition in the World of Today, drawing on his 1961 book *The Church in the World* (Tablada Pérez 2018, 125).
6. Pope Francis returned to the use of private property for the common good in *Fratelli Tutti*, para.120: http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20201003_enciclica-fratelli-tutti.html.
 7. See, e.g., Lebreton and Gatheron (1947), Lebreton et al. (1956), Feix (2007) and Gasper (2021).
 8. He never went as far as did Houtart later, who argued that modernity 'had been absorbed by the logic of capitalism' (cited by Tablada Pérez 2018, 293).
 9. For a pointed statement of this global ethics perspective, see Lebreton's foreword to the 4th edition (1962a).
 10. See also:- <http://www.stefangigacz.com/2017--the-cardijn-hermeneutic-in-populorum-progressio>
 11. *Le Drame du Siècle* was a shorter popular version of *Suicide* (Lebreton 1958a, 1960).
 12. Heidt (2017) presents Lebreton and Maritain, himself long a target for suppression by some Catholic reactionaries, as the main influences on *Populorum Progressio*; Lebreton as chief drafter, Maritain as an inspiration to Paul VI over several decades. *Populorum Progressio* quoted twice from Maritain's *Humanisme Intégrale* (1936). However, the elements drawn from Maritain (e.g., 'the complete development of the human person', Heidt 19) had been absorbed in Lebreton's work decades earlier.
 13. Houtart warned that: 'In the interpretation of many Christian scholars there are no structurally antagonistic interests which prevent successful cooperation between different social actors in favor of the common good. [The concept] can thus be included into capitalism, and can even legitimize this mode of production ...' (quoted from Houtart (2011, 2013), in an obituary at https://rosalux-ba.org/en/2017/06/07/common_good_of_humanity/). So critical social movements have to refashion the concept; Houtart, like Lebreton, reconceived it at the world scale.
 14. A comparison with the work of Lebreton's protégé Denis Goulet is essayed in Culebro and Gasper (2021).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Séverine Deneulin, Jean-Luc Dubois, Stefan Gigacz, Javier Iguñiz Echevarria, Cristóbal Kay and Christine Koggel, for helpful suggestions or materials. Responsibility for views expressed in the paper rests solely with the author.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Des Gasper is professor emeritus of Human Development, Development Ethics and Public Policy at the International Institute of Social Studies (The Hague), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands. His publications include *The Ethics of Development: From economism to human development* (Edinburgh University Press 2004; SAGE India 2005) and *Development Ethics* (International Library of Essays in Public and Professional Ethics, Ashgate 2010 and Routledge 2016, co-edited with Asuncion Lera St. Clair).

ORCID

Des Gasper  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4614-5454>

References

- Astier, Isabelle, and Jean-François Laé. 1991. "La notion de communauté dans les enquêtes sociales sur l'habitat en France. Le groupe d'Économie et Humanisme, 1940-1955." *Genèses* 5: 81–106. https://www.persee.fr/doc/genes_1155-3219_1991_num_5_1_1078.
- Barbieri, William. 2001. "Beyond the Nations: The Expansion of the Common Good in Catholic Social Thought." *The Review of Politics* 63 (4): 723–754.
- Becker, Charles, Pierre-Paul Missehougbe, and Philippe Verdin, eds. 2007. *Le père Lebre, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957–1963)*. Paris: Karthal.
- Berthelot, Yves. 2014. "Louis-Joseph Lebre (1897-1966)." In *Vers une économie 'humaine'? – Desroche, Lebre, Lefebvre, Mounier, Perroux*, edited by Laurent Loty, Perrault Jean-Louis, and Tortajada Ramón, 51–60. Paris: Hermann.
- Berthelot, Yves. 2018. "Louis-Joseph Lebre, une vie au service des hommes." [www.rieh.org louis-joseph-lebre](http://www.rieh.org/louis-joseph-lebre).
- Bordeyne, Philippe. 2005. "L'appel à la justice face au désir d'être plus homme. L'apport de Louis-Joseph Lebre à la rédaction de *Gaudium et Spes*." *Oikonomia: Rivista di etica e scienze sociali – Journal of Ethics and Social Sciences* 4 (2): 6–14.
- Bosi, Alfredo. 2012. "Economy and Humanism." *Estudos Avancados* 26 (75): 249–265.
- Calvez, Jean-Yves. 2004. "The French Catholic Contribution to Social and Political Thinking in the 1930s." *Ethical Perspectives* 7: 312–315.
- Calvez, Jean-Yves. 2006. *Chrétiens Penseurs du Social, Vol.2: L'après-guerre (1945-1967)*. Paris: Cerf.
- Camara, Helder. 1974. "Preface." In *Cardijn*, edited by M. Fiévez and J. Meert. Brussels: Ouvrière.
- Cohen, Antonin. 2004. "Vers la révolution communautaire. Rencontres de la troisième voie au temps de l'ordre nouveau." *Revue D'histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 51–52: 141–161.
- Colin, Roland. 2010. "Louis-Joseph Lebre: Confronting the Shock of Decolonisation and Development." *Development and Civilisations* 387-388: 2–3. Oct.-Nov. 2010. www.lebre-irfed.org/IMG/pdf/387-388_oct-nov_Special-Lebre_EN.pdf.
- Culebro, Montserrat, and Des Gasper. 2021. "Two Pioneers of Development Ethics: Louis-Joseph Lebre and Denis Goulet." *Journal of Global Ethics* (this issue).
- Feix, Marc. 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* 243: 9–48. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-d-ethique-et-de-theologie-morale-2007-1-page-9.htm>.
- Garreau, Lydie. 1997. *L.-J. Lebre, Un Homme Traqué, 1897-1966*. Villeurbanne: Editions Golias.
- Garreau, Lydie. 2011. *Louis-Joseph Lebre, Precurseur du Vatican II*. E-Book Reissue of Garreau 1997. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Garlan, Jean. 2010. *Barbara Ward: Her Life and Letters*. London: Continuum.
- Gasper, Des. 2008. "Denis Goulet and the Project of Development Ethics: Choices in Methodology, Focus and Organization." *Journal of Human Development* 9 (3): 453–474.
- Gasper, Des. 2012. "Development Ethics – Why? What? How? A Formulation of the Field." *Journal of Global Ethics* 8 (1): 117–135.
- Gasper, Des. 2021. "See-Judge-Act: The Embedded Research of Louis-Joseph Lebre." Draft manuscript.
- Gigacz, Stefan. 2017. "Louis Joseph Lebre: Architect of *Populorum Progressio*." <http://www.cardijnresearch.org/2017/04/louis-joseph-lebre-architect-of.html>.
- Gigacz, Stefan. 2021. *The Leaven in the Council – Joseph Cardijn and the JOCist Network at Vatican II*. Melbourne: Australian Cardijn Institute Cooperative Ltd. <http://theleaven.com.au/>.
- Heidt, Mari Rapela. 2017. "Development, Nations and 'The Signs of the Times'." *Populorum Progressio: 50 Years*, *Special Issue of Journal of Moral Theology* 6 (1): 1–20.
- Heinrich, Geoff, David Leege, and Carrie Miller. 2008. *A User's Guide to the CRS Integral Human Development (IHD)*. Baltimore, MD: Catholic Relief Services.
- Horn, Gerd-Rainer, and Emmanuel Gerard. 2001. *Left Catholicism 1943-1955: Catholics and Society in Western Europe at the Point of Liberation*. Louvain: Leuven University Press.
- Houée, P. 1997. *Un Éveilleur d'Humanité: Louis-Joseph Lebre*. Paris: Les Éditions de l'Atelier/Les Éditions Ouvrières.

- Houtart, François. 2011. "The Common Good of Humanity." https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277262730_From_common_goods_to_the_common_good_of_humanity.
- Houtart, François. 2013. *Le Bien Commun de l'Humanité*. Paris: Couleurs Livres.
- Koshy, Ninan, and Julio de Santa Ana. 2006. "The Meaning of Ecumenical." In *Beyond Idealism*, edited by J. Santa Ana, 30–55. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lavigne, Jean-Claude. 2007. "Le développement au Sénégal: utopie et réalisme des intuitions du Père Lebreton." In *Le père Lebreton, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957–1963)*, edited by Charles Becker, Pierre-Paul Misshougue, and Philippe Verdin, 5–18. Paris: Karthala.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1946a. *Guide Du Militant. Tome Premier: Les Forces a l'Assaut du Monde; Les Principes – Valeurs et Antivaluers*. L'Arbresle (Rhône): Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1946b. *Guide Du Militant. Tome Deuxième: Programme Constructif – Une Nouvelle Pédagogie*. L'Arbresle (Rhône): Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1947a. *De l'efficacité politique du chrétien*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1947b. *Découverte Du Bien Commun – Mystique D'un Monde Nouveau*. Paris: Économie et Humanisme. First published 1940.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1951. *Montée Humaine*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1952a. *Guide Pratique de L'Enquête Sociale. Vol I: Manuel de L'Enquêteur*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1952b. *Rajeunir L'Examen de Conscience*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1952c. *Phases et rythmes de civilisation - Orientation et méthodes de solution*. Économie et Humanisme. no. 74.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1953. "L'économie, le social et les moralistes chrétiens." *Recherches et débats*, cahier 5, Oct. 5–15.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1954. "Note sociologique sur les difficultés actuelle dans l'Église." National Archives of France, https://www.siv.archives-nationales.culture.gouv.fr/siv/rechercheconsultation/consultation/ir/exportXML.action?irId=FRAN_IR_013119.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1956. "Introduction Générale. Économie Humaine, Politique et Civilisation." In *Économie et Civilisation*, Vol. 1, edited by L.-J. Lebreton, A. Piettre, Alfred Sauvy, and R. Delprat, 10–30. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1957. "Exigences et conditions d'une nouvelle civilisation." Lecture, Dakar, 19 December 1957. In *Le père Lebreton, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957–1963)*, edited by Charles Becker, Pierre-Paul Misshougue, and Philippe Verdin, 73–92. Paris: Karthala.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1958a. *Suicide Ou Survie de L'Occident? Dossier pour comprendre notre temps*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1958b. "Le tour du monde en 16 questions - Interview du R. P. Lebreton, O. P." In: *Somme-nous en Révolution?*, 5–27. Paris: Informations Catholiques Internationales.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1959. *Manifeste pour une Civilisation Solidaire*. Supplement, revue *Économie et Humanisme*. Reissued as Lebreton 1963a.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1960. *Le drame du siècle: misère, sousdéveloppement, inconscience, espoir*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1961. *Dynamique concrète de développement*. With inputs by Paul Borel, Raymond Delprat, and J.-M. Albertini. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1962a. Foreword, 4th edition of *Suicide Ou Survie de L'Occident?* Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1962b. "Les conditions sine qua non de la planification dans un pays sous-développé." In *Le père Lebreton, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957–1963)*, edited by Charles Becker, Pierre-Paul Misshougue, and Philippe Verdin, 127–143. Paris: Karthala.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1963a. *Pour une civilisation solidaire*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1963b. "Pour une éthique du développement." *Économie et Humanisme* 148, 1–7.
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1964. "Diagnostic de la situation mondiale et éléments pour la réponse ..." Available in the libraries of the universities of Louvain and Notre Dame (Indiana).
- Lebreton, L.-J. 1966. "Croissance ou Développement Intégral et Harmonisé dans le respect des Civilisations." *Développement et Civilisations* 3. <http://lebreton-irfed.org/spip.php?article633>.

- Lebret, L.-J., and J.-M. Gatheron. 1947. *Principes et Perspectives d'Une Économie Humaine*. Ecully (Rhône): Économie Et Humanisme.
- Lebret, L.-J., A. Piettre, A. Sauvy, and R. Delprat. 1956. *Économie et Civilisation. Tome 1: Niveaux de Vie, Besoins et Civilisation*. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières.
- Lebret, L.-J., and J. Sauvé. 1950. *Pêcheries Mondiales et Marché du Poisson. Tome 1*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Luttwak, Edward. 1998. *Turbo-Capitalism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Malley, François. 1968. *Le Père Lebret – L'économie au Service des Hommes*. Paris: Les éditions du CERF.
- Maritain, Jacques. 1922. *Anti-moderne*. Paris: Editions de la Revue des Jeunes.
- Maritain, Jacques. 1936. *Humanisme intégrale*. Paris: Fernand Aubier.
- Maritain, Jacques. 1946. "The Person and the Common Good." *The Review of Politics* 8 (4), 419–455.
- Moreau, R. P. 1966. "Allocutions du R.P. Moreau en memoire du P. L.-J. Lebret." In *Le père Lebret, un dominicain économiste au Sénégal (1957–1963)*, edited by Charles Becker, Pierre-Paul Missehougbe, and Philippe Verdin, 49–54. Paris: Karthal.
- Murphy, Craig. 2015. "Imperial Legacies in the UN Development Programme and the UN Development System." In *Legacies of Empire*, edited by S. Halperin and R. Palan, 149–170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pelletier, Denis. 1995. "Engagement intellectuel catholique et médiation du social. L'enquête monographique de Le Play à Lebret." *Mil neuf cent. Revue d'histoire intellectuelle (Cahiers Georges Sorel)* 13: 25–45.
- Pelletier, Denis. 1996. *Économie et Humanisme*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- Pétain, Ph. 1941. "Principes de la Communauté." Vichy: Government poster declaration.
- Poulat, Emile. 2011. Foreword to Garreau 2011.
- Poupard, Cardinal Paul. 1987. "Le Père Lebret, Le Pape Paul VI et L'encyclique Populorum, Vingt Ans Après." [https://www.revuedesdeuxmondes.fr > uploads > 2016/11](https://www.revuedesdeuxmondes.fr/uploads/2016/11).
- Raskin, P., T. Banuri, G. Gallopín, P. Gutman, A. Hammond, R. Kates, and R. Swart. 2002. *Great Transition: The Promise and the Lure of the Times Ahead*. Boston, MA: Stockholm Environment Institute and Tellus Institute.
- Silva Leme, Maria Cristina da. 2016. "The Économie et Humanisme Movement: The Politicization of Urban Planning in Brazil After the Second World War." *International Planning History Society Proceedings*. books.bk.tudelft.nl
- Tablada Pérez, Carlos. 2018. *The Decline of Certainties: Founding Struggles Anew - The Biography of François Houtart*. Havana: Ruth Casa Editorial (open-access).
- Thibon, Gustave. 1945. *La Communauté de Destin*. Valence: Éditions du Centre départemental d'études de la Drôme.
- Villas Boas, Alex, and André Folloni. 2021. "The 'Common Good' Spirituality of Louis-Joseph Lebret and his Influence in the Constitution and Development Thinking in Brazil." *Journal of Global Ethics*.
- Ward, Barbara, and René Dubos. 1972. *Only One Earth; The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet*. London: Penguin.