

Accepted version

Licence: See Publishing Open Access Books. Chapters, section 2: “Archiving of a chapter on a website or in a repository. (The ‘Green’ OA Model)”. <https://www.routledge.com/our-products/open-access-books/publishing-oa-books/chapters#>:

Please cite as:

Persico, T. E., Mattoscio, N., & Bucciarelli, E. (2018). Economics and humanity: Theory of development in A. Sen and the concept of human integral development. In *The Individual and the Other in Economic Thought* (pp. 67-79). Routledge.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315113258>

Economics and humanity

Theory of development in A. Sen and the concept of human integral development

Tony Ernesto Persico, Nicola Mattoscio and Edgardo Bucciarelli

Introduction

The economy, as a science, finds methodologies and solutions, while the ethics answers the question of the meaning of human, and therefore also of economic, actions. The economy is not ethically neutral, because it cannot alienate to answer about dignity and human needs. Instead, it is precisely in comparison with the human needs that the economy exceeds the mere search for a quantitative result and is realized as a social science: fully human and fully science. The relationship between religion and economics is one of the first points of analysis of the broader relationship between ethics and economics. Economic theory has started a slow analysis route of the connection between religion and economics. Some authors acknowledged an important role to Catholicism in the beginning of the bank system and in the birth of the first economic concepts, like the role that they attributed to the works of Dominicans, Benedictines and Franciscans theologians. This is not surprising if we consider that the first approaches to economic problems were born within the medieval moral thought and if we think about the role of Benedictine and Franciscan authors. We can think of Schumpeter, who describes the religious St. Antonino from Florence (1389–1459), as “perhaps the first man to whom it is possible to ascribe a comprehensive vision of the economic process in all its major aspects” (Schumpeter, 1954, p. 91).

Our study is positioned between religion¹ and economics. The study focuses on the contribution of Catholic teaching about development and its relationship with the theory of human development proposed by the Nobel Prize economist Amartya Sen. The study cannot be exhaustive at all and it will even make an extreme synthesis of the reasoning, focusing on the elements considered more relevant. The theory of human development proposed by Sen is well structured for those who read it and it is formalized by numerous contributions of economic science. We cannot say the same for the concept of Integral Human Development (IHD) proposed by the Catholic Social Teaching (CST) of the Church. The Compendium of the CST of the Church states that “Church’s social doctrine was not initially thought of as an organic system, but was formed over the course of

time through the numerous interventions of the Magisterium on social issues” (CST 72). In fact, “it develops through different reflections applied to the changing situations of this world, under the driving force of the Gospel as the source of renewal” (OA 42).

In the next section, we will analyze the idea of development as it presents in Catholic social thought. In this way, we can verify how the assumptions of Christian morals allow a juxtaposition with Sen’s work, to find an effective opportunity of dialogue between the two contributions. It’s also necessary to specify the nature of IHD proposed by the Catholic teaching to explore the possibilities of comparison with the economic theory. Benedict XVI affirms that economics isn’t ethically neutral and for this reason it must be structured and institutionalized in an ethical way: “economics needs ethics in order to function correctly – not any ethics, but an ethics which is people-centered” (CV 45). Similarly, Sen adopts an ethics that depends on the position of the person and, displaying the influence of ethics on human behavior, he rejects the individualistic motivation as a guide for human action, in favor of the concepts of well-being and ability to act. Before Sen, Myrdal posed the problem about the non-neutrality of economic theory, about the fact it was easily influenced and about its need of a major transparency of the orientation given by the decision makers (Myrdal, 1969).

In the third section, we enter into the heart of the study, focusing on the dialogue between the two paradigms: IHD and the theory of human development proposed by Sen. To do this, we initially identify a common background because both Sen and the social doctrine are placed on a normative/ethical level. The common background includes several assumptions like: the agreement of Sen with the idea – proposed first by the CST – that humanity has a common destiny, the relationship between freedom and responsibility, the recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon of socio-economic development and the relational nature of the person. In addition, we will demonstrate how the concept of development, present in Sen, reflects the character of wholeness suggested by the Catholic teaching. To do this, we will first focus on the concept of freedom and its central role in the development process for the ethical and economic disciplines.

The study conducted is placed in a double frame of reference: on the one hand, we find the work of economists, above all several contributions of Sen, which were compared with the issue of ethics and economics; while, on the other hand, we find the work of theologians who have focused on the analysis of the social teaching and have built pieces of common field between the two disciplines, starting from the religious side of the problem. According with our purpose, we try to reach a possible central location between the two points of view. What we can find with this analysis is not two perfectly complementary halves. Instead, we can find some points of similarity, which come from the same origin. Finally, we individuated Aristotle’s theory of origin and the special anthropological attention as a base for a vision of development that is common to the two areas.

Origin and ethics of integral human development

The context of the relationship religion/economics

The study of the thought of an economist cannot exclude the mentioning of the authors he refers to. This is more than ever real for the study of the thought of a pontiff. In this chapter, we will investigate on the formation of the concept of development in CST. At the end of the chapter we will check how the assumptions of Christian ethics allow not only the juxtaposition with the work of Sen, but also an effective opportunity for dialogue between the two contributions. After a long debate in the Catholic world, Pope John Paul II (SRS 41) confirmed that the social thought must be considered part of the moral theology, the same that in philosophical terms we are accustomed to call Christian ethics (Grillo, 2010). This has a crucial importance for our study. If the social thought was considered merely as an indication of a pastoral nature, it would lack the ethical character of the two concepts we are considering. If the understanding of the historical economic development makes an extensive use of economic positive science, an indication of the future choices and judgment on economic policy is an area reserved for the science of economics ethic, as in Sen works. CST in the same way tries to conjugate evangelical views with historical context and to pursue a moral guidance. Pope Pius XI, after the Great Recession, directly addresses the relationship between ethics and economics: “it is an error to say that the economic and moral orders are distinct and alien and that the former doesn’t depend in any way on the latter” (QA 42).

The IHD is constituted by three main elements: a contingent data, that is the position of the Church about historical development problems; a personal data that is the moral imperative of human development; and a relational data that is the realization of development “of all man and of all men” (PP 13). On this purpose, the lexical closeness of Sen and the CST is emblematic: we can take as example the terms “integral development” introduced by Paulus VI and Maritain (Maritain, 1936) and the Senian “integrated approach” and his “development in comprehensive sense”.² The linkage between the Christian view of development and Sacred Scriptures is one of the implicit premises. Becchetti proposed an interesting comparison between the concepts of sympathy and commitment already present in Sen (Sen, 1997) and the concept of conversion presented by Saint Paulus (Becchetti, 2009). The man who observes the precepts without understanding them is like the man who obeys a moral commitment. Instead, the converted man follows the “love commandment”, adhering so completely to it he modifies his structure of preferences, as it happens in the case of sympathy described by Sen.

The construction of the idea of integral human development

Following, we recall the essential tools to our analysis because it is impossible to trace the centuries-old history of the Church’s Magisterium.³ Until the revolutions of the XVIII century, it would have been unthinkable for Christians to engage in any social action outside of a society founded on Christianity (Ruggeri, 2009).

In this period the Church found itself in a minority condition and it often had defensive behavior and attitudes of closure, but from 1900 it started comparing itself with the external world. At the beginning of the XX century CST considered development as a reflection in an international dimension of the principles of justice, truth and love, to which national communities are subjected. These principles derive from Thomistic and natural philosophy. Unlike what happens in the Protestant world, it is only in the XX century that the Catholic Church abandoned the idea of a “Christian economy”, i.e. a proper economic model, and joined the recognition and the utilization of economic science in its analysis (Duchini, 1989).

The dialogue with the contemporary world has intensified after the Second Vatican Council of 1962–1965. Inside the *Gaudium et spes* we can find a section dedicated to the theme of economic development, in which a human central position is directly related to economics: “man is the source, the center, and the purpose of all economic and social life” (GS 63). Useful for incoming comparison is the definition of the common good as “the sum of those conditions of social life which allow to groups as to individuals, to reach their fulfillment” (GS 26). This definition is inserted into the duality of the person and of society according with Maritain thought, that is that society is person of people (Maritain, 1947). The document proposes a series of reliefs on world conditions among which the observation of social disparities between nations stands out. The consideration of the consequences of this situation is extremely modern: “while a few enjoy very great power of choice, the majority are deprived of almost all possibility of acting on their own initiative and responsibility” (GS 63). The possibility of acting can be posed in relation with the Sen definition of capabilities in the theory of human development (Sen, 1987). We will also analyze the concept of freedom contained in the conciliar document: “only in freedom man can direct himself toward goodness” (GS 17).

Paulus VI too gave his contribution on the issue of possibilities:

the developing and the highly-developed economies there is a great disparity in their overall situation and in their freedom of action. In order that international trade be human and moral, social justice requires that it restore to the participants a certain equality of opportunity.

(PP 61)

The concept was further focused through the definition of development with the encyclical *Populorum progression*: development is authentic if it “must foster the development of each man and of the whole man” (PP 14). The concept of integrity is central in the thought of Jacques Maritain, who – with other personalist philosophers (Mounier, 1938) – influenced the Council documents (Maritain, 1936).

IHD is also related to the idea of the “universal destination of goods”,⁴ the same that allows the limitation of “private property” (PP 24). At this regard, it should be noted how the same Sen, while appreciating the universalist position of Rawls’s theory of justice (Rawls, 1971), doesn’t consider applicable the idea of an institutional base that can be common to the whole planet (Sen, 2002b). In addition,

the encyclical gave a negative opinion of international liberalism, guilty of having created a competitive market that accentuated the difference between countries rather than heal them (Barucci and Magliulo, 1996). Once again, we can find similarities with the thought of Sen on the gap between rich and poor countries (Sen, 1999c).

The reflection on IHD according with the contribution of John Paul II passes from an economic approach to a politic one. Behind political causes there are the moral causes of underdevelopment as called by the Pope. These latter bring to reverse the values' scale in the relation between ethics and economics (Musu, 1991). The violation of the basilar human rights always leave from the violation of human freedom in its different forms: economic, social, cultural and spiritual. The Pope asks: "the denial or the limitation of human rights . . . do these not impoverish the human person as much as, if not more than, the deprivation of material goods?" (SRS 15). Freedom becomes in his view the measure of development in full accord with Sen (Sen, 1999c).

Pope Benedict XVI's social encyclical *Caritas in veritate* makes a Christological foundation of IHD (Grillo, 2010): the assumption of "charity in truth" is indicated as the main propulsive force for a real development. The principle of freedom is updated by Benedict XVI, who posed it in relation with responsibility: "this freedom concerns the type of development we are considering, but it also affects situations of underdevelopment which are not due to chance or historical necessity, but are attributable to human responsibility" (CV 17). At the basis of the argument of Benedict XVI there is the consideration of non-neutrality of globalization. He affirms that "this freedom concerns the type of development we are considering, but it also affects situations of underdevelopment which are not due to chance or historical necessity, but are attributable to human responsibility" (CV 42). At this stage, we can observe the full maturity of the concept of IHD and at its updating inside the global context. During this period, we retrieve the direct contact between social teaching and scripture, the "Primacy of the Word". Next to the role of Bibliology in the development of the social doctrine, it emerges the participation of "civil economists" as Zamagni (Feix, 2015). We may terminate this brief excursus underlining how the proposals of the social teaching meet in several occasions the thought of Sen. He escapes from attitudes that reject globalization, calling for a better use of its benefits in favor of the most disadvantaged (Sen, 2002a). He also agrees with the CST (SRS 14) that the geography of poverty needs to be rewritten including large areas of rich countries afflicted by "new poverties" (Sen, 2003).

Which compatibility?

For the Catholic social teaching, development should be integral in referring to person, to material necessities and spiritual aspirations, and referring to the individual and the whole of humanity. Development so intended is ethical, and so realizable towards personal choices. It occurs an integral epistemology, referring to Maritain's words, that would be capable of dealing with empiric knowledge, modern

thought but also wisdom and classical thought (Fornero and Tassinari, 2002). This address can be found in Sen's pages where we can read some references to Asian tradition and Aristotle philosophy. In addition, Sen deepened the relation of ethics and economics in his *On Ethics and Economics* (Sen, 1987): the positive economics has come to elude a series of ethical issues that, years later, would have shown the weaknesses of the neoclassical reconstruction of human behavior.

Sen refuses the individualism of those theoretical approaches that, excluding interpersonal usefulness, don't take care about social effects in economic choices (Sen, 1987). He refuses the idea of individual utility as an evaluation measure and he introduces the concepts of well-being and of faculty to act (Sen, 1985). The result of this innovation is that we can consider the choices made by a person not to improve his own well-being but to support important causes or the common good (Sen, 1990b). This means that non-evaluative economics, left outside of any ethics point of view, is usually inadequate to a scientific comprehension of economic acting (Zamagni, 1990). Benedictus XVI affirms in effect that economics isn't neutral and for this reason it should be structured and institutionalized in an ethical way (CV, n. 36). Both the Pope and Sen note that if business ethics is sufficient for the market, it is not sufficient for the full realization of human development that also includes social and political aspects. According to Sen we can find the main limits in the problems of inequality, the environment and cooperation external to the market (Sen, 1999c). We can now draw a profile of the first "ethical demands" proposed by Sen:

- 1 Role of personal ethics
- 2 Existence of an objective ethics
- 3 Subjective character of objectivity.

Christian ethic founds itself on the personalist principle, which is the full recognition of dignity of man and of his relational nature that made of him a "naturae rationalis individua substantia".⁵ Pope Benedict XVI says: "the economy needs ethics to function correctly – not any ethics whatsoever, but an ethics which is people-centered". The main role of economics in the promotion of the person, his freedom and human rights finds the first motivation in the Church intervention: the concern for the good of mankind. Christian thought studies the constitutive dimension of a person as a bearer of relations, from Augustine and Boethius to Mounier and Ricoeur. The second demand could be: can a religious ethic support a theory of freedom like Sen's one? The economist affirms that an objective conception of ethic can coexist with a normative ethic but it must recognize the value of people capacity in choosing what they think has value (Sen, 1987). It cannot be different, because religious confession and morals are meaningless without freedom of choice. Even if indirectly, one of the consequences of the first two assumptions, the personal and objective character, allows the construction of an objective ethic model mediated by beliefs and information of the person. Thus, Sen adopts an ethic which depends on the position of the person (Sen, 2002c). Then, the last question is: can this "positional objective ethics" coexist

with Catholic ethics? The answer is traced within the so-called Conciliar morals, i.e. an ethics of the first person: an ethic approach based on subjectivity, in a way that we can speak about a subjective objectivity. We can use a phenomenological reading in which the ethical limit is passed through a process of inter-subjective knowledge⁶ (Casazza, 2007).

Dialogue between paradigms

The shared background

The analysis of the formation of the concept of human development led us to anticipate some of the aspects of closeness between Sen and CST. These common points are not delegated to secondary aspects, but they represent the conceptual structure which support the two visions of development. We have already discussed the recognition of the encyclicals inside the moral theology. Now let Sen justify a normative economic theory as “people themselves have responsibility for the development and change of the world in which they live” (Sen, 1999, p. 282). This attitude is not limited to the negative effects but is extended to all the positive intervention (Sen, 1990a). With this assertion, Sen is lined up with the idea of the common destination of humanity, proper of CST, but especially in measure with the relationship with freedom and responsibility that we have seen in Benedict XVI’s thought (CV 17).

Another common point is the shared recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon of socio-economic development. This means to consider the outcome of the development process as a composite, a qualitative and a quantitative one. This is possible by recognizing the relational nature of the person. This allows us to identify a second basis of sharing. This one is a prerequisite for any choice both in economics – which considers reactions and externalities – and in the ethical field, bearing in mind that in the context of the legislation the two planes coincide. The social teaching, on the other hand, takes the concept of the relationship directly from the Trinitarian theology of Catholicism, according to which there is no love without relationship. As Berdyaev said “our social doctrine is the Trinity” (Bello, 1989, p. 148).

Following in our study, we will try to explain how the concept of development present in Sen’s work reflects the character of integrality proposed by social teaching. Which is the position of the person in the economic system for the CST and Sen? The answer is contained in the idea of centrality and human purpose. If Sen believes that the new phase of development theory goes for the increase of human capital, on the other hand, he fears a possible exploitation of man (Gentilucci, 2008). He emphasizes that human beings are not the medium of goods’ production, but they are the purpose (Sen and Anand, 1994). The comparison with the aforementioned document *Gaudium et spes* is immediately visible (GS 63). Sen recognizes two possible visions of development: the first is defined as “fierce” and it sees a series of social and democratic guarantees as luxuries that should be avoided; the second, “sweet”, is comprehensive of these guarantees

(Sen, 1997). Both Sen and the CST approach to development refer to the second view. For Sen, this model combines both human rights and economic growth, and it is one of the best systems for the processes of development (Sen, 1997). The refusal of considering human development as a luxury reserved to rich nations – or a temptation for developing countries – has important empiric evidences, observed in the investment in human capital made by nations (Ishi, 1995). This type of consideration isn't only coherent with the idea of horizontal integrality of development – real development is for all men – but it constitutes also a concrete demonstration of his empiric validity.

Inside Sen's theory we can find the concept of functioning, that is what a person desires to be or to do, and the concept of capability, the alternative ensemble of functioning that a person is able to choose (Sen, 1999a). These last represent a form of substantial freedom, and for this reason Sen describes development as the removal of several forms of un-freedoms and the increase of the capabilities of people (Sen, 1999c). This fact marks a return to an "integrate approach" to socio-economic development on the track of Adam Smith's teaching. According to Sen, capabilities are the possibility of an individual to realize his own objective and human development to "contribute directly to the quality of life and to its flourishing" (Sen, 1999c, p. 144). It does not surprise that, years before, personalist philosophers, faced with the problem of the creation of categories, talked about conditionings and attitudes of person.⁷ The sharing of the binomial complexity-person by Sen and CTS is underlined by the respect that both have for the originality of each person, implied in Christian religion, and that is translated in Sen's work in the attention for the heterogeneity of people and their different possibilities of realization (Sen, 1992).

Freedom and development

In our comparison freedom has a relevant role both as a standalone element and in the form of instrumental freedoms for something else. We can mark four profiles of confrontation:

- 1 Constitutive profile: fundamental role of freedom
- 2 Evaluative profile: freedom as evaluation key of development
- 3 Instrumental profile: acknowledgment of instrumental freedom
- 4 Humanitarian profile: derivation of human rights from freedoms.

According to Sen, freedom has a central role in the theory of "development as freedom". Freedom has a proper direct value: first there is the elementary freedom of survival for which it is not necessary to find indirect justifications invoking his economic effects (Sen, 1999c). For Sen, freedom is the necessary condition for which men can choose between capabilities and it has a constitutive role for the enrichment of human life (Sen, 1999c). In the same way, for religious thinking, freedom has a key role because it is a condition of the conversion and so of the truth: human freedom undertakes its obedience to truth and then

to the duty of respecting the rights of other men (CA 17). Paulus VI posed the relation between development, freedom and possibility (PP 61) in the same way that for Sen development is expressed by the increase of freedoms and then of capabilities.

Freedom takes an evaluative role for economics and ethics. In fact, if capabilities can replace the indicators based on income, without hiding the obvious correlations between the two elements, this means that freedom can have an evaluative role of the results and of the guidance of economic politics (Sen, 1999c). Paul VI had severely criticized the unique use of economic indicators, suggesting a more careful approach to the quality of social life. The Pope said that “the quality and the truth of human relations, the degree of participation and of responsibility, are no less significant and important for the future of society than the quantity and variety of the goods produced and consumed” (OA 41).

We often think about an idea as freedom as it is made absolute by religious morals until it becomes an ontological category unusable in the solution of real problems. On the contrary, CST posed freedom in concrete situations, arriving to the formulation of a plural structure composed by several freedoms. John Paul II in his encyclicals *Sollicitudo rei socialis* and *Centesimus annus* proposes a series of “instrumental” freedoms: economic freedom, political freedom, social freedom, cultural and spiritual freedom. The underlying logic can be easily traced already in the Council document *Gaudium et spes* (GS 26). The contents are recalled also in the encyclical *Caritas in veritate* by Benedict XVI and they can be easily related to the five “instrumental” freedoms proposed by Sen as freedom in development: a) political freedom; b) economic infrastructures; c) social occasions; d) transparency guarantees; e) social security. Instrumental freedoms constitute a big unique theoretical corpus shared between Sen and social teaching. Thus, for example, the reading of the collapse of the Soviet bloc by Sen coincides with the one proposed by John Paul II: the negation of the market was accompanied by the privation of indispensable freedoms that changed into a lack of capabilities, and from a last analysis into a negation of possibilities of the realization of man.

The protection of instrumental freedom can be translated into the protection of human rights both in Sen and in CST. Pontiffs greet with benevolence the developments of international humanitarian development not only in relation with religious freedom but also referring to the whole set of “instrumental freedoms”. We had to underline that Sen opposes himself to those who criticize the legitimacy of human rights, understood as pre-institutional, protecting in this way also the Christian ethics that affirms the idea of universal human rights. On the contrary, he says that it is the ethical claim that vouches for the institutional recognition of the rights that men consider important (Sen, 1999c). Sen shares the concern expressed by John Paul II (SRS 38) about the danger that the declarations of rights may fail to an operational implementation: the reference to these rights presses anyone who can do it to make them effective (Casazza, 2007).

Democracy and development paradigms

The identity of views about the democratic character of development descends from Sen's freedom-based discussion. Per Sen, the solution of development issues passes through a democratic discussion, the affirmation of the transparency and the broadening of economic freedom. Comparing the two fronts, the request to put the markets in conditions of better functioning, with more equity and with adequate integrations, is unequivocal (Sen, 1999c). For both fronts, in fact, development is participative and it aligns itself with the democratic participation: if real development is contradistinguished by horizontal integrity, that is comprehensive of all men, then the "developing and strengthening a democratic system is an essential component of the process of development" (Sen, 1999c, p.157). Sen "relates the idea of subsidiarity to that of democracy in general and democratic evaluation in particular" (Sen, 2011, p. 15). The two areas of analysis have in common the possibility to universalize the value of democracy, not in the sense that all cultures share it, but because every nation can appreciate its value after having experienced it (Bazzichi, 2004). The importance from a "constitutive" point of view and from an instrumental point of view of political freedom depends also on the dynamism of the ethical discussion about the formation of values (Sen, 2004).

Sen fears that a major attention to the dynamics of the economic growth can overshadow the role of freedoms and democratic debate (Sen, 1999b). We recall here that one of the elements of the social teaching critique of the economic system is that a higher level of well-being cannot replace freedom and human dignity (SRS 33). We must highlight that Sen uses the concept of ability to resolve the conflict between human rights and collective purpose: if on the one hand the search for the common good limits individual choices, on the other hand the pursuit of this search allows the person more choice and possibilities otherwise impossible (Sen, 2000). In this way, we introduce the last step of our analysis: the consideration of the aim of rights in relation to common good.

CST defines the common good in an extensive way: opened to all those functions which respect the normative provision (GS 26). It is more than an ahistorical approach to the problem: it is centered on the adherence to the historicity and to the evolution of human needs, so that morality can deal with the social dynamics of the moment. This setting is like Sen's one, who – faced to set the operations required by his theory – prefers to avoid a limited list (Sen, 1999d). This derives from the common Aristotelic root of the conception of property and richness as instruments "useful for anything else". This orientation was made proper by Thomism thought and then CST. Nonetheless we had to deal with two levels: from one side the common good superior to the sum of individual interests and the common good available to everyone according to their needs (Zamagni, 2010). Sen argues similarly that the sense of creating wealth is to be more human (Sen, 1997). Sen's position, in the middle of natural and positive law, is nearer to the first position than the second. This last can be seen also overlapped with the character of integrality of development. The question of the work of Sen is in fact devoted to the understanding of how man should live. He recognizes also

that a partial movement in the direction of an ethical acceptance of rights can shake from the bottom traditional economic theory (Sen, 1987). The removal of disparities and the protection of human rights can be easily read in the double path of extension of capabilities and realization of the integrality of human development proposed by social teaching.

Concluding remark

The study permitted the comparison of the views of development present in Sen's work and in social teaching. The purpose of the first step was dedicated to identify the most important elements of development vision from the Church's point of view. This view was summarized in the concept of integral human development. The definition and analysis of this concept has shown how the common space between the two subjects examined were not limited to side elements, but concern the main bases of the two ideas of socio-economic development. Both move from a ethical/normative setting with a marked emphasis on the vocation/responsibility faced with the persistence of the conditions of inequality. Inequality is reinterpreted in a qualitative way and it includes the real possibilities of realization of the human person and his freedoms.

The key element of the coexistence between religious ethic and economic theory stays for Sen in the guarantee of freedom of men. So, it doesn't amaze that freedom posed itself as a basis of sharing, with the view of human development as freedom by Sen or with the view of IHD. Both views recognize the moral nature of the choices inherent to development processes moving from the complexity and the relationality of development. Freedom is understood as a constitutive and instrumental value for the promotion and verification of human development. This represents the realization of the possibilities of man and the protection of his rights. Anyway, such rights must be exercised in a right equilibrium in reason for common good (and for not becoming an occasion of un-freedom for the others). In this sense, Sen and the pontiffs have in common an integrate view of development, representing all men and all the dimension of the whole human being.

There are some differences between the two points of view. For social teaching, the right to live – Sen speaks about reproductive freedom – cannot be submitted to other purpose, the human person should not be at the service of the economic system but its aim. However, it should be noted that Sen's position about the "terrorism" of the Club of Rome and the phenomenon of "missing women" sounds like a proof of the Church position, always in contrast with any form of birth control, especially in developing countries (Sen, 2002c) (Sen, 1999c). In conclusion, this dialogue's exercise gives some suggestions for both subjects. Economics is enriched by the comprehension of behaviors, deducing important indications of normative character. Social teaching gains in accuracy of analysis and in concreteness, and it often find the empirical proof of the rightness of its positions. So, we conclude our study remembering the indication of Sen, who sees in the dialogue the best way to face development economic and politics problems.

Notes

- 1 In the following, words and expressions as religion, theology, teaching, doctrine, Church, Christian and social teaching are related to the Catholic Church and Catholic Social Teaching unless otherwise indicated. This is not to deny the precious contribution of other religions, but simply to avoid constant repetitions in the text.
- 2 This happens through the words of Wolfensohn J. D., *A Proposal for Comprehensive Development Framework*, World Bank, 1999, in Sen (1999c).
- 3 For more details see Bucciarelli et al. (2011).
- 4 The idea was introduced by John XXIII in 1963.
- 5 Boethius, *De persona et duabus naturis*, cap. 3, P.L. 64, 1343.
- 6 As in the work of E. Stein (1917) who takes the concept from Husserl (1859).
- 7 See Mounier (1961); Ricoeur (1983).

Bibliography

- The documents of the Holy See were published by Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Rome, Italy.
- QA Pius XI, *Quadragesimo anno*, (1931).
- GS Conc. Vat. II, *Gaudium et spes*, (1965).
- PP Paul VI, *Populorum progressio*, (1967).
- OA Paul VI, *Octagesima adveniens*, (1971).
- SRS John Paul II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, (1987).
- CA John Paul II, *Centesimus annus*, (1991).
- CST *Compendium of the Catholic Social Teaching*, (2004).
- CV Benedict XVI, *Caritas in veritate*, (2009).
- Barucci, P. and Magliulo, A. 1996. *L'insegnamento economico sociale della Chiesa (1981–1991)*. Milano: Mondadori Ed.
- Bazzichi, O. 2004. Dottrina sociale della Chiesa e democrazia. *La Società*, pp. 711–24.
- Becchetti, L. 2009. *Oltre l'homo oeconomicus*. Roma: Città Nuova Editrice.
- Bello, T. 1989. *Sui sentieri di Isaia*. Bari: Ed. la meridiana.
- Boethius, A. M. S. 1847. *Liber de persona et duabus naturis contra Eutychen et Nestorium*. PL, 64, 1337–1354.
- Bucciarelli, E. Mattosio, N. and Persico, T.E. 2011. The Christian ethics of socio-economic development promoted by the Catholic Social Teaching. *The Journal of Philosophical Economics*, 1, pp. 90–119.
- Casazza, F. 2007. *Sviluppo e libertà in Amartya Sen: Provocazioni per la teologia morale*. Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana.
- Cremona, D. 1991. *Carità e interesse in San Antonino da Firenze*. s.l.: Aleph.
- Duchini, F. 1989. Insegnamento sociale della Chiesa, scienza economica, attività economica. In *Alcune considerazioni sulle radici storiche del problema*. Il magistero sociale di Paolo VI. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Feix, M. 2015. Vers une nouvelle économie ? À propos de l'exhortation apostolique du pape François. La joie de l'Évangile. *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale*, pp. 3/89–110.
- Fornero, G. and Tassinari, S. 2002. *Le filosofie del Novecento*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Gentilucci, C.E. 2008. Il concetto di sviluppo in Amartya Sen e nella Dottrina sociale della Chiesa. *Studi economici e sociali*, pp. 47–58.
- Grillo, G. 2010. *Sommario della Dottrina sociale della Chiesa*. Genova: Ed. Marietti 1820.
- Husserl, E. 1859. *Husserliana*. Vol. 13–15. Springer. (ed. used 1966).
- Ishi, H. 1995. *Trends in the allocation of public expenditure in light of human resource development- Overview in Japan*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Maritain, J. 1936. *Humanisme intégral*. s.l.: s.n.

- Maritain, J. 1947. *Da Bergson a Tommaso d'Aquino*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Mounier, E. 1938. *A personalist manifesto*. s.l.: Longmans Green.
- Mounier, E. 1961. *Traité du caractère*, in *Oeuvres*, Seuil, Paris.
- Musu, I. 1991. La Centesimus Annus e l'economia. *La Società*, n°1.
- Myrdal, G. 1969. *Objectivity in social research*. New York: Pantheon Book.
- Nozick, R. 1974. *Anarchy, state and utopia*. s.l.: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. 1983. *Meurt le personalisme, revient la personne*, in *Esprit*, n°1, pp. 113–119.
- Ruggeri, G. 2009. Riforma politica, Riforma ecclesiale. In *Quando i cristiani non erano moderati*. Bologna: Il mulino.
- Schumpeter, J. A. 1954. *History of economic analysis*. Routledge (ed. used 1986).
- Sen, A., 1933. *Development As Freedom*. New York. Anchor Books, (ed. used 2000)
- Sen, A. 1985. Well-being, agency and freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984. *Journal of Philosophy*, p. 82.
- Sen, A. 1987. *On ethics and economics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishing.
- Sen, A. 1990a. *Individual freedom as a social commitment*. New York: New York Review of books.
- Sen, A. 1990b. Rational fools: A critique of the behavioural foundations of economic theory. In *Beyond self-interest*. Chicago: s.n., pp. 29–37.
- Sen, A. 1992. *Inequality reexamined*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. 1997. Development thinking on the beginning of XXIst century. In *Economic and social development into XXIst century*. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sen, A. 1999a. *Commodities and capabilities*. s.l.: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. 1999b. La crisi ecologica? Una sfida per l'economia etica. *Etica per le professioni*, n° 1, pp. 69–71.
- Sen, A. 1999c. *Lo sviluppo è libertà*. Milano: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore.
- Sen, A. 1999d. *Uguali e diversi davanti alla salute*. Keiron, pp. giugno 8–16.
- Sen, A. 2000. Human rights and human development. In *Human development report 2000*. New York: s.n., pp. 19–26.
- Sen, A. 2002a. Globalization, inequality and global Protest. *DEV 45*, n° 2, pp. 11–16.
- Sen, A. 2002b. *Globalizzazione e libertà*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Sen, A. 2002c. *Rationality and freedom*. s.l.: Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. 2003. *The local and the global*. Turin Workshop “Globalization and Local Development”. Turin. 27–28 November.
- Sen, A. 2004. *La democrazia degli altri: Perché la libertà non è una invenzione*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Sen, A. 2011. *Justice: Subsidiarity and capabilities*. Milan: Eupolis. Lectio Magistrali 11th May.
- Sen, A. and Anand, S. 1994. *Sustainable human development: Concepts and priorities*. New York: United Nation Development Program.
- Smith, A. 1776. *The wealth of nations. 2000 a cura di*. s.l.: Modern Library.
- Stein, E. 1917. *On the problem of empathy*. Springer. (Ed. used 1964–2013).
- Zamagni, S. 1990. Sulla cooperazione tra scienza economica e etica: ragione, problemi, prospettive. *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, Rendiconti*. Vol. 78. Bologna: Bononia University Press.
- Zamagni, S. 2010. Catholic social thought, civil economy, and the spirit of capitalism. In *The true wealth of nations*. s.l.: Oxford University Press, pp. 63–93.