Round Table: dialogue on brotherhood in various cultural spheres

Moderator: _Vera Araújo_

 Speakers: _Sergio Rondinara, Michele Zanzucchi, Eshter Salamanca, Simonetta Magari,_
        Luca Crivelli

We have come to the end of our second day of work.
We have tried as much as possible to show the influence that brotherhood, considered as a social category, has and will have on social relationships in the future. We seem to understand that in spite of the contradictions, conflicts and contrasts of a society that lives an epochal change, this influence can be accepted for its positive contents, for being able to stimulate processes of integration and social interactions that result in development and growth, in human and intellectual maturity.
Convinced of this, we are urged to continue in our work as social scientists, seeking also collaboration and dialogue with other humanistic and scientific subjects.

The colleagues we have invited to take part in this debate have already been working for some time in their respective cultural spheres on the idea of brotherhood. We would like to ask for their contribution so that a richer dialogue can be developed on this important subject. With discretion but with firmness, this subject is gaining more interest in the academic sphere and it is also being attributed a specific placement in the studies of various subjects.
We hope that this will be an interesting and creative moment that widens horizons that go beyond themes that are specifically sociological.

On our panel we have Prof. _Sergio Rondinara,_ an Italian nuclear physicist and a professor of philosophy of nature at the Pontifical Gregoriana university in Rome. He coordinates the research group _Eco-One_ that is inspired by the charism of unity and deals with environmental sciences.

Then we have Dr. _Michele Zanzucchi,_ the editor of the fortnightly magazine Città Nuova. He is an expert in communication sciences and a member of the group _Net-One_ that is now quite known in the media sector.

Dr. _Esther Salamanca_ is Spanish and comes from Madrid. She teaches at the university of Mursia and is an expert in international politics and relationships. The interesting topic for her doctorate was "Water, heritage of humanity".

Dr. _Simonetta Magari,_ who is a psychiatrist and psychotherapist, has a very long professional background. She teaches at the Catholic university in Rome and also works with a group of psychologists, psychiatrists and psychotherapists who get their inspiration from the charism of unity.

Prof. _Luca Crivelli_ is Swiss and comes from Lugano. He is an economist and a professor at the university of Lugano. For years he has been doing research about basic concepts that characterise the project of the Economy of Communion, about which I have touched very briefly this morning in my report.

Having presented our panel, we can start our debate by asking each member to answer the following question:
"What does brotherhood mean and what does it convey to your respective disciplines?"

Sergio Rondinara
One of characteristics of today's environmental problems (the ozone layer, climatic change, etc) is that they develop on a planetary scale and hit all humanity. So the attention of individual nations is not enough; a worldwide policy is needed to guide all people towards a more careful management of our planet and to achieve an ecological global strategy before it is too late.

In other words we need a worldwide policy that enforces a _global strategy for safeguarding the environment._ This is one the greatest and most urgent cultural challenges of our times. We must understand that good and positive choices of individuals or of single nations are not enough.

For example, in 1990 the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) pointed out that the Greenhouse effect would lead to an increase in the mean temperature with all the consequences we are all so well aware of. But only a few countries acted unilaterally to reduce their output. The European Union proposed the introduction of a <u>carbon tax</u> in Europe, but seeing that other countries (especially the USA) had not followed its example, the programme was changed. Why did this happen? Because the most important environmental resources (water, air) are global public resources and this renders unilateralism (like strategy in environmental politics) deceptive.

In fact economical structural changes on a worldwide scale are needed to make our model of development a sustainable one.
Besides, there exists a very strong relationship between the sustainability of development and the problem of poverty. It is illusory and irresponsible to think that the first problem can be solved by separating it from the second one, or worse still by opposing it to the second problem. All the efforts to improve or preserve the environment of the Northern part of the world, are not of much good if at the same time these do not help the countries of the South to develop in line with their own cultures. It is very clear that a programme developed on a global scale is needed, because politics on a national scale cannot achieve such an aim.

But it is easy to foresee that this will be impossible unless we acquire a new sensitivity to common good, to universal brotherhood, to a universal destination of goods, and unless a considerable part of the world population changes its consumerist habits radically.

This operation demands an anthropological model about which we do not know much today. In this operation the attitude of communion has to replace the individual point of view. The limited view of a group has to give place to the view of the global human family. And everyone is called to give one's share.

Michele Zanzucchi
My talk comes from the reflection and work carried out by NetOne during these four years – a very short span of time, I should say - and it is the result of the "coordination between us communicators".
It is no easy task to speak of universal brotherhood in the world of media, where antagonism prevails.   Whether we like it or not, we media people have to deal with enemies; they may be present both within our circles (the manager for example) and also outside them (Osama or Saddam, for example).   Unfortunately, these enemies are there in front of us, even if we do all we can not to see them and not to create them. The media system – a system, that according to well know theories is based precisely on the amplification of contrasts and conflicts – seems to be purposely made to instigate us against someone.
So the professional communicator, who wants to work seriously for universal brotherhood, has a lot to risk. Technology and sophisticated communication techniques are continuously increasing the extraordinary possibility of bringing society closer together, or, on the contrary, creating divisions and separations. Bridges and gaps depend also on us.
An example: recently, Sunta Izzicupo, an italian-american from Los Angeles, who was the deputy manageress of the powerful CBS station, told me how television contributed in a very decisive manner to the events following 11th September, helping to prevent an implosion within the entire American territory. She related that the attention of TV viewers was concentrated on long forgotten values like solidarity, brotherhood and reciprocal help, rather than on fear, hatred and revenge. There were certain debatable aspects in what she related, but there was also a certain amount of truth.

Unfortunately, in media professions there is also the tendency of "creating" an enemy *ad hoc* that gives one the opportunity of projecting on the outside the bad feelings and division one may feel inside. Therefore great attention is needed when one is actually contributing to media projects. It is here that brotherhood can live or die, due to influences very often doomed by the media product itself.   With regards to this, communication among communicators is of utmost importance. Brotherhood has to be exercised by those who work in the field of communication. And this means that as brothers they should communicate their frustrations and also their stimuli and their projects. It means that they should help one another to discover the qualities and the potential that each one possesses and that are frequently discarded. Very often better work is the result. And this is not "being good". Because "being good" does not risk anything, it is living quietly, it is tackling problems and contrasts superficially. A goody is one who tends to demonstrate compassion about things he is not really sensitive about.

There seems to be three consequences that arise. The first one stems from the fact that in the act of communication not just two are involved (the one who talks and the one who listens, the one who gives the news and the other who receives them, the one who interviews and the one who is being interviewed), but there is always a third one. At times it may be one of the protagonists of communication; it may be the one helping out in an interview (the reader or the viewer), but it may also be our friends who listen to our transmission on the radio, or even a group of people mentioned in a news programme. Communication is never solely two-way. And very often this third element, more than any other, appreciates the behaviour of the media operator who tries to overcome divisions and to love the enemy. So it is of utmost importance to learn to speak to our listeners, explaining to them very clearly and truthfully the situations being dealt with, giving the bright and the dark side of each fact, without concealing any hope that may exist.

The second consequence deals with forgiveness, which is necessary both for our personal and social life and also essential in our media sphere. It is logical that no one asks for it by law; yet those who practise it internally or externally, manage very often to have a certain lucidity and shrewdness that they would otherwise lack. Don't we say that anger makes one go blind?

The third consequence is about memory, or better still about the purification of personal memory and even the historical memory. This means that one is ready to be merciful where mistakes of others are concerned (and as Simone Weil reminds us – it also means being merciful towards our own mistakes). It means that we look for what is good to present a solution and to start afresh from the good things we manage to achieve together. Through this, the communicator is not burdened with resentment that paralyses him or induces him to vengeance and to sterile contrasts. The communicator will also have no regrets about the irreparable mistakes committed, while confidence in future possibilities becomes the driving energy that leads to true communication for a united world.

Simonetta Magari
If brotherhood means what in psychology is termed as reciprocal relationship, then I believe it has much to say to my subject. But I must confess that psychology never speaks of brotherhood. Maybe only Maslow, who is indirectly interested in it, stresses the idea of "communitarian sentiment", an expression borrowed from Adler, used while speaking of the various characteristics of the person that achieves self-fulfillment. This sentiment of communion shows a genuine desire to help humankind. It is as if one is a member of the same big family.
I think I can claim that from Freud onwards psychology became interested in brotherhood, but here brotherhood simply meant a relationship between brothers, considered from a negative aspect, where conflicts arise and sentiments of jealousy and hatred take the upper hand and make one feel very guilty.
So rather than speaking of brotherhood, here one speaks of "fraternal rivalry".
Anna Freud attributed a mechanism of pathological infantile defense to this and she called it: "altruistic renunciation". But I think that there still exists an orientation that is quite known and found in various schools of thought and which is important for my report. In this sense, the subject of brotherhood may find a reason for confrontation, of great interest where psychological research is concerned, because most schools of thought consider it to be the foundation for human relationships.
Being continuously immersed in the situations that crop up from family and social interactions, the psychologist is bound to look for a common element that regulates communicative exchanges that frequently break out into violence, clashes, etc.
The concept of brotherhood may represent an indispensable element to combine each relationship in the respect and recognition of complementarities.
This brings to mind the news of some days ago: 11 suicides were committed in the span of 50 days in a certain Italian region. I do not know other details, but I think it is a bit hasty to conclude that this situation is simply the outcome of personal "pathology". Even the journalist who commented about the event spoke of a competitive society . . . etc, etc.
Definitely, a certain amount of self fragility, of a certain anguish, do not depend exclusively on external conditions, but they depend on the subjective answer one gives when passing through a critical moment, through a trauma. . . What would the situation be if such fragility were faced within a social community, within a family, where one inhales an atmosphere of brotherhood? In a culture that favours performance, competition, appearances and where even the most intimate and sentimental relationship of a couple frequently changes into a struggle where the dominating partner decides to leave the one who is not up to the mark, let us try and think of an atmosphere of brotherhood.
Brotherhood is solidarity; it is a trusting alliance that goes beyond the characteristics of the other

person. It says no to discrimination; it is able to compose diversity (we know that brothers have the most varied characteristics). Brotherhood is the place where even the one who is not productive finds a space. If we live this type of relationship, how many persons and families who live under the burden of a big or small psychological discomfort, would feel relieved, if not completely cured!

An interesting example of this is a self-help group of drug addicts and alcoholics: they have the chance to speak in a group, to share their fears, to open up to others. All these things help the person to understand himself better, to feel more cheerful and to contribute towards a positive change. Knowing that there is someone who can share your experience without judging you and who understands what you feel because he has passed through similar experiences, contribute to changes that will never happen just through individual psychotherapy.

Esther Salamanca
From a theoretical point of view, I think we can stop on two levels of different analyses. On one hand, it is necessary to look at this question considering the debate based on International Law (the moral foundation of international legal order) started during these last years at the heart of the scientific community. On the other hand, it is necessary to get to know the possible effects such a category can have on the structure of international society. These two different levels that we have mentioned – a normative one and an institutionalised one – are very closely related since International Law, like any other legal system is conditioned by the social group it regulates, and in our case by the characteristics of international society[1]. I would also like to clarify that this theoretical analysis is not sterile. On the contrary, it leaves a fundamental mark in international politics, because the general performance of all States is based on their concept of international law and international relationships.
An introductory statement: what do we mean by brotherhood when speaking of international order? The concept of "brotherhood" that I have in mind comes from two objective facts that are universally accepted:

- In the first place it means that all human beings belong to "a global entity" known as humanity. In the Preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) this is accepted explicitly when it speaks about "the dignity of all members of the human family". The notion of humanity contains a double meaning. It brings together into one space all men that live at the same time, irrespective of the place where they live and it brings together not only those who are living presently, but even those who will live in the future.

- Secondly, there exits a filial bond between all members of humanity because human nature is common to all of them. This is what is termed by article 1 of the Declaration of Human Rights (1948) as the "spirit of brotherhood".
"All human beings are born free and have equal dignity and equal rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and they have to behave towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood".

Klaus Diche, a jurist and critic of the Declaration, affirms that the human dignity found in the Universal Declaration is "an expression of the unity of humankind"[2].
By introducing this concept of brotherhood in article 1 of the Declaration, the value of a programmatic principle[3] has been conferred to it. This interpretation explains article one of the Declaration of the UNESCO on the human genome: "The human genome is the basis of the fundamental unity of all the members of the human family and the recognition of their intrinsic dignity and diversity"[4].

Nevertheless, on a political level, such a natural reality is determined by the existence of a political entity, by the sovereign State. Humanity is politically structured in sovereign States and it will continue to be so, unless an international political authority emerges that will be above the authority of the States. Yet, such a temporal reality does not eliminate the natural reality, but on the contrary, it supports the characteristic relationship of each human or political community: countries, states, international organizations[5].

---

1 I will avoid using the term "international community" used in international texts since the 60's because of a problematic concept. I do not want to be involved in the classical discussion among sociologists about "community" and "society". See Tonnies, *Communauté et société,* 1887.

2 "Dignity is an expression of the unity of mankind". K. Dicke "The Founding Function of Human Dignity in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights" D. Kretzmer /E. Klein (eds), The Concept of Human Dignity in Human Rights Discourse, Kluwer Law International, 2002, p.114

3 Ch. Tomuschat, Human Rights. Between Idealism and Realism, Oxford University Press, 2003.

4 UNESCO, Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, 11 Nov. 1997

5 This idea was started in the XVII century by the Spaniard Francisco de Victoria, who was one of the father founders of the Rights of People. He did not consider the State as a political society and as the last of the political realities, but he considered it to be part of the whole world. Victoria looks at

Explaining the concept of brotherhood as mentioned in the beginning – "the unity of the humankind" - I would like to refer to the first level mentioned: the aims of international law.

I do not intend to enter into details about the new theories on the moral and judicial justification of International Law, or in other words, about the function that International Law should be exercising to-day[6]. But we can be brief and say that to-day we have two lines of thought. There is the classic idea – the static approach. This considers international juridical order to be there to safeguard the interests of the States. The second one is the human rights approach. This claims that international juridical order is there to safeguard human rights, to see that justice is done with all human beings on our planet[7]. Yet, I feel that I should present a further juridical philosophical concept. This concept is trying to introduce a new function of International Law in international fora, and it speaks about the rights of humanity – the humanity approach. Punishment against "crimes of humanity", the recent evolution "in humanitarian international law", all humanity as the owner of the world's common heritage (the seabed, the Moon and other planets); the common human problem about the environment, together with the principle of intergenerational equity - all these are developments of the present international law. If man does not belong to humanity, then no one will be able to explain these developments.

My personal conclusion is that to-day brotherhood does not constitute a normative principle of International Law, because it is not being translated into norms that explain the international rights and obligations, not even in institutions that control the fulfillment of such regulations[8]. Yet, this does not mean that it has no repercussion on international law as "a programmatic principle", which in future may show all its potential.

With regards to the effect of brotherhood on the structure of international society, I intend to make other references later on during the debate.

Luca Crivelli

In my opinion, economy is, at the core of social sciences, the discipline which, more than any other has believed it can do without the principle of "fraternity". Of the three principles that have inspired the French revolution, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity", only the first two have, in fact, penetrated the field of economy.
- Liberty is, undoubtedly, the characteristic that best finds fulfilment in the exercise of free trade. Markets are actually the place in which one meets free thinking people – free and endowed with equal dignity. It is worth remembering that the mercantile society has replaced the feudal society which was, definitely, less liberal and more unjust, and that the exchange of equivalents can result – in the typical, ideal situation of perfect competition – in a level of equality among contracting parties. Exchange can, therefore, prevail over relations regulated by the principles of hierarchy or class of origin, and can create the premise (in terms of liberty and equality) necessary (even if not enough) to allow fraternity to flourish.
- When perceived not only in terms of a potential dignity but also in terms of an availability of a real resource, and of an opportunity for economic and social development, equality has guided the building of the models of welfare, the setting up of taxes and of fiscal systems, and the logic adopted for the esteem, of normative matters, attributed to neoclassical economists. One cannot

---

the various counties that are politically organised as being united between them through the common bond of human nature that is common to all of them. Men's language constitutes a unity, the moral person of the world. He believes that the only international society that one can see has no social contract. It emerges from "man's natural social nature that does not stop with the borders of a county but is extended to the universality of mankind. His bond is *ius gentium*. And for Victoria this has a double meaning. On one hand he looks at it as a universal right of humanity and on the other hand he sees as a right of peoples in the relationships between them - ius inter gentes". A. Truyol y Serra, Victoria, his place in the history of thought. R.E.D.I. vol36, 1984, p.25

6 See F.R. Teson, *A Philosophy of International Law*, Westview Press, 1998; A Buchanan, *Justice, Legitimacy and Self-Determination*, Oxford University Press, 2004

7 This philosophy can be very clearly appreciated, when one sees the orientation of work done by UN for peace, for development, international solidarity, democracy, the globalisation of economy, etc . . . for human rights.

8 Except for the legal framework which developed the principle of common heritage of humanity, applied to the international territorial waters of the seabed and founded an international organisation which represents humanity and administers this heritage to its benefit, the United Nations Convention on Marine Law, dated 10 December 1982 (Part XI) e the relative Agreement to Part XI of the United Nations Convention of Marine Law, dated 28 July 1994. See E.Salamnca, *La zona internazionale dei fondali marini. Partimonio commune dell'umanità*, Dykinson, Madrid, 2003.

deny the fact that in these last 30 years, equality has inspired the thoughts and actions in the field of economy in a much lesser way than liberty has.

- Finally, during the last two centuries, fraternity still remains to be considered as an irrelevant principle in economic considerations. It has been surpassed and, consequently, in my opinion, liberty and equality have been separated from each other. This has brought about the notorious juxtaposition between state and trade, between equity and efficiency (according to Dkun-"the big trade-off"), between the stage of producing economic well being and the moment of its redistribution.

This is not the place to investigate, in detail, the reasons why the principle of fraternity has not found an adequate space in the field of economics. I will limit myself and say that in this resultant situation, the influence exercised on economic sciences, ranging from utilitarianism and, I assume, the intransigent recourse to ontological individualism in describing the rational characteristic of mankind, are not unrelated. In the theory of rational choices, the characteristic relationships of rational man are, a priori, denied. The principles have lost their fundamental affinities and their social bearing and have assumed a further more personal and subjective dimension and have reduced themselves to the level of simple individual 'preferences'. Quite consciously, we have come to believe we are able to apply a principle which in economy marks the relationship between man and goods; in other words, the concept of utility even in relationships between persons. Through a semantic metamorphosis, happiness – *eudemonia* - which describes the flowering of social relationships has progressively been made to coincide with the concept of utility, a concept that defines the relationship that exists between man and goods. However, this actually means that the circle of interpersonal relationships is based on self gain. It is obvious that in such a paradigm, there is no space for fraternity. This, in fact, presupposes the recognition of the values and the identity of another person, perceived as necessary in order to be able to co-exist. When relationships are built on fraternity, the other person is always an end and not a means to achieve one's objectives.

Let us now consider this question: why is the principle of fraternity relevant to economic sciences? Even these sciences sense a growing discomfort when confronted with discipline and, in particular, because of the incapability to give adequate answers to the many afflictions of contemporary society. This discomfort is testified in a very effective way by the Swiss economist B.S. Frey, who, in the volume entitled "Inspiring Economics", notes a loss of contact, in the 1980's and the '90's, between this discipline and reality. The analysis of the economy of these twenty years is marked by a high degree of formalism and vigour, while the relevance and the originality of the theories are not given so much importance, and, above all, the programs of research have rarely been formulated to consider the "evils that afflict society", or with the intention to find remedies for them. This situation threatens to transform economy, from a "sad science", as Thomas Carlyle described it in the 18th century, into a "boring and insipid science". How can this stagnant situation be solved? The Swiss economist stresses the need to return and draw inspiration from knowledge that has developed in other social sciences. After years of imperialism of the economic method, years in which economy exported its own model of analysis and knowledge to all other social sciences, while remaining itself impermeable to the goals reached by other disciplines, it is now opportune to invert the signal of these specific "commercial scales", and move on to fully import knowledge from psychology, sociology and anthropology. I personally believe that this importation is already taking place (it is sufficient to think of the Nobel prize in Economics given in 1998 to the philosopher Amartya Sen and in 2002 to the psychologist Daniel Kahneman), and I am convinced, but this is perhaps still a stake for the future, that the principle of fraternity is specifically one of the most fruitful and inspiring ideas for the development of economic sciences.

Let us now move on to some specific questions.

Prof. *Rondinara the environmental themes in today's society provoke an endless discussion and generate very variegated and possibly, contrasting positions. However, I believe that, undoubtedly, the problem is not only a scientific or technological one, but that it is also a cultural problem, a matter of mentality, of approach and of vision. Do you agree?*

Humanity, has always felt to be part, and a special part, of the environment, and capable to learn its secrets, capable to contemplate its beauty, capable to work and transform it in order to satisfy its needs.

A typical characteristic, nowadays, is the experience of being able to know how to manage an ever increasing number of natural events, which, when taken as a whole, continue further to make us feel masters of nature, capable of exercising systematic control on nature – real control.

If in the recent past – especially when society was built on agriculture and farming – the relationship between man and nature was a relationship of collaboration, nowadays, we have to realize that this relationship has taken a critical configuration and is rightly considered by many to be an ethical problem.

Human behaviour, in fact, presents itself as the cause of problems of an ecological nature and also as the place and means, necessary for their solution. The environmental problem begins and identifies itself with man's actions on nature and particularly with those actions that cause an alteration in the balance found in nature.

The environmental crisis takes us back to a more profound crisis that assails a person in his entirety; and this is an anthropological crisis. The environmental crisis, the alarm bell secularized understanding of contemporary man, produces a culture of power, of dominion on natural reality and exalts the idea of progress totally guided by economic and technical reasoning that has never learnt to interrogate itself on the causes that have given rise to an irreversible growth.

This crisis is the offspring of a precise concept of modern man, a 'secularized' man who in his search for independence has called himself absolute master of his own destiny.

Each one of us can see how the present crisis of the man-nature relationship indicates the incapability of contemporary man to manage his own creativity and to put nature to good use. These aspects, in the present cultural situation are in juxtaposition among themselves, in that, if one makes space for human creativity, it is nature that suffers the consequences – one only needs to think about the impact of technological development on the environment – and, if one were to protect nature from man's works at all costs, it is the creativity of the latter that would have to be sacrificed.

The exploitation of nature and of human creativity are presently in conflict with each other, as very often human creativity is not in line with strong values like universal fraternity and the universal destiny of the environment, but is conditioned and, at times, even guided by a model of social – economic development with a strong anthropological deficiency: not focused on the person and on those values of which the person is flag bearer, but rather on profit. However, the ethical aspect, in respect of the performance of one's creativity, is only a component of a more articulated and complex problem such as the relationship between man and nature.

I think that such a renewed relationship, suitable for today's world necessarily restores the significance of relationships that link each one of us to nature itself. However, how is this possible? How can we build a correct "ecological ethos"?

These questions are a challenge for contemporary man who after having put aside – but not discarded – the spectre of a nuclear holocaust of mankind because of the contra opposition of the military blocks of the East and West, now finds in the environmental crisis a new and further decisive problem for the future of humanity.

Prof.essa *Salamanca, international relationships – from my point of view – are dripping with every type of interest: first of all, political and economic interest, but then also cultural, national, in other words, always interests of the individual. I know that you are profoundly convinced – by the research you have done and continue to do – of the need of bonds and more Unitarian, even gratuitous implications in international relationships. Would you like to explain your views to us?*

Fraternity, on the institutional level, can be a structural principle for the "future". If, in a general way, one mentions "interests of power", then the structure of international society to which I referred to earlier, continues to be the basis of a structure of power[9]. However, it is important to note that states have never remained in isolation. In 1965, Professor G.I. Tunkin, e Russian writer, stated: "States have never existed in isolation from each other. Each state finds itself from its very inception in a system of States".

---

[9] J.A.Carrillo Salcedo, *El Derecho internacional en un mundo en cambio*. 1983, pp.71 y 72.

Independently, from the beginning of the philosophy of politics, and here, we can refer to many theories about the organisation of the international society (from the Victorian *tutos orbis* to *civitas gentium* of Kant, or Rawl's international community of liberal states) we can find this "relational characteristic"[10].

Regarding international relationships, *strictu sensu*, as, for example, the relationship between States, history says that relations between States have never been "static". On the contrary, they have been profoundly "dynamic". We have been able to appreciate an evolution which allows us to say that up to this day, depending on the type of relationship established among States, we have three types of international societies:

    (a)   the simple juxtaposition of sovereign States, in other words, co-existence;

    (b)   the recognition of their common interests, in other words co-operation;

    (c)   a differential organisation, in other words, the institution of relationships.

I have to explain this concept further, to help you understand it: at the beginning of the international society of today, a beginning which can be dated back to the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Modern Era, with the appearance of the first nation States, States simply existed in juxtaposition. Sovereignty and equality of States were the basic notions. However, the actual development of society led, from the beginning of the 19th century, to the recognition of common interests of States, interests established on the notion of "interdependence", thereby giving rise to co-operation in order to fulfill these interests. This society – in turn, gave rise, in order to fulfill always greater common interests, to an institutionalized co-operation; in other words, international organisations came into being at the beginning of the 19th century and especially, prospered in the 20th century. Today, these three types of societies co-exist together.

At this point, may I ask: is it possible that the actual dynamics of an ever more closely linked interdependence between States, can transform itself into a new structure of international society built on the fulfillment, not of common interests but on the common welfare of humanity? In order to be able to give a positive answer to this question, a profound trust in humanity, not shared by all, is necessary.

My final conclusion is this: since the principles that have formed modern international societies are liberty, equality and the independence of basic political autonomous entities (the sovereign States), then, in this way, when the concept of fraternity, or, in other words, the concept of the "union of the human family", will learn how to politically structure international society, in a very different way from today's reality, then we will be able to say that fraternity has become a principle in the structure of international society.

Dott,ssa *Magari, your subject has recognized an exceptional development in these last decades, however with very uncertain results. We have less certainties, but do we have better instruments of knowledge to help men and women of today find a more mature balance to be able to make knowledgeable choices? Can the paradigm of unity pose an option in this regard?*

It is true! Psychology has developed very much in these last years, both in its theoretical aspect and in its practical application.

Your question indicates that we have a lesser number of certainties. In this respect, we can affirm that a greater knowledge of oneself and a greater liberty to express oneself and to make choices can lead, in the initial stages, to the perception of uncertainty, typical of the attitude of man towards new discoveries.

However, once consolidated, this greater knowledge and awareness of ourselves, leads us to a goal: the liberty of being, of choosing. Certainly, the risk of an absolute and extreme use of this, is the ethical relativism and an exasperated individualism, just as, in the past, the emphasis placed on the group to which one belongs, has, very often, led to an impersonalised social adaptation.

---

[10] Today this occurs not only among States, as main international actors, but also between persons, between national firms. One need only think of Globalisation, of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalisation founded recently, which in its first declaration states: "Broadly speaking, the process of globalisation has two aspects. The first refers to those factors – such as trade, investment, technology, cross-border production systems, flows of information and communication – which bring societies and citizens closer together".

However, and we often witness this in our clinical activity, an opportune use of awareness and of liberty leads man to be able to give freely, hence increasing his personal equilibrium and social cohesion. Also, each person's contribution becomes the added value to the free choice of being part of, of belonging to a social group: a group which, in turn, completes and empowers the personal value. And that group, as Gestalt says, is more than the sum of its parts.

This seems to us to be a real and ordinary opportunity, facilitated by cognitive instruments which psychology offers.

These are the dynamics of the paradigm of unity which, in contrast with uniformity, is characterized by the choice to love: offers itself for our own personal good and to accept fully whoever is besides us.

Therefore, it is perhaps true, that we have less certainties, but, it is actually this feeling of uncertainty that stimulates us to more real, spontaneous and free pursuits.

I feel that I can state that the paradigm of unity is actually the best opportunity, in this sense.

The first feeling is that one can somewhat assimilate the paradigm of unity with that of fraternity, in other words, as a reciprocal opening and wide disposition that allows persons to be close together, to help each other, to feel more similar to each other.

However, if we consider it in its full meaning, I feel that unity completes and surpasses those realities described earlier, because it requires a different measure of disposition, "to the point of giving up one's life", doing this with everyone, friend, neighbour and relative.

I think that the most important aspect is to state that living in "unity" does not destroy the person; there is no loosing oneself in another person (altruistic renunciation) because one does not give oneself up to the will of the other person, but, in an active way, one opts to love. Consequently, on the personal level there is an expansion of "I" and not a missed fulfillment; one's real needs are recognized, and not an emulation of what certain individualistic cultures propose.

Prof.*Crivelli*, *nowadays, economy takes the lion's share in a global society. The market controls and determines the life of peoples and of society, with its values and lack of values, with its processes, with its cultures. As a result, however, society has become more competitive in conflict rather than in agreement and harmony; has become greedier for consumer goods and possessions rather than sharing and giving, much more than economists of the 18th century ever thought of. Do you see, in modern economic theories and in many initiatives of social and civil economy, that have started in these decades, something which indicates, or better still, that recalls fraternity as a category useful also to economy?*

Even among economists, awareness is growing that an hypertrophied expansion of a mercantile nature, of instrumental relationships dictated only by personal interest, could lead to a progressive dissatisfaction of society. Without necessarily sharing the positions of critics, even most radical ones, like Serge Latouche, and convinced that any form of market can destroy civil virtues, trust and social capital, many are those who today perceive the necessity to establish economic activity on other scales, so that they can find space on the market next to other spheres such as equality and justice, responsibility and reciprocity, donation and gratuity.

I am impressed by the contents of these speeches that important people of the world have made a few days ago on the occasion of the World Economic Forum. Proposals which we were accustomed to hear mostly in Porto Alegre have been formulated. They might remain nice words, but, in any case, the fact that such speeches have been delivered already constitutes a historical fact, "a sign of the times". In these years, one of the most promising sectors in which work has been done, on the theoretic and experimental level, concerns the type of man with whom economic research has to come to terms. We are becoming aware that abridged theories like that of "homo oeconomicus" end up by modifying one's object of studies (man), making legitimate and thereby favouring the diffusion of one' own interests and anti-social behaviour. Theories in social sciences are never "neutral" instruments of knowledge. I, consequently, claim that studies, published in these last seven or eight years by many influential economists, studies that have often been made in collaboration with researchers in other social disciplines, like topics on reciprocity, trust, the removal of intrinsic motivations determined by monetary incentives, the role of social capital that allows the good functioning of businesses and institutions and the risk that completion, in terms of

positional consumption, removes the growth of relational wealth, are of particular significance. Consequently, it is important to admit that a culture of politics that aims to encourage reciprocity and to promote the presence, in every level of society, of persons who focus their attention on interpersonal relationship generates higher results even of the performance of an economic profile more than policies which promote efficiency through monetary incentives which actually exasperate individualistic and self-interested behaviour. Allow me to refer to an experience with which I am well acquainted known as "Economy of Communion". It is a project that today involves 800 firms worldwide and which affirms, by its very existence, that economic activity can make room to more principles than those which promote the logic of interest and manipulated rationality. In firms adhering to the Economy of Communion a fundamental resource has a cultural matrix that pervades the whole project and is defined as "the culture of giving". This culture that promotes commercial and occupational relationships as occasions of authentic encounter between people, and regards firms as a social benefit and a collective resource; such a culture transcends the idea of markets as being solely a place for efficiency and of instrumental relationships. In perceiving and living economy in this way and remaining at the same time entirely together with all firms present on the market, the experience of the Economy of Communion reunites the market and life, efficiency and solidarity, economy and sharing. The project also carries a cultural importance, as it is followed by a lot of research and cultural reflection which has matured some significant results: an initial theory of relational goods and an important contribution towards the debate on economy and happiness, giving some guidelines for the foundation of a relational theory of happiness centred on the notion of the person.

If it is true, as someone mentioned, that the decline of a society begins at the moment in which persons do not find within them that motivation which binds their destiny with that of others; then, it is probable that no other resource can be more useful and necessary than fraternity, especially in the economic world.

Conclusion: The aim of these brief insights on the subject of fraternity taken from different perspectives was to make you see how our working together around the subject of fraternity is motivating us not only within each discipline, but also among the various disciplines. We are trying to seek dialogue among ourselves, to build together a plan of interpretation of a reality that has a meaning, a value. Our proposal – in line with the method we have adopted – is open to discussion, to the contribution of whoever would like to add a part that could enrich the whole picture in harmony with all the other contributions.