

Cardinal Peter Kodwo TURKSON\*

## GLOBALISATION: A THREAT OR AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A DEVELOPING COUNTRY? A CASE FOR PARTNERSHIPS THAT EMBODY SOLIDARITY

**Abstract:** With the onset of the third millennium, African leaders and their counterparts elsewhere in the world community have signed Agreements to do better for Africa and its peoples. Yet the new global connections of partnership between developing and developed worlds, like those of earlier times, often fail to benefit the people of Africa. Among the factors that underlie this failure are the globalisation and economic liberalism which increasingly dominate the world economy. The world's stronger actors must renounce all forms of petty selfishness and adopt an *ethic of solidarity* as the only authentic basis for collaborations that enhance what is truly human. It is the task of today's generation to appreciate and actualize *solidarity* at the centre of world dynamics in order to achieve universal common good.

**Key words:** *partnership, globalization, G8, NEPAD, EU, WTO, NEPAD, free trade, open market, Reaganomics, Africa, developing countries, development, common good, economic liberalism, deregulation, solidarity*

### INTRODUCTION: AFRICA, AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WORLD?

In 2011, as you will recall, sixteen African countries celebrated the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of their independence. One of these governments, Cameroon's, in a generous display of magnanimity, chose to consider the *pan-African* significance of these independence celebrations. Against the background of their own particular history and experience of independence, Cameroonians set out to consider the reality and the challenges of Africa as an *opportunity for the world*. Accordingly, numerous distinguished, seasoned and erudite statesmen, diplomats and scholars gathered to reflect deeply on Africa – her place and experience in the world, and the challenges facing her as well as her opportunities. The hope at the time was

---

\* Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace

that this study session would lead to a new trajectory for Africa in her post-independence history while, for the sake of her populations, she pursues opportunities for good governance, economic stability and growth, poverty eradication, disease control and access to health care, food security, and peace in an increasingly globalizing world.

Indeed, when in 1999, President Bill Clinton visited Ghana, the *Herald Tribune* wrote: “We have been told that Clinton is coming to change the way Americans think about Africa, from a continent of despair to a place of opportunity and hope.” President Clinton had introduced into Congress the *African Growth and Opportunity Act* which he explained as follows: “By opening markets and building businesses and creating jobs, we can help and strengthen each other. By supporting the education of your people, we can strengthen your future and help each other. For centuries, other nations exploited Africa’s gold, Africa’s diamonds and Africa’s minerals. Now is the time for Africans to cultivate something more precious: the mind and heart of the people of Africa, through education.” [1]

Similarly, proceedings at the G8 meeting in L’Aquila, Italy, in July 2009, led observers to describe Africa as a continent of opportunity for the world, so the rest of the world had to change its way of looking at Africa. As a journalist of an Italian newspaper put it: “It is no longer the time to hit readers in the stomach, seeking to get them emotionally excited with images of hunger and death. Through all these years, it did not achieve much. We have to speak to their minds... and explain that Africa’s development is an opportunity for all, bringing with it solutions for the economy, for security and for the environment.”[2]

Here it was not just Africa which was considered an opportunity for the world. It was rather *Africa’s development* which would make it an opportunity for the world.

The basic challenges now facing Africa are clear:

- *how to make the people of Africa see for themselves the opportunities which outsiders describe in her; and still more importantly,*
- *how the people of the continent can turn their God-given opportunities and endowments into a reality from which they can truly benefit.*

The rest of this presentation will focus on the key role of *partnership* in responding to those challenges, especially the second. Partnership holds great promise but can easily fall short of that promise if disconnected from an overriding ethic of *solidarity*.

<sup>1</sup> 23 March 1998. <http://www.library.yale.edu/~fboateng/bill.htm>

<sup>2</sup> *La Stampa Domenica*, 5 July 2009, p. 3. “Non è più il tempo di colpire lo stomaco dei lettori, cercando di emozionali con immagine della morte e della fame.” Non è servito a molto in questi anni. Dobbiamo parlare al cervello... e spiegare che è un’opportunità per tutti che l’Africa si sviluppi: sarebbe una soluzione per l’economia, la sicurezza e l’ambiente.” Our translation into English.

## AFRICA'S ARCHITECTS AND ARCHITECTURE OF OPPORTUNITY AND DEVELOPMENT

Happily, the onset of the third millennium appeared to have coincided with an emerging continental desire on the part of African leaders themselves for a new Africa. A new breed of African leaders dreamt of a new Africa and wanted to spearhead Africa's response to her vocation to pursue her own development. Thabo Mbeki of South Africa's ANC party, for example, believed that "there was an African renaissance on the way which would change both the perception and the reality of Africa's drive towards modernization and prosperity," and that "it required renewal of our values and re-definition of our methods."

Another politician from more than half way across the continent— Ghana's former minister of Foreign Affairs, Nana Akuffo-Addo – would echo the sentiments of Mbeki, claiming that there was "a new contemporary African self-assertion to build an African civilization which would be responsive to the dictates of our times, namely, economic prosperity, political freedom and social solidarity." In July 2009, President Kikwete of Tanzania repeated the same sentiments: "in Africa there are already strong leaders who are ready to go ahead, and we would like to be by their side."<sup>[3]</sup>

Such were the sentiments, and many more ideas which followed, that fuelled the formation of NEPAD, the New Partnership for Africa's Development. African political leaders, it appeared, were determined to change the face of political administration on the continent. They spearheaded, accordingly, a critical self-appraisal of Africa, which identified poor and even bad governance on the continent as a cause of Africa's poverty. They charted a path of good governance, accountability and transparency, and adopted a framework that would guide performance and set the tone for Africa's renewal through transparent political leadership.

This is the strategic framework of NEPAD. It received worldwide recognition and applause; and it was extolled as a development framework fashioned by Africans to guide Africa's emergence from poverty and its attainment of the Millennium Development Goals. This, for Dr. Uschi Eid, <sup>[4]</sup> for example, was how Africa's development had to proceed: "Cooperation means to realize a vision together with the people in Africa, the vision of an Africa that is modern and independent, where self-confident African men and women shape their own life, their own future and pursue their own path of a sustainable and a democratic development. Only stimuli and efforts coming from within Africa will lead to success."<sup>[5]</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Fraternité Matin*, 10 July 2009, p. 1 "il existe déjà en Afrique des dirigeants forts qui sont prêts à aller de l'avant; et nous souhaitons être à leurs côtés." Our translation into English.

<sup>4</sup> Parliamentary State Secretary in the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany.

<sup>5</sup> TICAD (Tokyo International Conference on African Development) III held in Tokyo, 2003.

## AFRICA'S ARCHITECTURE OF OPPORTUNITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBALIZING WORLD: THE NEED FOR PARTNERSHIP

In the globalized setting of our world, the creation of partnerships between independent sovereign states was understood to be indispensable for the implementation of Africa's architecture of opportunity and development.

### *NEPAD, the G8, the EU*

Accordingly, in July 2001, NEPAD was presented to the G8 leaders at Genoa. They committed themselves to preparing a G8 Africa Action Plan.

The five president initiators of NEPAD presented the Action Plan in October 2001 to the EU at Brussels. The EU issued a joint statement expressing strong support for the African initiative, especially for the political values at the heart of NEPAD and for its commitment to poverty eradication. It also provided a follow-up mechanism to focus on capacity-building and infrastructure. The Action Plan was also endorsed at a G8 summit held 26–27 June 2002 at Kananaskis, Canada in the presence of the former UN Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan, and four of the five African initiators. In the words of one commentator, "The aim of the G8 Africa Action Plan was neither to provide a massive infusion of funding nor to underwrite NEPAD. It was to put in place a new partnership to unlock much greater resources, both public and private. Trade and investment were to be favoured over loans and grants, through deregulation, removal of controls, and creating an appropriate investment climate."<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, there was agreement between the associations of developed countries and the African leaders to contribute to the implementation of NEPAD in specified areas:

- promoting peace and security;
- strengthening institutions and governance;
- fostering trade, investment, economic growth and sustainable development;
- implementing debt relief;
- expanding knowledge and improving and promoting education, and expanding digital opportunities;
- improving health and confronting HIV-AIDS;
- increasing agricultural productivity;
- improving water resource management.

But alas, the African leaders and architects of NEPAD failed to appreciate and to live up to the challenges of their own commitments and agenda, and thereby provided their external partners with an escape from honouring theirs. NEPAD went dormant. However, the African Union (AU) has adopted some of its ideas and strategic visions to inspire ongoing EU-African cooperation. Accordingly, the EU-

---

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Francisco Granell, Principal Adviser at the European Commission's Directorate-General for Development and Professor at Barcelona University, in the ACP-EU Courier, no. 194, September-October 2002, pp. 28–29.

Africa summit of December 2007 cemented a new Africa-EU Strategic Partnership that sought to make a qualitative leap in eight strategic areas, namely:

- Peace and Security,
- Democratic Governance and Human Rights,
- Trade – Regional Integration and Infrastructure,
- the Millennium Development Goals,
- Energy and Climate Change,
- Migration – Mobility and Employment,
- Science Information Society, and
- Space.

These strategic areas have defined the framework for EU-African cooperation in the subsequent years, together with the principles of *African ownership, co-management and co-responsibility* as the fundamental bedrock of this cooperation. Indeed, the third Africa-EU summit, which took place in November 2010 in Libya, was expected to be guided by these principles and foster discussions of partnerships in the interests of the two continents.

#### PARTNERSHIPS, OLD AND NEW: THE GLOBALIZATION FACTOR

The term *partnership* can be applied to the inter-dependence and inter-connectedness of nations and their economic lives that date from the first contacts between Africa, Europe and the Arab world. It all began when our ancestors began to venture out of the savannah, first north, then west and east and finally throughout the globe, in search of game and then of fertile land. Later movements – whether it was empires expanding, traders in search of opportunities or zealous missionaries wanting to spread their faith – had some grounding motivation to involve other parts of the world in one's projects, to 'go global', to *globalize*. For example, Ghana came into contact with Europe by accident when Portuguese sailors came ashore at Shama in search of fresh water. When they could easily trade a blanket for a handful of gold dust, they quickly forgot about the spice route they had been following to the Indies.

Christian chaplains who accompanied the sailors and early traders (colonizers of the 15<sup>th</sup> century) soon ventured out of their trading posts to preach their faith to the natives in fulfilment of the missionary mandate of Christ: "Go and teach all nations" (Mt 28: 19). Islam followed, coming from the Sahara in the North with camel traders (17<sup>th</sup> century) who exchanged spices for wood and salt. Muslims sought to establish the *Ummah* while Christians wished to share the Good News to the ends of the earth. What the colonizers, the missionaries and the Arab traders began doing in earnest some 500 years ago, namely, to 'go global' with their interests, culture and faith, has never stopped.

African countries achieved 'independence' more than 50 years ago, but the Commonwealth, *la Francophonie* and the Organization of Islamic Countries with their respective spheres of influence are still present, along with the mixed blessing of international languages (English, French and, lately, Arabic). So, contact with

the broader world via a mix of colonization, trade and faith is not new to African countries – some global features of Africa’s early contacts, especially with Europe and the Arab world, have persisted.

To a large extent, where the economic alliances within these traditional forms of partnership between African states and their colonial masters used to be the norm, other powerful economic alliances have come to the fore of late. There are alliances between African nations (individually or *en bloc*) and the USA (*Millennium Challenge Account*), the European Economic Community (*Lomé Culture, Yaoundé Agreement* and the *Cotonou Agreement*)[7] and Japan (*TICAD I-III*). Recently, China and India, hungry for natural resources, have emerged on the scene, displaying interest in every conceivable aspect of African national economies and concluding various loan and development agreements with African States individually.

Several controversial issues persist beneath the surface of most of these modern alliances, protocols and agreements. The major debates are about:

- *Trade or aid*. The countries that have experienced discernible development have done so through trade in raw materials and other goods and not through aid which brings with it a syndrome of dependency. Therefore, the decisions and conditions which the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other investor bodies impose on trade are of great concern to the young trading economies of Africa.
- *Trade and investment versus loans and grants*. It is generally held that in order to favour trade and investment, a so-called *appropriate investor climate* is required. This usually consists in free markets, deregulation and the removal of controls. These features remove tools from African governments for shaping their economies to meet their internal needs.
- *Imbalance of power*. National African Governments can find the integrity and autonomy of their national economies threatened by investor groups which are not only better-resourced than they are, but which also enjoy various forms of diplomatic pressure which their home governments readily exercise on their behalf – including the waging of wars – to protect their investments and interests. The latest example, as some see it, has been Britain and France arranging for the might of NATO to fight against Gadhafi to protect British Petroleum and Elf-Total.

---

<sup>7</sup> The *Lomé Culture* is the name given to a bundle of development cooperation agreements between countries of the European Economic Community (EEC) and their former colonies. It began in 1957 at the “Treaty of Rome”, which established the EEC. *Lomé I – Lomé IV* arranged for Aid through Trade between EEC countries and 46 African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) countries (respect for human rights, democratic principles and rule of law). The *Yaoundé Agreement* was signed in 1975 between EEC and ACP countries to help with infrastructure development in Francophone countries. The *Cotonou Agreement* was signed in 2000 between the EU and 77 ACP countries to last for 20 years. It was aimed at poverty reduction, sustainable development, and progressive integration of ACP economies into the world economy.

It is the essentially *social* nature of the human person and the organic and cooperative character of human society that give *partnership* its fundamental logic and *raison d'être*.<sup>[8]</sup> But in the economic context outlined above, *partnership* may be deflected from its natural expression in mutuality or reciprocity and made to serve the “law of the strongest”.<sup>[9]</sup> Similarly, the inter-dependence and inter-connectedness of nations and their economic lives grow out of the organic and cooperative nature of society, from which arises the fundamental ethic of partnership; but all this is transformed by modern communication technologies into the current phenomenon of globalization. So, in our 21<sup>st</sup> century, the determining context within which economic partnerships are concluded, within which African leaders anticipate an African Renaissance, and within which Africans dream of opportunities, is *globalization*.

### GLOBALIZATION AND NEW PARTNERSHIPS FOR AFRICA'S RENAISSANCE AND OPPORTUNITIES

When Fox News analysed the sequence of socio-political upheavals in North Africa and the Middle East on the weekend of 12–13 February 2011, it attributed the simultaneity of the demonstrations, their coordination, their efficiency and their effectiveness to a planned use of the modern improved means of communications, namely, the *Internet* (Google and Facebook) and *mobile telephony*. The power of improved modern communication and mobility technologies has been at work in the demonstrations of North Africa and the Middle East, spreading behaviour patterns, actions, idealisms and ideologies etc. The same power also lies at the heart of the phenomenon of *globalization*. Globalization may be seen as the process of the increasingly rapid and inexpensive circulation or mobility of goods, capital, people and information on a planetary scale in “real time”, made possible by new technologies of data transmission. As a result, the geographical location where an economic agent carries out its operations may coincide with the entire world.

In the wake, then, of dizzying developments in the field of telecommunications and the attendant reduction in the cost of communication and its technologies,<sup>[10]</sup> the process by which commercial trade and financial transactions are expanding worldwide has greatly accelerated. Thus our modern era is characterized by a complex phenomenon of economic and financial globalization: a process that progressively integrates national economies at the level of the exchange of goods and services and of financial transactions. Along the way, ever-growing numbers of people involved in the economic sector are prompted to adopt a more global, less local perspective concerning the choices that they must make with regard to future growth and profits.

---

<sup>8</sup> In the well-known words of the English poet John Donne, “No man is an island.” The mutuality of partnership rests on the fundamentally social nature of human beings.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Benedict XVI, *Address on arrival at Luanda International Airport*, 20 March 2009.

<sup>10</sup> *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004, § 362.

This new perspective – “global society” – does not simply consist in economic and financial ties, and bonds between national forces at work in different countries. These have always existed. It consists rather in their pervasiveness and the absolutely unprecedented nature of the system of relations that is developing.[11] The result is the creation and emergence of a “*process of interaction and integration among people, companies, and governments of different nations: a process driven by international trade and investment, and aided by information technology.*”[12] It is thus a *globalization of commerce* that goes beyond the elimination of barriers to the movement of people, capital and goods. More importantly, it “enshrines a kind of triumph of the market and its logic, which in turn is bringing rapid changes in social systems and cultures.”[13] This is where one needs to advert to the impact of *globalization* on emerging economies and on developing nations.

### UNMASKING GLOBALIZATION IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Understood as referring to how enhanced mobility (of capital, goods, people, resources etc.) and improved telecommunication have heightened man’s sense of inter-dependence and inter-connectedness, globalization is really value-free, neither good nor bad. As Pope Benedict XVI puts it: “Despite some of its structural elements, which should neither be denied nor exaggerated, globalization *a priori* is neither good nor bad. It will be what people make of it.” Accordingly, the Holy Father recommends open-mindedness to the phenomenon of globalization:

Blind opposition would be a mistake and prejudiced attitude, incapable of recognizing the positive aspects of the process, with the consequent risk of missing the chance to take advantage of its many opportunities for development. The processes of globalization, suitably understood and directed, open up the unprecedented possibility of large-scale redistribution of wealth on a wide scale; if badly directed, however, they can lead to an increase in poverty and inequality, and could even trigger a global crisis.”[14]

To prevent the latter from happening, Pope John Paul II once advised that “the necessary ethical guarantee must be developed, so that individuals and peoples do not become tools, but protagonists of their future. All this can be achieved and, since it is possible, it becomes a duty.”[15]

Indeed, globalization has become what people have made of it; and both the positive and the negative effects are verifiable! While it can be credited in places with having facilitated the growth and development of local economies, it has also decimated national economies. In the “triumph of the market and its logic”, the real

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, § 361.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.globalization101.org/what-is-globalization/>

<sup>13</sup> John Paul II, *Address to the Pontifical Academy of the Social Sciences*, 2001, §2.

<sup>14</sup> Benedict XVI, *Caritas in veritate*, § 42.

<sup>15</sup> John Paul II, *Homily at the Mass for the Jubilee of Workers*, 1 May 2000.



novelty of today's globalization, which also makes it a menace to developing nations, is the *disappearance of economic sovereignty* or of the *economic nation state*.

It is the belief in certain circles that the two world leaders who successfully campaigned for this disappearance of economic sovereignty were U. S. President Ronald Reagan (1981–1989) and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (1979–1990). They both believed firmly that private enterprise and the workings of the market economy, if not interfered with by external regulations and interferences (whether subsidies or taxes) would best meet the needs and fulfil the desires of the greatest number of people.

Well then, let us look at two typical examples, Zambia and India:

- Between 2006 and 2010, Zambia's annual economic growth averaged 6.1%. During the same period, Zambia's poverty level declined from 62.8% to 60.5%. Today, 8.1 out of the 13 million Zambians do not dispose of \$1.25 per day and are considered poor.
- Still more dramatic is the case of India: The economy of India is now the fourth largest in the world – this is accredited to trade liberalisation. Growth in the Indian economy has steadily increased since 1979, averaging 5.7% per year. India, now a global leader in software and business process outsourcing services, rakes in revenues of US\$12.5 billion per annum.<sup>16</sup> However in 2006, the UNDP's human development index ranked India at 126<sup>th</sup> out of 177 countries. Nearly 35% of the population was living below \$1 a day, while at \$2 a day, it was nearly 80% of the population, which means some 800 million people, more than the entire population of sub-Saharan Africa.

So, all is not well with the economics of the President and the Prime Minister!

Impressive rates of growth co-exist with so much ongoing and pervasive poverty. There is a paradox here that the growth of global wealth in absolute terms does not correspond to the development and flourishing of all. It simply means that growth or recovery does not translate into improved living standards for the majority of citizens. When given a narrow fixation on investment yield and maximum profit, *globalization* does not make for an equitable spread of wealth and a solution to human flourishing. As long as *globalization* is unfairly tilted in favour of the already-developed economies, as long as it is made to serve the “strongest”, local industries and economies are going to collapse, and the imbalances and, indeed, injustices and suffering are going to continue with little or no improvement.

Nevertheless, the combination of liberal market ideology (“*reaganomics*”) with the two factors of *speed* is the predominant form of *globalization*; and this is not a chance development, without “owners” and “drivers”. It is public knowledge that the ‘opening up of markets and economies’ were specifically driven by the IMF, the World Bank and the US Treasury. This was done under the tacit agreement among these institutions which came to be known as the *Washington Consensus*.<sup>17</sup> Thus,

<sup>16</sup> *Economic Survey 2005–2006*.

<sup>17</sup> J. E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents*, London, Penguin Books, 2002.

it is perhaps naive to assume that economic globalization is a process that evolved on its own and, therefore, is uncontrollable; the reverse, in fact, is the case. From many indications, global finance or ‘the markets’ (as we have come to know them), seem to be in the driver’s seat, bestowing on *globalization*, as the new form of *economic partnership*, the very narrow vision of interest in investment yield and profit.

But the wish, of course, of developing countries and their economies is that profit and gain would not be the only compass directing the movement of “the markets” and *globalization*, but also those “*ethical guarantees which ensure that individuals and peoples do not become mere tools of globalization and the market, but protagonists of globalization for their future*”.

The present day experience of *globalization* in developing countries, like Ghana, is essentially twofold:

1. The *enhanced mobility* (of capital, goods, people, raw materials, manufactured goods, resources etc.) and the *marvels of communication technology* are serving the dismantling of economic and cultural sovereignties.
2. The pursuit of investor-friendly conditions – that is, of deregulation, free market and the removal of controls – imposes on developing countries precisely those conditions which militate against productivity and growth of local industry.

These, despite the observed benefits of *globalization*, are a real threat to emerging economies and developing nations.

### ***Humanizing Globalization through Solidarity:***

But, *globalization* does not have to rob people of their future. Rather, the fact that “it becomes what people make of it” means that it can become something else; and we may recall again and with great profit Pope Benedict XVI’s evaluation of the phenomenon already cited above: “The processes of globalization, suitably understood and directed, open up the unprecedented possibility of large-scale redistribution of wealth on a wide scale; if badly directed, however, they can lead to an increase in poverty and inequality, and could even trigger a global crisis.”<sup>[18]</sup> To ensure that the latter does not happen, the Pope advises:

It is necessary to correct the malfunctions, some of them serious, that cause new divisions between peoples and within peoples, and also to ensure that the redistribution of wealth does not come about through the redistribution or increase of poverty: a real danger if the present situation were to be badly managed... Today the material resources available for rescuing these people from poverty are potentially greater than before, but they have ended up largely in the hands of people from developed countries who have benefited more from the liberalization that has occurred in the mobility of capital and labour. The world-wide diffusion of forms of prosperity should not therefore be held up by projects that are self centred, protectionist or at the service of private interests. Indeed the involvement of emerg-

<sup>18</sup> *Caritas in veritate*, § 42.

ing or developing countries allows us to manage the crisis better today. The transition inherent in the process of globalization presents great difficulties and dangers that can only be overcome if we are able to appropriate the underlying anthropological and ethical spirit that drives globalization towards the humanizing goal of *solidarity*. [Thus, it will be possible] to experience and to steer the globalization of humanity in relational terms, in terms of communion and the sharing of goods.<sup>[19]</sup>

At the end of the day, globalization must not only make us inter-connected and inter-dependent. It must also make us brothers, in response to the vocation of humanity to brotherhood, and in the realization of the social nature of the human person and of the organic and cooperative character of human society. *Solidarity*, then, must also be *globalized*!

***The Ethic of Solidarity must become a virtue:***

Nowhere else in the world is there such strong reason for believing deeply in the unity of the human race as in Africa, where man was born and back to where all peoples of the earth – no matter how far and wide they have been scattered – must finally trace back their ancestry. Maybe it is no accident that we are so conscious of our ancestors, as an expression of our “*inter-generational solidarity*”.

I am not quite sure how Muslims and Jews would affirm that the ethic of solidarity must become a principle of action. Let me say it as a Christian: The Christian Social Teaching about the fundamental ethic underlying *globalization* lies in the Scriptures; and it is the unity of the human race and its vocation to *solidarity*. The biblical affirmation of God’s lordship over history, the cosmos and all that there is, has a corollary affirmation, which is the common divine source and authorship of humanity. From this derives the affirmation of the unity of the human family, despite its diversity, and the relatedness and indeed interdependence of its members: all belonging to each, and each belonging to all. Humanity as it were has a commonweal for which we all are co-responsible; and *solidarity* expresses humanity’s co-responsibility for its commonweal!

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

