

From the text of Populorum Progressio

Excerpts from the encyclical Populorum Progressio, issued on March 26, 1967 by Pope Paul VI:

... Today the peoples in hunger are making a dramatic appeal to the peoples blessed with abundance. The Church shudders at this cry of anguish. . . .

Before We became Pope, two journeys, to Latin America in 1960 and to Africa in 1962, brought Us into direct contact with the acute problems pressing on continents full of life and hope. Then on becoming Father of all We made further journeys, to the Holy Land and India, and were able to see and virtually touch the very serious difficulties besetting peoples of longstanding civilizations who are at grips with the problem of development. . . .

Then quite recently, We considered it Our duty to set up a Pontifical Commission in the Church's central administration, charged with "bringing to the whole of God's People the full knowledge of the part expected of them at the present time, so as to further the progress of poorer peoples, to encourage social justice among nations, to offer to less developed nations the means whereby they can further their own progress": its name, which is also its program, is *Justice and Peace*. . . .

Part I: For man's complete development

Freedom from misery, the greater assurance of finding subsistence, health and fixed employment; an increased share of responsibility without oppression of any kind and in security from situations that do violence to their dignity as men; better education—in brief, to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more: that is what men aspire to. . . .

In [the current world replete with inequalities] . . . the temptation becomes stronger to risk being swept away towards types of messianism which give promises but create illusions. The resulting dangers are patent: violent popular

reactions, agitation towards insurrection, and a drifting towards totalitarian ideologies. Such are the data of the problem. . . .

[L]ocal and individual undertakings are no longer enough. The present situation of the world demands concerted action based on a clear vision of all economic, social, cultural and spiritual aspects. . . .

Development cannot be limited to mere economic growth. In order to be authentic, it must be complete: integral, that is, it has to promote the good of every man and of the whole man. . . .

In the design of God, every man is called upon to develop and fulfill himself. . . . By the unaided effort of his own intelligence and his will, each man can grow in humanity, can enhance his personal worth, can become more a person. . . .

But each man is a member of society. . . . It is not just certain individuals, but all men who are called to this fullness of development. . . . The reality of human solidarity, which is a benefit for us, also imposes a duty. . . .

"Fill the earth and subdue it": The Bible, from the first page on, teaches us that the whole of creation is for man, that it is his responsibility to develop it by intelligent effort and by means of his labor to perfect it, so to speak, for his use. If the world is made to furnish each individual with the means of livelihood and the instruments for his growth and progress, each man has therefore the right to find in the world what is necessary for himself. The recent Council reminded us of this: "God intended the earth and all that it contains for the use of every human being and people. . . ." All other rights whatsoever, including those of property and of free commerce, are to be subordinated to this principle. . . .

Development demands bold transformations, innovations that go deep. Urgent reforms should be undertaken without delay. . . .

Individual initiative alone and the mere free play of competition could never assure successful development. . . . It is not sufficient to increase overall wealth for it to be distributed equitably. It is not sufficient to promote technology to render the world a more human place in which to live. . . .

It can even be affirmed that economic growth depends in the very first place upon social progress: thus basic education is the primary object of any plan of development. . . .

Not that material prosperity of itself precludes the activity of the human spirit. On the contrary, the human spirit, "increasingly free of its bondage to creatures, can be more easily drawn to the worship and contemplation of the Creator. . . ." What must be aimed at is a complete humanism.

Part II: The development of the human race in the spirit of solidarity

There can be no progress towards the complete development of man without the simultaneous development of all

humanity in the spirit of solidarity. . . . This duty is the concern especially of better-off nations. . . .

But . . . it is not just a matter of eliminating hunger, nor even of reducing poverty. . . . It is a question, rather, of building a world where every man, no matter what his race, religion or nationality, can live a fully human life, freed from servitude imposed on him by other men or by natural forces over which he has not sufficient control; a world where freedom is not an empty word. . . .

Every nation must produce more and better quality goods to give to all its inhabitants a truly human standard of living, and also to contribute to the common development of the human race. . . .

In order to be fully effective, these efforts [to improve the economic conditions of the developing sector] ought not to remain scattered or isolated. . . . [T]he present situation calls for concerted planning. . . .

At Bombay We called for the establishment of a great *World Fund*, to be made up of part of the money spent on arms, to relieve the most destitute of this world. What is true of the immediate struggle against want, holds good also when there is a question of development. Only world-wide collaboration, of which a common fund would be both means and symbol, will succeed in overcoming vain rivalries and in establishing a fruitful and peaceful exchange between peoples.

There is certainly no need to do away with bilateral and multilateral agreements. . . . However, if they were to be fitted into the framework of world-wide collaboration, they would be beyond all suspicion, and as a result there would be less distrust on the part of the receiving nations. . . .

This means that it is absolutely necessary to create among all peoples . . . dialogue. This dialogue between those who contribute wealth and those who benefit from it, will provide the possibility of making an assessment of the contribution necessary, not only drawn up in terms of the generosity and the available wealth of the donor nations, but also conditioned by the real needs of the receiving countries and the use to which the financial assistance can be put.

Developing countries will thus no longer risk being overwhelmed by debts whose repayment swallows up the greater part of their gains. Rates of interest and time for repayment of the loan could be so arranged as not to be too great a burden on either party, taking into account free gifts, interest-free or low-interest loans, and the time needed for liquidating the debts. Guarantees could be given to those who provide the capital that it will be put to use according to an agreed plan and with a reasonable measure of efficiency. . . . And the receiving countries could demand that there be no interference in their political life or subversion of their social structures. As sovereign states they have the right to conduct their own affairs. . . .

The efforts which are being made to assist developing

nations on a financial and technical basis, though considerable, would be illusory if their benefits were to be partially nullified as a consequence of the trade relations existing between rich and poor countries. . . .

In other words, the rule of free trade, taken by itself, is no longer able to govern international relations. . . . [P]rices which are "freely" set in the market can produce unfair results. One must recognize that it is the fundamental principle of liberalism, as the rule for commercial exchange, which is questioned here.

The teaching of Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* is always valid: If the positions of the contracting parties are too unequal, the consent of the parties does not suffice to guarantee the justice of their contract, and the rule of free agreement remains subservient to the demands of natural law. . . ."

Without abolishing the competitive market, it should be kept within the limits which make it just and moral, and therefore human. . . . Here again international agreements on a rather wide scale would be helpful: They would establish general norms for regulating certain prices, for guaranteeing certain types of production, for supporting certain new industries.

Conclusion: Development is the new name for peace

. . . To wage war on misery and to struggle against injustice is to promote, along with improved conditions, the human and spiritual progress of all men, and therefore the common good of humanity. Peace cannot be limited to a mere absence of war, the result of an ever precarious balance of forces. No, peace is something that is built up day after day, in the pursuit of an order intended by God, which implies a more perfect form of justice among men.

The peoples themselves have the prime responsibility to work for their own development. But they will not bring this about in isolation. Regional agreements among weak nations for mutual support, understandings of wider scope entered into for their help, more far-reaching agreements to establish programs for closer cooperation among groups of nations—these are the milestones on the road to development that leads to peace.

This international collaboration on a world-wide scale requires institutions that will prepare, coordinate and direct it, until finally there is established an order of justice which is universally recognized. . . .

Some would consider such hopes utopian. It may be that these persons are not realistic enough. . . .

A final appeal

. . . We turn to all men of good will who believe that the way to peace lies in the area of development. . . . For if the new name for peace is development, who would not wish to labor for it with all his powers. . . .

Continued from page 35.

pabilities of the developing sector, would be sufficient to generate a higher rate of industrial expansion in the advanced sector than has been seen during the most prosperous intervals of the past quarter century.

The IDB proposal rapidly attracted sympathy and interest among various governments of the Non-Aligned nations. It also generated a sharp polarization, into a minority of interested proponents and a majority of hostile opponents of the plan among leading government and banking circles in Western Europe. LaRouche himself ran for President in 1976 on a platform promoting the new proposal.

Sixteen months after LaRouche had presented the IDB, on Aug. 19, 1976 at a conference of the Non-Aligned Nations in Colombo, Sri Lanka the more than 70 nations represented adopted a "Final Resolution" which incorporated key features of the IDB proposal. Addressing the brutal effects of the world economic crisis upon their nations, the Colombo Final Resolution called for a complete reorganization of the global monetary system so as to institute a "new world economic order" designed to "promote development" as a means to "eliminate hunger, disease, and illiteracy." They specifically reiterated the right of every country to "exert its sovereignty" in its national economic affairs, and called for:

Deep restructuring of world production on the basis of a new international division of labor through the following means: improvement of the access of developing countries' manufactured products, transfer of technology. . . .

When the IDB and Colombo proposals were definitively rejected by the hegemonic majority among Western governments and banking leaders, the world economy was plunged into a full-scale economic breakdown crisis.

Immediately thereafter, in the autumn 1976 General Assembly session of the United Nations, Fred Wills, then both the foreign and justice minister of the nation of Guyana, delivered an extraordinary speech highlighting the LaRouche policy alternatives. Wills stated that there indeed was a solution to the otherwise unsolvable international debt crisis, with the following historic words: "We must have international development banks."

1974-79: from the 'Biological Holocaust' report to Volcker

One feature of the scientific studies behind LaRouche's proposals in the 1970s merits special emphasis in light of the now universally recognized threat that the AIDS pandemic will devastate the populations of the world, as it is already causing genocide in Africa, on a scale greater than the mid-14th century Black Death. In 1973, LaRouche created an interdisciplinary scientific task force to study the causal re-

lationship between economic breakdown and the generation of pandemics. In early 1974, the Task Force published a now-famous forecast on how new and reactivated old, deadly pandemics would be the inevitable consequence of the then-proposed "zero growth," "Fourth world triage," "brutal food consumption lowering," "energy reduction," and "large-scale population reduction" policies of the IMF, World Bank, and Bank for International Settlements. The LaRouche Task Force prepared a long-range forecast, specifying with precise maps, graphs, and charts, that a full-scale global "biological holocaust" would be the inevitable result of such policies.

In quite explicit detail, the 1974 study predicted that, beginning in the mid-1980s a new form of species-threatening "recombined" deadly pandemic would sweep from the developing sector, devastating Africa and threatening to overwhelm the United States itself, beginning to acutely accelerate in the 1987-88 period. The Biological Holocaust Task Force had precisely forecast the development of what is today known as AIDS, along with the renewal of deadly classic diseases associated with economic breakdown—cholera, tuberculosis, tropical fevers of various kinds, etc.

In October 1979, Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker and the Carter administration embarked upon a course of high-interest-rate austerity to "crisis manage" through the global economic depression. Their plan was based upon a series of papers also prepared in the mid-1970s under the name, "1980s Project," proposing to "tough it out" through the world economic breakdown with a policy of "controlled disintegration" of the world economy. A subsumed feature of their policy was to allow "nature to take its course," by creating the conditions favorable to disease that would eliminate unwanted, "excess eaters" in Africa, Asia, and targeted areas of Ibero-America.

We can say with scientific certainty that there is a direct causal relationship between the policy decision by the Western banking and political "elites" to reject the development proposal of *Populorum Progressio* and the IDB-Colombo plan, thereby defying Natural Law by imposing a Malthusian "forcing environment" for the generation and uncontrolled spread of disease, and the subsequent uncontrolled spread of the AIDS pandemic in tropical areas.

1982-83: Operation Juárez

On August 2, 1982, after discussions with the heads of state of two Third World nations—Lopez Portillo of Mexico and Indira Gandhi of India—Lyndon LaRouche issued a new programmatic policy proposal for development: *Operation Juárez*. The kernel of *Operation Juárez* was the political concept that, were the United States not prepared to unilaterally "initiate" a global economic reorganization, then the nations of Ibero-America should deliver a series of political shockwaves by deploying their "debt bomb" to force the issue of a global "Chapter 11" bankruptcy reorganization for development. He proposed that the Ibero-Americans take the

lead by forming an Ibero-American Common Market based upon development.

At the beginning of September 1982, in his historic "state of the state" national address, Lopez Portillo nationalized Mexico's banks and began intense negotiations with Argentina and Brazil for the declaration of a common debt moratorium, along the lines of the Operation Juárez proposal. By his actions, Lopez Portillo was moving to stem the massive capital flight and destabilization of the economy occurring because of his nation's massive debt burden. The combination of the oil price collapse and the usurious Volcker interest rates had totally destroyed what had previously been an impressive Mexican economic development program. Through a combination of manipulation, threats, and classical "divide and conquer" tactics, the international banks and their operatives, such as Henry Kissinger and Vernon Walters, successfully averted the possibility of immediate Ibero-American solidarity.

Nonetheless, their brutal actions and the resulting ever-more-intolerable "conditionalities" of the IMF ensured that the next battle would be on a larger scale. LaRouche correctly anticipated that a Brazilian challenge to the international system would be inevitable. In October 1983, he published a detailed plan entitled "What Reagan Must do When Brazil Defaults."

During his 1984 presidential campaign, LaRouche gave a series of nationwide half-hour television addresses which promoted his plan for an FDR-style 1939-43 economic mobilization, in conjunction with the Operation Juárez global monetary reorganization, to tens of millions in the United States. LaRouche's campaign was widely reported throughout the world.

1985-86: Garcia and Pope John Paul II

The battle for development intensified so greatly in the events leading up to and following the inauguration of Peruvian President Alan García, that they are best reported in the form of a brief chronological battle summary:

January-February 1985. Pope John Paul II does a two-week tour of Ibero-America, repeatedly denouncing the "imposed financial conditionalities" of the international banking institutions. Emphasizing themes from *Populorum Progressio*, the Pope undercores the conception that the world economic system must have no other aim but to support a conception of "Man created in the image of God." During the Pope's visit, Lyndon LaRouche and his associates published the first Spanish-language edition of *Narcoráfico, S.A.*, the combat manual for fighting the War on Drugs.

June 1985. With Alan García already President-elect of Peru, LaRouche issues *Ni Kissinger, Ni Castro*, an operational handbook to accompany *Operation Juárez*, which specified the precise, political-tactical perspective for Ibero-America to do battle against the IMF.

July 15-17, 1985. The Schiller Institute Trade Union

Commission held its first Continental Congress in Mexico City, with 40 trade union leaders from seven Ibero-American nations issuing a declaration endorsing *Operation Juárez*. The Schiller Institute had been founded in the summer of 1984 by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the wife of Lyndon LaRouche.

July 28, 1985. Alan García was inaugurated President of Peru and proclaimed that the nation will not pay more than 10% of its export earnings for international debt, no longer the 60% which the IMF had demanded. García embarks on a program of national "development."

Aug. 20, 1985. Colombian President Betancur names Jorge Carrillo, who spoke at the founding conference of the Schiller Institute Trade Union Commission, the labor minister of Colombia. Carrillo embarks on a challenge to the IMF through mobilizing labor and business interests of his nation around the Abraham Lincoln "American System" concept of a "harmony of interests."

September 1985. García receives a Schiller Institute delegation of 20 Ibero-American labor leaders pledging support to his challenge to the IMF. García travels to the United Nations where he declares: "World economic injustice causes genocide."

Nov. 1-3, 1985. The Schiller Institute organizes an international conference in Rome, Italy in celebration of the 1,600th anniversary of the conversion of St. Augustine to Christianity. A broad alliance from five continents pledged support to Alan García in his fight with the IMF. Days afterward, President García was greeted on his arrival in Rome by a Schiller Institute delegation.

Nov. 25-Dec. 8, 1985. An Extraordinary Synod of Bishops is assembled by John Paul II around the theme: "To make all men into sons of God." At the Synod, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger declares that there must be a moral, ethical imperative to economic theory and practice. Just prior to the Synod, he had specifically attacked Adam Smith's "free enterprise" and the practitioner of economic liberalism par excellence, "Mr. Rockefeller." He announced that the Church would involve itself in the "unpayable international debt situation."

March 18, 1986. Two LaRouche-associated candidates win Democratic Party primaries in Illinois for statewide offices.

July 1986. Pope John Paul II in Colombia urged Ibero-America to unify to bring about a new international order where "man is the subject and not the object of economics and politics." He denounces narcotics trafficking as a "new and more subtle form of slavery."

Aug. 15, 1986. The IMF declares Peru "ineligible" for new loans at the precise moment that García was meeting with an Ibero-American labor delegation which included Jorge Carrillo, now head of the Unified Confederation of Workers of Colombia, and several members of the Schiller Institute Trade Union Commission.

September 1986. The Schiller Institute issues a Spanish-

language book, *Ibero-American Integration: One Hundred Million New Jobs by the Year 2000!*, detailing the program for an Ibero-American Common Market.

October 1986. A meeting of 26 Ibero-American and Caribbean countries (SELA) in Lima endorsed the García "10 percent" debt-payment ceiling in a challenge to the IMF.

Oct. 28, 1986. Zaire breaks with the IMF.

Nov. 29, 1986. Peru announces that its course has been an economic success. Since Peru broke with the IMF conditionalities policy, her manufactures have grown 22.5%, inflation has been massively reduced, and the country has experienced 7.8% overall economic growth.

1987: Brazil ends the IMF era forever

On January 29, 1987, the Pontifical Commission *Justitia et Pax* issued an extraordinary document on the debt question which has functioned as an immediate battle document, captured in the following statement in the "presentation" of the document by the Commission:

Debt servicing cannot be met at the price of the asphyxiation of a country's economy, and no government can morally demand of its people privations incompatible with human dignity.

The document explicitly referenced the 1967 *Populorum Progressio* of Paul VI for a world monetary reorganization.

One month later, on Feb. 20, 1987, the government of Brazil suspended payment on interest of foreign debt. In his announcement of the historic decision, President José Sarney quoted from the just issued Pontifical Commission document.

Lyndon H. LaRouche commented immediately:

At 2030 hours, on Friday, Feb. 20, 1987, the government of Brazil broke the political power of the International Monetary Fund, bringing the hopelessly bankrupt world banking system to the brink of overdue collapse. This act of patriotic political will by the government of Brazil, closes the curtain on an entire era. A new era has begun.

Thus, we have entered a stage of total crisis in which the range of policy choices is extremely limited. The world today is in a state of "limbo," the old era has been demolished, the new institutions and arrangements of a global reorganization for "development" have not been established.

Either mankind will be consumed in the apocalyptic Hell which the species-threatening AIDS pandemic threatens, or the long overdue global monetary reorganization, along the lines first raised by *Populorum Progressio* 20 years ago, will proceed.

The author delivered the above speech at a conference honoring the twentieth anniversary of Populorum Progressio in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on March 21, 1987.

Economics and the Catholic Church

by Vivian Freyre Zoakos

The internationally recognized, preeminent role which the Catholic Church is playing in the current fight to establish an equitable solution to the Third World debt problem, is a most fitting commemoration of the 20th anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, Pope Paul VI's celebrated encyclical, first published on March 26, 1967.

When Brazilian President José Sarney rocked the world banking community Feb. 20 by announcing that Brazil was "suspending payment on the interest of its foreign debt," the document he cited in moral justification of his nation's action was authored by the Vatican Commission established by Paul VI for the purpose of implementing *Populorum Progressio*. The document Sarney named, and which has been named again and again by like-minded world leaders, including French Premier Jacques Chirac, is entitled "At the Service of the Human Community: An Ethical Approach to the International Debt Question." It was issued at the beginning of this year, at the instigation of the current Pope, by the Vatican's *Justitia et Pax* Commission. In both content and philosophy, it is the direct successor of Paul's encyclical.

Back in 1967, Pope Paul had created that Commission because, as he wrote in the Introduction to *Populorum*, "We considered it Our duty to set up a Pontifical Commission . . . to offer to less developed nations the means whereby they can further their own progress": [the Commission's] name, which is also its program, is Justice and Peace."

A misunderstood document

Yet, although the expression of the best of Catholic orthodoxy and an instrument for a desperately needed intervention by the Church into world affairs at a time of profound crisis, *Populorum Progressio* has been a widely misunderstood document almost from the moment of its publication. The advocates and founders of Liberation Theology have attempted to claim the encyclical as their own, a fact which has provided grist for the mill of those who would prefer to see the Church remain the backer of the political status quo,