

his effective ministry. To spell out the implications of a sermon in particular and immediate moral terms could with certain congregations run the risk of the sermon not being the word of God to that congregation, not really happening to them, not being heard. This is not because the congregation is taking offence at the word of the cross (that can always happen and is the evangelical scandal of preaching) but because it is unable to comprehend the over-particular and as a result of its situation in a more or less literary or scientific environment can only work and be changed by the general and the non-directive. This result of the Gutenberg culture may or may not be desirable, but the culture remains one in which very many of us willy-nilly live and move. Preaching is certainly not just instruction; kerygma and didache are not simply interchangeable; the content of the sermon should make contact with the hearer as a moral being, as one who is called on by it to decision. True, and yet this may only be possible if the preaching is cool, in both senses, non- emotive and leaving space for the congregation to find itself. It needs to be offered rather than thrust at people.

This does not mean that a sermon should be some sort of pre-Leavis lit. crit. In the sermon the text comes out from its obscurity into the present as the word of God. The *text* comes out; it is the *text* which must speak, which must be God's word on the congregation and the times. In the craft of the sermon, too, *ars celare artem*. The labour of preparation, the wrestling with the text should not be obvious. People are not concerned to hear of the preacher's intellectual ability, but only to listen for God's word. And so the authorities consulted, the Greek and Hebrew background, the patristic interpretations, the modern commentaries, all fall away and disappear from view. They have had their part in the initial understanding of the text, they have helped the text in its fullness take a grasp on the preacher, and now through him it endeavours to lay hold on the congregation, to challenge them to the decision and the obedience of faith.

## **I.R.F.E.D.—Struggle for Development<sup>1</sup>** by Vincent Cosmao, O.P.

I.R.F.E.D.—*Institut international de recherche et de formation en vue du développement harmonisé*, the International Institute for Research and Training towards Integrating Development—was founded in 1958

<sup>1</sup>Translated by Erik Pearse, World Poverty Secretary, C.I.I.R.

by Fr L. J. Lebre<sup>1</sup>; in spite of the originality of its research and activities, the Institute is still virtually unknown to the British public.

I.R.F.E.D. defines development as the constructive use of all natural and human resources in order to promote the collective and interdependent progress of mankind. This means that I.R.F.E.D. seeks to tackle development in every sphere and at every level; it is concerned as much with making peoples aware of their situation as with the structural reorganization of international trade and finance; with socio-cultural change and strategies for industrialization; with the appropriate spiritual, moral or political conditions for participation as well as with the rational, economic or technical constraints on planning. This global approach demands a simultaneous and concentrated emphasis on a series of different activities—fundamental and applied research, analysis in depth, programming, training, publication, the stimulation of public opinion, etc. . . .

#### I. DEVELOPMENT—FUTURE, PERSPECTIVE, PROJECT

Development is the key word in the work of the Institute; but how is it visualized? Since the discovery of underdevelopment has made people aware of the word, the concept, the myth of development, its significance has evolved concurrently with the different stages in the analysis of underdevelopment and the elaboration of strategies or policies to combat this. I.R.F.E.D. has followed this evolution, taking part in its different stages, and progressively acquiring a deeper understanding and a clearer insight into a pattern of development which is dependent on man's gradual assumption of control over his world-wide destiny.

The first stage corresponded to the perception of underdevelopment and its extent by means of different parameters (*per capita* G.N.P., growth rate, nutritional standards, literacy, etc.). This stage was followed by the analysis of the gradual dislocation of the underdeveloped economies and societies; this in turn by the phase of becoming aware of the unequal partnership in international trade, and the pattern of economic dependence; and this again by the phase of discovery of the socio-cultural breakdown, etc. . . . As the perception of underdevelopment as a process became progressively more sophisticated and more elaborate, research on development broadened its terms of reference and paved the way for the elaboration of a global plan—the only possible plan for mankind at this particular moment in history: the collective control by mankind of the accelerated and radical change which it is undergoing, and which is responsible both for the multiplication of areas of interdependence in the economic, social, political or cultural spheres, and for their

<sup>1</sup>Fr L. J. Lebre<sup>t</sup> was one of the principal advisers in the drafting of the Encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (Translator's note); cf. 'L. J. Lebre<sup>t</sup>, O.P., 1897–1966', *New Blackfriars*, February, 1970.

extension to the whole planet in a generalized socialization affecting all mankind as well as life in all its dimensions.

Development, first and foremost, must be a pointer to a possible future, to a 'utopia' which gives meaning and impetus to man's collective and personal life. In so far as it is utopian, it has its roots in a *rejection* of the present, in a radical, moral revolt against a world which is unjust, irrational, inhuman, dehumanizing, prehistoric. At the junction of revolt and utopia, development can be defined as the collective will *to create* a world suitable as a human environment for all men.

Ever since he was created, man has looked towards the future; of all creatures, he alone does not accept the world as it is, nor himself as he is, and is perpetually reinventing and reorganizing it. But what characterizes mankind today is the fact that it can predict this *future*, and as far as possible *plan* its course, seeking to control it. Modern man knows or senses that he has the wherewithal to ensure his survival, whether in relation to the satisfaction of his basic needs or to the organization of life in society. Progress achieved in the processing of data has made it possible to make calculations which had hitherto not been even imaginable. But the methodology which has been so eminently successful in the conquest of space, requiring as it has done the rigorous programming of millions of different items, has yet to be applied to the organization of the collective life of mankind and the creation of the necessary conditions for his existence.

Sensing as he does these possibilities of controlling the future, modern man knows or feels that he must for that reason collectively become a *new man*, facing this future and emerging from his pre-history; that he must be impelled by the desire to become more human and to create himself collectively by winning over from nature and the still natural parts of his being, a space for culture; so that the world may become the 'body' of mankind, in such a way that man emerges from the world, transcending it, as open to the infinite as the aspiration which impels him.

### *Development Man*

The novelty of the particular period of history in which we live resides in the urgent and global character of the call made to each man, and to mankind as a whole to take control of its existence in order to ensure its own survival.

The new man's *creativity* will need to concentrate, first and foremost, on the organization of the world, collective life, methods of production, exchanges, the satisfaction of needs. It will have to be technical, economic, social, political. It will have to be collective in its fulfilment, as well as in its objectives. It will need to be realized rationally and scientifically, due account being taken of the increasingly complex nature of the universe.

*Responsibility* will become greater and more widely spread; everyone will be called upon to take the greatest possible part in choices and decisions which affect his future. On this participation depends the effectiveness of the total organization. The more complex the organization, the more its functioning requires the conscious and deliberate co-operation of those who are involved. Participation is also an integral part of the organization's humanizing function. The new man will thus be a free man, not as a result of some theoretical and often illusory gift of freedom, but as a direct result of the fact that he will be forced by the very multiplication and interdependence of socio-economic, political and cultural factors, gradually to free himself from his alienations and contradictions, in order to fulfil himself in a perpetually expanding universe.

Since changing cultural patterns will no longer be adequate as natural carriers of *meaning* and purpose, development man, in assuming the exercise of control over his specific role in the cosmos and in history, will more and more need to develop the necessary systems of evaluation and methods of communication to enable him to emerge, personally and collectively, from the universe he is organizing, by giving a sense of meaning to his work and to his life. Brotherhood and communion will provide one of the main pillars of this sense of purpose, but the inner life, both on the personal and inter-personal levels, will also have to be able to rediscover therein that opening out on to the infinite which makes them what they are.

Creative, responsible and free, able to interpret his collective and personal history, the new man sees himself becoming more human. One of the significant expressions of man's new self-awareness in a developing world is the ever more conscious need for permanent education as the fundamental requirement for human fulfilment.

Development discerned as a vision of the future, as a collective plan for the future and fulfilment of mankind, necessarily concerns the world as a whole and not only the developing countries. But although these latter are most immediately concerned with this collective control of the conditions for a human existence for all, the problems which they face today merely prefigure the sort of re-evaluation which the whole of mankind together, and the industrialized countries primarily, will increasingly be facing. Though 'underdevelopment' is largely due to the breakdown of traditional structures in the satellite countries, as a result of their being attracted into the sphere of influence of the international industrial mother-countries, the same type of dislocation is taking place in all human societies; nor are those most advanced scientifically and technically necessarily the best prepared to accomplish the new syntheses required by '*human control*' of the new universe in process of being built.

The world economic system; the structure of international trade; the efficient use of all the productive forces—these must all be

brought under control if human progress is to continue and to be shared by all.

Effective development seems to rest on two pillars: planning and participation.

As we have already said, the universe is becoming more complex, and can only be controlled through a more rational approach. The multiplication of elements to be collected and collated entails rigorous investigation, classification and co-ordination in space and time. Programming and planning are in fact no more than the rationalization of the conditions of production of human existence.

But for this existence to be human, all must be able to participate in such a way as not to be transformed into mere operatives, cog-wheels or instruments; the fact of their participation to the collective effort should be both the condition and the means of their truly human execution.

Planning and participation: on these two pillars rest all I.R.F.E.D. research, activities and training in development. Nor are they simply theoretical premises, but rather lines of action derived from experience and from conclusions based on fieldwork in the course of implementation of development projects or policies.

## II. FIELDWORK—RESEARCH—TRAINING

One of the characteristics of I.R.F.E.D. is that its history and its objectives are largely determined by its prehistory; this in itself is to a great extent related to the history of one man, Fr Lebret, but also to the experience of all those who are somehow involved in its work for development, as a result of work which has made them see development as one of the basic constituents of their professional or everyday life.

From 1947 onwards, Fr Lebret and his team have been pioneers in development, whether in the analysis of the causes of underdevelopment, the elaboration of methods of analysis or planning, or in promoting a strategy for development.

### 1. *Fieldwork*

I.R.F.E.D.'s activity, based on work in the field in which failure is as significant as success, draws continually from practical experience. As development consultants or experts, the members of the team aim to solve concrete, as opposed to purely theoretical, problems of development. This struggle is the main-spring of I.R.F.E.D.'s activity, whether it consists in making peoples aware of their situation, planning at the regional or national level, reorganizing the terms of trade or changing public opinion. As Fr Lebret used to put it, 'changing the world' is I.R.F.E.D.'s overall objective; in view of the modest means at the Institute's disposal, this entails close collaboration and co-ordination with all the different forces fighting for human progress.

## 2. *Research*

The research unit came to be built up to provide for the requirements of work in the field. Its twofold aims are to analyse the conditions of development in ever greater depth, and to produce the requisite tools to meet the need.

The research unit is essentially orientated towards work in the field; it is composed of a series of sub-sections specializing in general planning and evaluation, regional planning, industrialization, wakening of consciousness; these provide the logistical support for teams confronted with similar problems in the field.

## 3. *Training*

Both fieldwork and research need to be sustained by training. The training section is at present divided up into three specialized sub-sections, which are co-ordinated both in their research into didactic methods and in the provision of supporting material for this.

The first sub-section provides a nine-month course which brings together in inter-disciplinary exchange people qualified in different fields and enables them to bring up to date and apply their previous training or experience to one of the subjects or tasks concerned with development.

These students can be divided into two groups—those who have finished their university training (economists, sociologists, engineers, etc.) and have acquired a minimum professional expertise; and those who, without necessarily having any university training, have had considerable professional experience. The teaching methods used with both groups place particular emphasis on the personalization of projects and training programmes, and on group work in the field.

The second sub-section provides extensive courses on development, specialized seminars, individual study outlines and conferences for the public, or for groups or organizations keen to work in some way towards world progress.

The third sub-section endeavours to initiate or consolidate training facilities in the developing countries. In September, 1969, for example, I.R.F.E.D. organized a seminar which brought together representatives of most of the development training centres in French-speaking Africa south of the Sahara. One of the points stressed at this seminar was the need for more collaboration with English-speaking Africa.

## 4. *Reference Material*

Fundamental to fieldwork, research and training is the collection, classification and analysis of information. I.R.F.E.D. has therefore built up a reference library which itself processes general information, or information concerning matters of particular interest to the different areas of specialization of the Institute; it is also in touch with other reference libraries concerned with development, both in Paris, and, as far as possible, in the rest of the world.

### 5. *Publication*

In order to make others benefit from its work, I.R.F.E.D. has always had a publication called *Développement et Civilisations* (Development and Civilizations) which is sold the world over and includes articles from academics, experts and people directly involved in development.

### III. A CENTRE

As a result of its fieldwork and research, I.R.F.E.D. has also become a development centre, where the results of experience and research in every field and on every aspect of man and development can be compared and discussed. Catholic in its origins, because of its founder, the Institute has evolved, *de facto* and then *de jure*, towards non-religious status, to become a focal point for international collaboration characterized by a spirit of research and freedom.

This enlarged role does not entail either neutrality or eclecticism. It leads to an involvement in and a struggle for development wherever it is decided upon, realized or tentatively applied, whether in the quest for a viable international trade system or in the spiritual or political groupings seeking to promote the new man, development man.

The spirit which moves and directs this struggle is perpetually renewed through contact with the great aspirations which lead men and people forward, aspirations towards justice, peace, freedom, brotherhood. It takes substance from its insertion into the moment of history which mankind is experiencing, characterized as it is by a collective awareness of a new threshold to be crossed in the process of humanization for each man and for mankind as a whole. In its perpetual progress through the assumption of nature by culture, mankind seeks a second wind to enable it to humanize the increasingly complex universe which it has already begun to organize through its control over nature. What is required now is a second-level organization which will enable it to rationalize its collective activity, making it relevant and meaningful to the totality of its members.

It is in this *struggle for man* that I.R.F.E.D. is engaged, together with all those who believe that human progress can take place coherently, justly and fraternally.

For several decades now, *development* has increasingly come to the foreground of collective awareness. Each stage described in the analysis of the underdevelopment which has been responsible for this new awareness has a corresponding stage of mobilization for development. The emphasis has been placed in turn on aid, technical assistance, revolution. . . . But it is becoming more and more obvious that only a global strategy, a world policy, can overcome the challenge now facing mankind. To take up this challenge (and



this must be the aim of the second development decade), it is necessary at once to re-imagine, to analyse and to bring about radical reforms in the organization of the world economy and in the relationships between peoples and men, and to call on each man, whatever his station in society, to turn himself into a new man, able to contend, together with the rest of mankind, with the growth of awareness and organizational complexity required by human progress, by man's coming of age.

*Bibliography: Développement et Civilisation, No. 34.*  
'L'I.R.F.E.D. d'hier à demain. Perspectives 1968'.

## Black Power—Black Racism? by Peter Baldock

The recent report on 'Colour and Citizenship'<sup>1</sup> was greeted by the press with mild bewilderment and a sigh of relief. Britain apparently is not, after all the fuss, on the edge of racial violence. Three-quarters of the population are demonstrated to be 'tolerant' or 'tolerant-inclined', and it is precisely in those areas where coloured immigrants actually live that there is most tolerance.

In this respect *Colour and Citizenship*, like the laborious P.E.P. report on discrimination,<sup>2</sup> is useful. But more than volumes of sheer fact are needed if we are to come to grips with the race problem. We would be mistaken to point out too enthusiastically that the majority of people in this country have been shewn to be tolerant. 'Tolerance' is a pretty word and one that is heavily overvalued by the prevailing ideology. In effect it means 'indifference'. It makes little difference to the established economic system whether people have purple or green wallpaper, whether they worship in Anglican churches or synagogues, whether they sleep with members of the same sex or not. These are matters of indifference to capital organization and only a paranoid will be really intolerant of the options that people make. In other circumstances those choices could become significant. Only a minority of the population (10 per cent) are prejudiced in the strictly defined sense of *Colour and Citizenship* and for many of those it is apparently a symbolic issue (like the members of the Conservative Party in Surbiton—where there are some hundred black people out of a population of over 60,000—who wish to replace their liberally minded M.P. with a supporter of Enoch Powell). Most of the rest do not see that their interests are directly affected.

<sup>1</sup>*Colour and Citizenship*, by E. J. B. Rose, Nicholas Deakin *et al.*, O.U.P., for the Institute of Race Relations. cf. 'Colour and Citizenship: The Rose Report', by Michael Dummett, *New Blackfriars*, January 1970.

<sup>2</sup>*Racial Discrimination in England*, Daniel; shortened version published by Penguins, 1968.