Mobilize people’s hearts to circulate goods

The Economy of Communion

BY CHIARA LUBICH

We are all aware of the serious state of affairs currently weighing down our planet. First and foremost is rampant terrorism, a result, as stated by John Paul II on several recent occasions, of the dark forces of Evil with a capital E. It is an Evil that calls forth the forces of Good with a capital G: God above all else and everything that is rooted in him—the spiritual dimension of life, the enduring quality of great values, and the strength of prayer. These forces of Good have brought about such outstanding events as the Day of Prayer for Peace, which took place in Assisi in January 2002.

Yet, notwithstanding their paramount role in defeating such terrible phenomena, interreligious dialogue, a more spiritually grounded life, and increased prayer do not seem to be enough. We know, in fact, that one of the causes of terrorism is the disparity existing between rich and poor nations. This intolerable division of the world into two parts—the have and have-nots—generates hatred, vengeance, and episodes of terrorism. We, therefore, need to foster a more equitable distribution of goods and a sense of solidarity among all nations.

We know, however, that goods don’t circulate by themselves. A change of heart and the idea and practice of brotherhood need to reach as many people as possible. The widespread problems that we are facing cry out for universal brotherhood.

A confirmation of this is the so-called “Economy of Communion in Freedom” (EOC) of the Focolare Movement, a system based on economic solidarity. The EOC is an economic activity which—while operating within the current economic market—is in direct contrast with fundamental economic principles. EOC business owners follow new lines of conduct inspired by the guiding principles of the spirituality of unity. This new model urges them to give first priority to their relationships with employees and the clients and to avoid attitudes and ways of acting that are in contrast to the Gospel message of love of neighbor. It also encourages entrepreneurs to ask for their employees’ involvement in making managerial decisions and it requires them to conduct business with clients, suppliers, and government and taxation entities according to just ethical standards—therefore, in a law-abiding fashion.

Special consideration must also be given to the care of the environment, should it potentially be affected by a business’ production.

In the end, but also right from the beginning, one must also remember to allow for God’s intervention, to count on his providential intervention even in the concrete aspects of running a business. This may come in the form of unexpected payments, an ingenious solution to a technical problem, novel ideas for new products, and in many, many other ways.

(From the acceptance speech upon receiving the Castel Gandolfo City Award, April 13, 2003)

Focolare founder Chiara Lubich gave the initial inspiration for the Economy of Communion. She has been given various honorary doctorates in economics as well as other awards of recognition, which have contributed to spreading the EOC on a worldwide scale, including numerous academic circles.
EVEN A GLANCE AT THE HEADLINES lately would reveal that it has been a rough few years for “corporate America.” As the woes of Enron, Tyco, WorldCom and Martha Stewart have flashed across our television screens, who hasn’t mused that honesty and integrity seem pretty hard to come by in the business world?

Less noticed in the press, but perhaps just as important, are promising seeds of hope. Some of these projects are not so much a bandage to cover over ugly wounds in the midst of a crisis, but deeper and more consistent efforts to construct positive models for business life. In this light, it is not surprising to see that business professionals are increasingly considering a number of creative resources that might help sustain their commitment to professional integrity and social responsibility—among them religious values.

It was in this spirit that lawyers, corporate executives and academics in the fields of management, economics and law gathered recently at Fordham University in New York City for a conference on Religious Values and Corporate Decision-Making. The event was sponsored by Fordham’s Institute on Religion, Law & Lawyer’s Work, which holds an annual conference to explore how religious

An interdisciplinary interfaith conference at Fordham University in New York

BY AMY UELMEN

A DIALOGUE WHICH SEES “AS PERSONS” NOT ONLY THOSE AFFECTED WHO WORK IN CORPORATIONS, HAD CAUGHT THE PARTICIPANTS’
values might permeate a particular area of the legal practice.

Discussions did not shy away from some of the more difficult questions. As Mark Sargent, Dean of Villanova Law School, explained, “there should be a place for people to incorporate religious values into corporation decision-making, but as an empirical matter there is very little room.”

Others were especially cautious because they saw that the effort to draw on religious values could become a source of conflict. But in their discussion of particular problems, many of the panelists were clear that it would be impossible for them to wall off their personal values. As Joseph Geoghan, Esq., former General Counsel of Union Carbide Corp., explained, “I strongly believe in the maxim that there is no rule of separation whatsoever between the principle that I apply in my personal life as a Roman Catholic and those applied in my business career. The norms and standards I would apply [to the case at hand] would be influenced by the social justice teachings of the Church, beginning with the primacy of labor over capital.”

Similarly, Talat Ansari, Esq., a partner in the law firm of Kelley, Drye & Warren, who has had extensive experience in counseling large corporations, explained that because “Islam was brought to this world by a person who before achieving his status as a prophet was also a trader, in addition to universal ethical norms, Islam also contains certain norms of business which have to be kept in mind and followed when any believer engages in business.” For example, Islam includes specific guidance on adherence to contracts, fair treatment of workers, as well as prohibitions against false advertising, misrepresentation, hoarding and profiteering.

Similarly, he sees much promise in recovering the public dimensions of what it means to be an “entrepreneur.” As Italian Maffeo Pantaleoni and American Thorstein Veblen explained in the early twentieth century, there is a marked difference between the speculator, whose exclusive goal is profits, the entrepreneur, a “person with a project” who gives intrinsic rather than simply instrumental value to economic activity.

Finally, Professor Bruni proposed that economic theory be fleshed out with a robust principle of sincere “gratuity”—the capacity to act “not for instrumental reasons but because it is good in itself.”

From the positive and hopeful reaction of the conference participants, it was clear that the Economy of Communion, an experience based on trust and genuine personal relationships, can provide rich and fertile ground for further reflection on the contribution and challenge it poses for current economic theories and models. —A. U.

For background on the Economy of Communion, see the recently published collection of essays, The Economy of Communion: Toward a Multi-Dimensional Economic Culture (L. Bruni, ed., New City Press, 2002) and its website www.edc-online.org

The Economy of Communion’s Contribution to Economic Theory

AFTER A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ON THE ORIGINS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE ECONOMY OF COMMUNICATION, LUIGINO BRUNI, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MILAN-BICOCCA, DREW OUT SOME OF THE PROJECT’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO ECONOMIC THEORY. BECAUSE IT HAS EMERGED BASED ON SPIRITUALITY, HE EXPLAINED, EXPERIENCE IS PRIOR TO THE THEORY: “IT’S NOT THAT WE WRITE FIRST AND THEN APPLY THE PRINCIPLES TO LIFE; AS SCHOLARS WE ARE LISTENING TO WHAT IS GOING ON IN PRACTICE.”

He acknowledged how difficult it may be for economists who work within the framework of contemporary economics to grasp its novelty, for their “methodological and theoretical tools” may not be able to explain “an experience based on a community and relationality.” But from the analysis presented, he already seems to have made quite a bit of headway.

For example, as an economic historian he has been able to recover the early aspiration of economic theory to explore “public happiness”—public by definition. “You can be rich alone, but if you would like to be happy—Professor Bruni explained—there must be at least two people; happiness is relational.”

Similarly, he sees much promise in recovering the public dimensions of what it means to be an “entrepreneur.” As Italian Maffeo Pantaleoni and American Thorstein Veblen explained in the early twentieth century, there is a marked difference between the speculator, whose exclusive goal is profits, the entrepreneur, a “person with a project” who gives intrinsic rather than simply instrumental value to economic activity.

Finally, Professor Bruni proposed that economic theory be fleshed out with a robust principle of sincere “gratuity”—the capacity to act “not for instrumental reasons but because it is good in itself.” He opined that this theory may actually work better than instrumental market-based incentive schemes.

From the positive and hopeful reaction of the conference participants, it was clear that the Economy of Communion, an experience based on trust and genuine personal relationships, can provide rich and fertile ground for further reflection on the contribution and challenge it poses for current economic theories and models. —A. U.
Perhaps one of the most compelling arguments for the role of religious values in corporate decision-making is that market itself requires such a complex analysis. As Stefano Zamagni, Professor of Economics from the University of Bologna, Italy, explained in his keynote, recent theories have moved away from the idea of “consumer as customer,” who utilizes purchasing power to maximize utility, toward a model of the “consumer as citizen,” who “also wants to express his feeling about the way the menu of commodities is produced and the way commodities are sold.” For example, “if I happen to know that a shoe or a balloon is produced in a country where human rights are severely violated, I might object to buying that commodity even though the price and the quality of the commodity are good.” Through this lens, moral and religious values are not so much a constraint on bad behavior but more of a preference which should be accounted for in the market.

The afternoon panels devoted to exposition and discussion of “viable pilot projects” illustrated how religious values can inform and enrich corporate decision-making, and confirmed Professor Zamagni’s insight that the idea of “consumers as citizens” is indeed alive and well in many of the projects which aim to express and increase corporate social responsibility (see boxes).

In the final discussion, the word that most frequently emerged was “dialogue.” Participants expressed the desire for further opportunities for a rich exchange between different faith traditions and academic disciplines. And as one participant put it, in the efforts to “change minds and hearts,” a dialogue which sees “as persons” not only those affected by the actions of large business, but also the people who work in corporations, had caught their imagination and inspired hope for positive change.

Amy Uelmen is the Director of the Institute on Religion, Law & Lawyer’s Work at Fordham University School of Law. The papers and proceedings from the February 2004 Conference on Religious Values & Corporate Decision-Making will be published in Fall 2004 in the Fordham Journal of Corporate and Financial Law. For more information contact auelmen@law.fordham.edu.

In Dialogue with Corporate America

The Interfaith Center for Corporate Responsibility (“ICCR”), located in New York City, has been a leader in the corporate social responsibility movement for more than thirty years. Its membership, an association of 275 Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic institutional investors, has a combined portfolio value estimated at $110 billion. The ICCR and its members press companies to be socially and environmentally responsible, using, among other tools, shareholder resolutions.

As Patricia Daly, OP, Director of the Tri-State Coalition for Responsible Investment, explained, previously when faith-based institutions decided that a company’s actions offended their personal or spiritual values, they would simply divest their stock. The ICCR came to life as we realized “that as U.S. investors we had power and we were part of the company; we owned the company and we needed to speak up and to participate in the structure.” As Sr. Daly explained the process of coming together with corporate management to work out a change, she noted, “Corporate dialogue is really the essence of our work.”

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling, Director of The Shefa Fund, also expressed confidence in dialogue as the most effective path: “Face-to-face meetings with other human beings change things, and often the people on the corporate side are very appreciative that ICCR has brought these concerns up because it allows them to make the changes that they do really want to make,” and gives them both financial and ethical reasons to change company policy.

In their work for corporate social responsibility, the religious values of member institutions often provide specific guidance. For example, as Rabbi Liebling noted, under Jewish law, “we have the responsibility to make sure that something we own does no harm. So if we are owners of large corporations, we have a responsibility to do whatever is in our power to make sure that those assets do not hurt anybody else.” Further, as some rabbis have explained, the passage “love God with all your strength (m’odecha)” actually means “with all of your wealth”—which would include not only giving money for justice, but also trying to do justice with our assets, and working “to get corporations to change
It might be difficult to imagine that top level economists and policy experts would take time out from their busy schedules to ponder the topic of “happiness.” Yet on a crisp evening in February, over 100 guests filled the Italian Embassy in Washington DC to hear the insights of Professor Luigino Bruni of the University of Milan, Bicocca, and the response by Carol Graham, Vice President and Director of the Governance Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, on just such a topic.

Presenting his research on the link between wealth and happiness in contemporary economic analysis, Professor Bruni put forth a compelling challenge: over the past several decades in the U.S., Japan and countries in Europe, rises in aggregate income are not associated with rises in aggregate happiness. Mainstream economic analysis, which focuses exclusively on income, wealth, and consumption, is unable—Professor Bruni opined—to probe the depths of the paradox, because it fails to consider some key dimensions which have a great impact on happiness and well-being, such as the need for love, achievement, and control. He set forth such “relational goods” as a true source of happiness, but also challenged economists to fine tune their instruments so as to recognize and appreciate their vulnerability and fragility, as many can be enjoyed only in reciprocity.

In her response, Dr. Graham highlighted the importance of the topic in policy analysis, and drew out its implications for development, public finance and international economics. The public also appeared to be extremely appreciative and interested in the issues and raised many questions, giving the impression that a true thirst for relational goods and for a different take on conventional concepts of well-being are most needed, even in a power-oriented city like Washington DC.

—Alessandra Campanaro
Financial Sector Operations and Policy (OPD)
The World Bank Group
OR MORE THAN A DECADE, LIVING CITY readers have closely followed the developing “Economy of Communion” initiative in which business owners freely choose to share their profits, divided in three parts: to help people in need, to foster a “culture of giving,” and to help the business itself remain an efficient and viable model. Many have intuited its power as a practical model which fulfills the deepest aspirations of business life at the service of humanity. Some, however, may not have dared to dream as boldly about its realistic potential to bring about a major shift in economic theory and culture.

On a clear and bright sunny Sunday morning in February 2004, Stefano Zamagni, Professor of Economics from the University of Bologna, distinguished for his contribution in the history of economics, visited Mariapolis Luminosa, the Focolare little town for North America, where some 100 Focolare members dedicated to bringing the spirituality of unity into every aspect of social life had gathered for their annual convention. Over the course of a uniquely joyful meeting, Zamagni opened for them broad vistas on the powerful and profound cultural impact of the treasure they carry. What follows are excerpts from his impromptu presentation and interaction with the audience.

THE ECONOMY OF COMMUNION was launched in 1991 by Chiara Lubich during her visit to Brazil. It is something that has provoked in many people, including me, a sort of shock. Why? Because the Economy of Communion is a scandal. It is the most intriguing challenge against the dominant culture and the dominant practice in economics. As you know, economics is a science that was developed in a period after the first Industrial Revolution on the basis of one anthropological assumption, that is, on the “economic man” (homo economicus).

But the economic man is a lonely individual who has only one goal: to maximize personal interest, self interest. And the old economics knowledge was created on this premise—that human beings are essentially selfish. And when they relate a relation to others it is only for instrumental
reasons, in order to obtain more.

At the beginning of the 19th century this idea was not very popular, but nowadays it is the dominant culture. In the media, in the common culture, the argument is that everyone should mind his or her own interest. That is the logic by means of which you can develop in the economy, you can grow in importance, you can sell more, maximize profits, and so on.

The problem of the present-day situation is that people who follow this anthropology, accumulate more wealth, but they become more and more unhappy. And so, nowadays, the issue of happiness is on the frontlines. What’s the point of maximizing income if the result is an increment of unhappiness?

The idea of the Economy of Communion is clearly a challenge to the dominant mode of doing economics. In other words, to be able to show that it is possible to be efficient, to remain in the market, and at the same time to be happy, is a real challenge because for more than three centuries nobody believed that. At the academic level, the idea of the Economy of Communion has disturbed many people in economic circles, because we are challenging their paradigm and their faith in what they have been doing and preaching in all universities and in all their classes decade after decade. I would not say that this paradigm is wrong but it is incomplete, because it does not take into account that the human being is a unity. And you cannot split a human life as if we were a simple machine.

The Economy of Communion is also a challenge from a practical point of view. Today, in the era of so-called globalization, the situation is difficult. In the past, people allowed us to believe that it was enough to practice the paradigm of homo economicus to solve all the problems. Now we are living in a period where that is not true. We have many more problems than in the past.

Why is that so? Because until recently we have been accustomed to interpret conflict as “conflict of interest.” Even the Marxist and socialist traditions were based on that: the conflict of interest between the workers and the owners, the poor and the rich.

But now a new type of conflict is emerging in our society: the “conflict of identity”—not to be confused with the conflict of interest. The conflict of identity is a conflict which is “declined” on the dimension of being, not of having—to be or not to be. And what are typical issues of the conflict of identity? Religious identity, ethnic identity and cultural identity. The novelty is that we cannot cope with the problems stirred up by the conflict of identity with the same tools used in the past in the conflict of interest where the strategy is to redistribute. If the conflict is between those who have and those who don’t have, the solution would be to take away from the rich and give to the poor. But can you do the same with the conflict of identity? Of course not. I cannot approach a Muslim and say, “How much do you want in order to give up 30% or 40% of your identity?” That question makes no sense. It creates a reaction in the other and the end result will be terrorism of various types.

In other words, the conflict of identity hinges on the dignity of the person. You cannot use the typical economic instruments to cope with it. You cannot buy identity. You can buy the interest. For example, you can ask workers how much they want in order to stop the strike and they will respond, “Give me 30% more of my salary and I’ll be O.K.” But you cannot do the same with identity. That would be an offense to one’s dignity.

We are discovering now that the usual instruments produced by the economic life to cope with conflicts of interest are not viable for the conflicts of identity. In fact, when you come to the conflict of identity you need specific attention to the being of the other person in front of you.

One can now understand why the logic of the Economy of Communion is a real challenge. This innovative economic system is an attempt to show that you can do business respecting the identity of the other. In this way the other who cooperates with you does not feel repressed or humiliated. Today humiliation is the true original sin of our society. You can humiliate someone even if you give him or her “stuff”—that is called paternalism. Paternalism is generous, in the sense of philanthropic generosity. But when people feel humiliated you can be sure they will react, and most of the time violently. The idea of the Economy of Communion is to give value to the whole of the person, including his or her religious, ethnic or cultural identity.

A FEW YEARS AGO I started inquiring why the model of the economy of communion is viable and is progressing. Through a research project we discovered that the Economy of Communion is nothing but the last ring of a chain which started during...
the civic humanism of the fifteenth century. At that moment all the fundamentals of the market economy started within the church. We have elaborated this research and the results will be published soon under the title “Civil Economics,” co-authored by Luigino Bruni.

Most people believe that the basic principle of economics is the principle of profit-maximization. We do not deny that, but we show that even more fundamental is the principle of reciprocity. In other words, in those economies where you have a culture of profit-maximization without a principle of reciprocity you can maximize profits and wealth but you do not make people happy.

Chiara Lubich’s innovative idea of the Economy of Communion can be visualized as the last ring of a chain which started in that period. And the fact that she hardly knows anything about economics is even more relevant. Such an idea would have never occurred to an economist. It occurred to Chiara because she is interested in the happiness of the person.

It is up to the Christian to find how to expand the space of happiness. In this historical period the problem of happiness cannot be solved unless we reinterpret the idea of the economy. As you know, most of our lives are spent in economic organizations. It could be a firm, an office, and so on. In the world we live in, most of our time is dedicated to economic affairs. Unless we solve the problem at that level, how can we possibly think about making people happy?

That is why strategically it is important to show to those who are skeptical or cynical that this is not just a fanciful idea which occurred one day to one person, but is the result of an ancient wisdom that is rooted in a particular conception of the human being which is not individualistic but is personal. The “person” differs from the individual, because a person is an individual in relation with others. Relation is the important dominant aspect.

Translating this fundamental idea into economic discipline, into economic science, I can assure you, is a major challenge. That is why we need to progress on both sides: on the actual experience in the Economy of Communion by the various enterprises, and on the cultural level. Our friends in the Economy of Communion need to listen from time to time to people who are saying, “You are doing something good, you are on the right path.” This gives them the strength to continue to overcome the difficulties because, of course, there are difficulties. We need to reinforce their choice to have accepted to join the Economy of Communion. And that, it seems to me, is one of Chiara’s great merits.

I STARTED TEACHING A COURSE on “the economics of reciprocity.” That word is never used in economics. The usual language includes terms as efficiency, profit, cost-minimization, and so on. But no one uses the word “reciprocity.” That word is never used in economics. The usual language includes terms as efficiency, profit, cost-minimization, and so on. But no one uses the word “reciprocity.”

Q: The idea of reciprocity is exciting. I work in an anti-poverty program, which is trying to address social issues with economics. I could really understand your concern about people losing their identity and can see how instead of being grateful, people end up feeling humiliated and angry. I was just wondering how to translate the idea of “reciprocity” with some of the economically based social programs that we have.

Jennifer Krokey

A: That question often emerges in this type of discussion. For understandable reasons, the concept of reciprocity has been confused with the concept of exchange of equivalents. That is the fault of us economists. All our books are written in the wrong way. They are written in such a way that our students of today will become the leaders or managers or media operators of tomorrow, and they will perpetuate the wrong idea.

The basic difference is that the exchange of equivalents is impersonal. In the morning you go to buy a newspaper and you give one dollar. That is the price. I do not need to know you in order to get from you the newspaper. I only need my purchasing power and you need to have the property rights to sell me your newspaper. But I do not need to know who you are.

Relations of reciprocity presuppose the knowledge of the identity of the other. In other words, the reciprocity principle applies the principle of fraternity,
brotherhood. The principle of fraternity is one of the words most used by Chiara. She applies it in politics, economics and social life. If you pay attention, the word “fraternity” was one of the three key words of the French Revolution—Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité (Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood). But after the Revolution the word fraternity was cancelled. And now nobody speaks about fraternity. The reason is that the French Revolution was afraid of the word because it was typical of the Christian tradition. Other cultures or religions have the word “solidarity” but the meaning is different.

Most people confuse the word solidarity with fraternity. Solidarity means that I should feel responsible for the well being of the others. But I do not need to know who the others are. I can apply solidarity to people I never met. Fraternity is different: it is based not only on giving, but on giving with the intention of establishing a relationship.

Brotherhood presupposes that we are children of the same Father. You can see why fraternity, which is translated in practical life into the principle of reciprocity, is different from the exchange of equivalents.

Now consider what happens in a regular business of the economy of communion, in the relationships among people living and working in the Economy of Communion. Solidarity implies trying to make different people equal. Fraternity allows equals to be diverse. Under fraternity people flourish. Under solidarity that is not guaranteed. With the principle of fraternity not only do I tolerate that you are different from me, but I want you to be different from me. I want you to flourish according to your proper dimensions. That strengthens our unity. Unity in diversity, yes, but we have to understand the implication of “unity in diversity.” The implication is the principle of reciprocity. An Economy of Communion business is where people translate the principle of reciprocity into everyday life. It is as efficient as another business, and those who work there feel fulfilled and happy. We were all born for happiness.

**Q:** I come from the business environment. I was so upset about the corporate scandals and the society in the United States is very upset about economics in general, even if we are prosperous. What you are talking about—how we can bring economics and happiness—is what I think is really needed to solve some of the problems in our world. Many are getting pessimistic about what’s happening, and this is the most optimistic thing I’ve heard in a long time.…

**Jim Milway**

**A:** What you say is so important. There is a fascinating example: in fourteenth-century Europe, feudalism was in a situation similar to ours today. It was full of scandals. At that time, when humanity was losing its north star, out of Christianity came the proposal of the market economy. Its new technicalities were an answer to the pessimistic attitude which was spreading at that period. The market showed that it is possible to progress. Christians are not against, but in favor of progress. And it is possible to progress without slavery, exploitation and so on.

Taking into consideration the enormous differences between historic periods, we live in a similar situation. We need to instill a new type of optimism into those who have been touched, even badly, by this type of scandal and are losing any hope of remodeling our economy. That is why the idea of the Economy of Communion is really revolutionary. It emerged during a period when globalization was showing its face with new problems.

It is a duty for us to instill a new sense of hope in the people around us. A Catholic French philosopher, Charles Peguy, wrote: “The virtue I love most is hope. In comparison to its big sisters, faith and charity, it seems as if it is pulled. But it is hope that is pushing the other two.” In other words, in a period of crisis we need to spread around seeds of hope because hope makes the other two virtues, faith and charity, work. We should never accept the attitude that there is nothing to be done.

—Stefano Zamagni
The Metropolis of São Paulo is truly vast. We had been traveling rapidly along the highway for almost an hour passing hillsides dotted with brick homes, often incomplete. Then the buildings and traffic became denser and the road began to run alongside a muddy canal that was soon to be cleaned up by the local environmental department. I was headed from the airport towards Vargem Grande, the location of the Focolare little town named Mariapolis Ginetta, accompanied by Margarida Silveira Silva. I asked her about her work in the delicate phase of distributing goods to those in need.

What is being done in this region for the people being assisted through the Economy of Communion?

For those of us involved in the task of distributing the EOC financial profits allocated for the poor it is not only a matter of reaching the right people and giving priority to the greatest needs—a task not so easily accomplished in the face of so many urgent situations. It is mainly about transforming the act of giving into a relationship that builds universal brotherhood. In such a relationship, positions of inferiority or superiority cannot exist if we consider the others as “another us,” as brothers or sisters. This is possible because the people we are speaking of have made sharing a way of life.

Do you and your team decide where to direct these resources or do those in need request your help?

Both cases occur but often, even if in urgent need, most people will not ask for help. We have to be alert for signs of need especially because these people are used to thinking first about others’ needs, rather than their own. In certain cases, it is not easy for them to accept the fact that they need material help. For this reason, we try to be as delicate and discreet as possible.

Are you concerned that your offer of help might be seen as patronizing, or that someone may take advantage of your generosity and will become dependent on it?

A couple of times we thought that we could be running that risk. Once someone made an extravagant purchase assuming that someone else would take care of the essential needs of his child. We resolve situations like this by simply talking about it, making them aware of where the money is coming from and how many others are also in need. Fortunately, the opposite occurs more frequently. When

The following are excerpts from letters written by persons who, in the Economy of Communion (EOC) system, have accepted help through the businesses’ shared profits and the individual contributions of Focolare members worldwide.

God has a plan of love on each person

I have been helped by the Economy of Communion (EOC) funds for the last five years and, thanks to this assistance I am now completing my second year at the university. To be part of the EOC has meant much more to me than just receiving a monthly stipend for my studies. Every month, when I receive the letter with my name written on it, my conviction that God wants each one of us to be happy is strengthened. At the end of last semester, I was given the opportunity to introduce EOC concepts to the students and professors in my faculty. Our assignment was to take a specific environmental problem and outline solutions. Another student and I decided to take on what seemed to be the biggest of these issues. We presented the EOC as a viable solution to the poverty and social disparity that in many cases lies at the root of a given environmental crisis.

(Dayani Zanuzetti, Croatia)
someone finds employment, he or she notifies us right away that they no longer need help. One family began their own cottage industry and now they want to help someone else.

The help you give is first of all destined to those in need within the Focolare family, for those who live the spiritual-ity of unity. Isn’t this a rather limited view?

The fact that we take care of “our own family” first might appear negative, but actually it is extremely positive. The spirituality of unity lived out is the necessary common basis for “giving” one’s own needs and “receiving” help in a spirit of communion. It is an experience that is proving to be an effective, innovative model that can definitely be replicated on a larger scale, and that holds great promise for the future.

WE HAD BY NOW left the more densely populated area and were passing by a number of villages that had sprouted up along the roadside. Signs of poverty were very evident. I felt like concluding that the distribution of the help given must be the most delicate phase of the EOC, even more than the management of the businesses themselves. The process will need to be carefully monitored but I was relieved and heartened to see that the existing process is functioning well. The financial help reaches its destination through a chain of uninterrupted relationships lived out in the spirit of universal brotherhood, maintaining the inherent dignity of those who are on the receiving end.

—Benedetto Gui is a professor and dean of the Department of Economics at the University of Padua, Italy

The EOC model was launched by Chiara Lubich during a 1991 visit to Brazil, as a response to the needs of the many Focolare members living in the shantytowns surrounding the city of Sao Paulo. The model grew to include people in need in many other countries as well.

I continued to believe that this too was part of God’s plan of love for me. The EOC helped me pay for the operation which was a success. I am now expecting again and so far all the tests have come out normal and my doctor is confident that this time everything will go well.

(Pakistan)

To be on the other end
My husband who is an accountant lost his job due to the economic crisis that our nation has been experiencing. We were forced to incur many debts, many of which we could not pay off even after taking out a second mortgage on our home. With the help of the EOC, we were able to cover the most urgent debts. We then sat down and planned how we had to live in order to make it on a very reduced budget. We had to be open about our needs and this allowed us to experience first hand what it is like to be among society’s less advantaged. Now our children work part-time to pay for their own activities and we are experiencing the love of those around us in a new way.

(Aргентина)

A dignified burial
Thank you for helping us honor our father with a dignified funeral. (Pakistan)

Opposite page: the shantytown of Vargem Grande. Left and above: some of the young students of a local school supported by the EOC and local families.

Just in time
It was such a relief to receive this divine providence right when they were going to cut off our light and gas due to the unpaid bills. The cost of these utilities is so high in our country that we could no longer afford to pay them. We were able to experience that we are truly a family and that God loves us personally and immensely.

(Colombia)

It’s absolutely different
It would have been very difficult for me to continue my studies without the help of the EOC. Living in a market economy which is highly competitive, where nothing is given freely and everything is the object of exchange, I often experience a profound sadness. The Economy of Communion, instead, is really revolutionary, absolutely different, yet feasible. Thanks to all its businesses, poverty can be effectively overcome.

(Chile)

An even bigger problem
One day, feeling burdened by many problems and poor health, I confided in a friend. A short while later, I met a person who in turn confided in me the difficulties she was having. I realized that her problems were much bigger than mine. One of her daughters was ill and she did not have the money to buy the necessary medicine. I had very little myself but I gave her everything that I had, sure that God knew my every need.

The following day, I received his answer through the help of the EOC which I still continue to receive. I thank God every day for his concrete assistance which arrives just when I need it.

(Brazil)

I am going to be a mother
A year ago I needed to undergo surgery for a miscarriage. This was the second time this was being asked of me and it was difficult for me to say yes. Yet I con-