

Christian Social Traditions and the European Society: some Perspectives for the Future.

Johan Verstraeten, K.U.Leuven

Reflecting upon the many insightful and inspiring contributions to this 5th Social Week on “Times of Responsibility”, the aim of this synthesis is to articulate the question how Christian Social Traditions should respond to the rapid social changes in the European society.

Christian Social Traditions are living traditions of thought and action inspired by a common source: the gospel. They are embodied in movements, communities and networks. Together with many other actors they are co-responsible for the creation of a just and solidary European society.

This responsibility can be pointed out in 6 points.

- (1) Responding to change and anxiety: being builders of trust
- (2) Responding to the increasing inequality: defending social justice
- (3) Responding to de-personalisation and disconnection in the world of work: practicing solidarity as “being connected”.
- (4) Responding to the subordination of politics to economics: being a source of inspiration and action in the public square
- (5) Responding to a lack of vision: being imaginative and creative
- (6) Responding to a diversity of cultures and religions: being curious in the face of difference

1. Responding to change and anxiety: being builders of trust

The synergy between the divine and the human enables people to become fully humane. Paraphrasing the words of Ireneus of Lyon: the glory of God is the human person fully alive, or, in more contemporary terms: human flourishing. God’s transcendence can, moreover, “not be discovered in the exaltation and distance with respect to the concrete and laborious life, but precisely in connection with it”¹ (Erik Borgman). Hence, the main vocation of Christian

social traditions is to embody Gods care for human flourishing in concrete personal and structural relationships.

In Europe this responsibility has become quite a challenge. Because Christian social movements are in many regards confronted with rapid social changes in the European society (“the only constant is the change”): internal and external migrations and a more visible presence of new religions have a huge impact on the life in cities; new forms of poverty, social exclusion and exploitation (such as extremely low wages for unskilled or informal labour; abuse of undocumented people in sweatshops and domestic work) require adapted methods of action; new bio-technological developments challenge the traditional understanding of the human person and of agriculture; massive youth unemployment causes despair and frustration.

As we already diagnosed during the 4th European social week, the problem is not so much the radical transformations as such, but the fact that, at least in Europe they are connected with a collapse of a common framework of belief and values, a collapse which, as Herman Van Rompuy suggested, is partially caused by the diminishing historical consciousness about the reasons why the European Union was created as guarantee for sustainable peace. Surveys also show a general decrease of trust in institutions.

When fundamental frameworks of belief and values collapse, when people lack vision and lose confidence in institutions, crisis phenomena become intensified, at least subjectively in the perception of citizens who are increasingly individualized and disconnected from living communities. The consequence is: anxiety and insecurity, which in turn leads to a strong reaffirmation of imaginary identities, a revival of nationalism, extreme political ideologies, or even racism.

In such a context Christian social traditions have the responsibility to offer an alternative and to propose again a vision of the common good as “a heuristic objective beyond the horizon of current practice”. They are capable of opening new and meaningful perspectives on life and society, because they have access to a biblical horizon of interpretation which is different from the dominant horizon of interpretation of our time. Christians social movements and networks can, moreover, give people again confidence in life and offer them inner resources to resist the logic of anxiety (for example by introducing them to spirituality and a new consciousness of wholeness as Zulehner proposes) . They

can also create open communities where individuals are liberated from their social isolation and where they can experience solidarity and feel again safe and at home in the society.

2. Responding to the increasing inequality: being realistic

Vision should be ‘evidence based’.ⁱⁱ

One of these evidences is that society has the face of its victims and the gospel urges Christian movements to see and analyze social realities from the perspective of their impact on the poor (cf. Jérôme Vignon). One of the most threatening developments in this regard (several times mentioned during this social week, particularly by Pierre Defraigne and Dirk Messner), is the increasing inequality¹.

According to the *Global Risk Report*, a publication from the World Economic Forum in Davos, the increasing inequalities threaten social and political stability and undermine development’. According to Pope Francis, inequality is the root of all social ills (Evangelic Gaudium, 202), a thesis confirmed by Wilkinson and Pickett: inequality creates an ever growing unequal, ‘broken’ and socially corrosive society.

The extreme inequalities are damaging to human abilities, performance and happiness and they lead to more health and social problems, as well as to a breakdown of social life.

Social inequality also reinforces the tendency to ‘privatize profits and socialize costs’.

The damaging inequalities are, moreover, not only a ‘physical’ reality, but, as Dorling demonstratesⁱⁱⁱ, also the consequence of subjective beliefs and biases which serve as false justifications, such as elitism, prejudice, the idea that greed is good and despair inevitable. Pseudo-scientific publications such as *The Bell Curve* even defend with socio-biological arguments the idea that one should not invest any more in social programs for the poorest. A Belgian think tank recently even promoted inequality as stimulus for economic development. Such ideologies are completely alien to the Christian social traditions, which are in an exemplary way represented by texts like *Quadragesimo anno*, promulgated two years after the 1929 crash of Wall Street: “...the riches that economic-social

¹ see also the Jos Van Gennip’s publication on *Capitalism and Inequality*

developments constantly increase ought to be so distributed among individual persons and classes that the common advantage of all... will be safeguarded; in other words that the common good of all society will be kept inviolate. By this law of social justice, one class is forbidden to exclude the other from sharing in the benefits... To each must therefore be given his own share of, goods, and the distribution of created goods, which... must be brought into conformity with the norms of the common good, that is social justice (QA 57-58).

In other words, as ‘connected critics’ (Walzer), Christians have the responsibility to be communities and networks of resistance against any ideology or system that promotes inequality at the cost of social justice.

3. Responding to de-personalisation and disconnection in the world of work: being connected.

In several interventions attention has been paid to shaping new relationships between employees and employers (Huibrecht Bos, Fritz Neugebauer, Duco Sickinghe, Kai-Uwe Hemmerich) and to enriching labor-contracts with a more fundamental commitment in the form a sustainable ‘covenant’ (Elena Lasida). The inspiring examples we have heard are an adequate answer to one of the major problems today: cynicism as caused by modern management styles and theories². The spirit of Taylor’s ‘Theory of Scientific Management’, with its tendency to de-personalize relationships still dominates the world of work (oft in softer versions such as lean management). The contemporary management vocabulary is a clear indication of this tendency: there are no departments of “human relations”, but of human “resources”, there are no more co-workers, but “workforce”, *people* are not laid off, but companies are *downsized, right-sized or re-engineered*, students and patients have become ‘customers’; organization and function design reduces people to functions and producers of measurable output and via panoptic control systems organizations and entire societies are transformed into systems of institutionalized distrust (example: the omnipresence of cameras).

An example of a depersonalizing management attitude was what has happened last year when Ford Motor co. closed down on of its biggest

² This was also the diagnosis made by Jerome Vignon during the 4th European Week):see also the Jos Van Gennip’s publication on Capitalism and Inequality

plants in Belgium, causing at least 4000 new direct and 4000 indirect layoffs. What really shocked many people was not the decision as such, but the body language of the European CEO who, afraid to face his workers, communicated his decision at distance from Brussels (even there he was surrounded by several body guards). This refusal of a human relationship and confrontation with the other, is the perfect opposite of the humanization of the economy as proposed by Christian churches.

The tendency to de-personalize is, however, not only present in the sphere of work. Many political decision makers, bureaucrats and even scholars and intellectuals are not touched any more by the real life and concerns of the citizens^{iv}. They are simply disconnected.

Christian social traditions can be a remedy against such a disconnection and this because of the radical function of Christian love, which generates the alternative attitude of an *open heart*. This enables leaders and managers to be touched by people's needs and to pay attention to what in personal contexts and stories is happening (Otto Scharmer, Theory U).

The Christian virtue of love and the *connection* with people to which it enables, makes people conscientious of the fact that behind every political decision or market transaction there is a human face (cf. Nuria Chinchilla's contribution: 90% of reality are people!).

Overcoming this disconnection is also one of the great concerns articulated by Pierre Rosanvallon in his most recent book *Le parlement des invisibles* and the series of publications '*Raconter sa vie*' (Seuil, 2014). These publications are symptomatic for the new development in social science: to revalue life-stories and even novels about people and real life situations, in order to overcome the problem that all too many studies become abstractions from the real world.

This matches with pope Franciscus' contention that "conceptual tools exist to heighten contact with the realities they seek to explain, not to distance us from them" (EG, 194) and that "only on the basis of this real and sincere closeness" we can 'properly accompany the poor on their path to liberation' (EG, 158).

The sources of this closeness are love. As virtue it is crucial for the society: on the one hand it takes away the distance to the poor and the vulnerable, by way of promoting daily acts of concrete solidarity and meeting the real needs of people

one encounters, on the other hand, love finds its full expression in action to eliminate the structural causes of poverty (EG 188) and to realize social justice, which implies: a dignified sustenance for all people, education, access to health care and employment. In one word, as Sen. articulates it: we must “secure an adequate level of agency and morally basic capabilities for everyone in the world –regardless of nationality, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, or sexual preference” (Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, p. 381) .

Because of their co-responsibility to realize social justice, Christian movements “cannot and must not remain on the side-lines in the fight for justice”. This requires political action.

4. Responding to the subordination of politics to economics: being a source of inspiration and action in the public square

In a secular society, which risks becoming programmatic instead of procedural, one of the greatest threats for Christian traditions is the privatisation of religion. But both pope Francis and Rowan Williams, the former head of the Anglican Church, have strongly underlined that Christians must actively resist attempts to reduce the role of religion to individual spirituality or private life: “It is no longer possible to claim that religion should be restricted to the private sphere” (EG, 182), and even churches play and must play an indispensable necessary role in the public square (cf. Williams book on *Faith in the Public Square*).

Side-lining the Christian social traditions would impoverish the public debate and deprive the European policy makers from the necessary inspiration and critical input.

But what does the political responsibility of Christian social traditions concretely mean?

Politics in the fullest sense of the word is “one of the highest forms of charity” (Pope Francis). It extends charity from personal relationships to political, economic and social relationships (EG, 20).

The problem of our time is, however, that the political sphere is subordinated to economic relationships and that this is internalized by individuals via “discipline”, being the process by which the human person as political power is reduced to his economic force as producer or consumer (Michel Foucault). Nevertheless, the search for the good life, the care for the quality of living-

together demands that we acknowledge that the human person is not only a labourer, or a *homo faber*, but an acting person, whose action is oriented towards human encounter as activity in which acting is not subordinated to making. The reduction of human work to merely economic production and consumption is, erodes democracy because it leads to banishing the citizens from the public realm. Nevertheless, public conversation about our common ‘inter-esse’ (and thus much more than our self-interest or group interest) is a condition *sine qua non* for the creation of a good society, because what is at stake is the “capacity for establishing relationships” (Arendt, 191). “*The basic error of all materialism in politics is (...) to overlook the inevitability with which men disclose themselves as subjects, as distinct and unique persons, even when they wholly concentrate upon reaching an altogether worldly, material object. To dispense with this disclosure (...) would mean to transform men into something they are not (...)*” (183)^v.

It is evident that the political conversation proposed by Arendt needs to be more than what happens on the level of the state or party politics. Paraphrasing Amartya Sen, one could say that “what is to be avoided above all” is the re-establishment of the state or society [or a supra national entity such as the European Union] as an abstraction vis-à-vis the individuals”^{vi}.

The re-valuation of the central role of human inter-action and thus politics requires, moreover, that people who are excluded from the benefits of markets, become actively involved as subjects in the creation of the future; not only as people whose ‘problems’ must be resolved by experts, but as part of the solution, as people acknowledged as actors who, in their struggle for mere survival have acquired grass roots wisdom and competencies.

(2) That is the reason why Christian social traditions put so much emphasis on participation in the civil society (or in Dutch “het middenveld”). But today the space between state and individual is no longer unproblematic, because it has also become the object of social “discipline”: its role as space for subsidiarity and self-organization of the social sectors, is unfortunately very much limited by the discipline of state and market, as well as under the influence of the neo-liberal economic culture^{vii}.

Hence the necessity of creating communities capable of delivering a ‘counter discipline’ against the dominance of market and state (as servant of the market), against the reduction of people to being producers or consumers. Christian traditions and the social movements connected with them can function as

pedagogic communities where such a counter discipline can be developed, spaces where citizens are enabled and formed to become critical political subjects, capable of resisting the permanent indoctrination by the system. Much more time and energy can be invested in the formation of citizens into empowered subjects and in order to do this we need more than strong organizations. We also need social networks being efficient actors in the new social media (cf. the splendid examples given by Jan van Betten, initiator of Nudge).

With regards to the “Christian involvement in the public sphere” Rowan Williams also refers to building sustainable communities where Christians learn to “celebrate the sacramental reality of the world” and where they invent and implement “projects suggesting *possibilities* for human beings *different from those assumed by contractual and acquisitive stories*”^{viii}. Put in more simple terms: because of their sensitivity actualized by liturgical and sacramental celebrations, as well as because of a mystical experience of the earth as a ‘milieu divin’ (Teilhard de Chardin), Christians keep the consciousness alive that there is much more to life than markets and property and their legitimations (cf. also Bernhard Emunds). Their vision of the world enables them to enrich the economic logic of scarcity with the inter-subjective logic of abundance, generosity and friendship. In this regards we can value the encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* (Benedict XVI).

When we look at human interaction with an open mind, the problem is not primordially the scarcity of goods, but our relationship with one another as related to scarce goods^{ix}. This relationship can move beyond scarcity by generosity, based on solidarity, sharing, and the development of new lifestyles.

(3) Together with the counter-discipline the task of Christian social traditions is to contribute to shaping an *open and critical mind in the public opinion*. That requires breaking away from the biases and blind spots that have caused so much ill effect on people, communities and societies. The philosopher Lonergan expressed this in terms of ‘negative spontaneities’ deeply rooted in our system which lead us to ‘hate the truly good and to love the really evil’. Abandoning negative spontaneities means: to stop *downloading* [French: télécharger] ideas and frameworks which confirm the unjust status quo or the established disorder as Mounier has described it. Anxiously sticking to downloaded ideas leads to a lack of empathy, a lack of understanding as a consequence of sticking to one’s own perspective or interest.^x

(4) An indispensable part of the political role of Christian traditions, is their contribution to public reasoning. As such they can offer an answer to one of the most problematic aspects of the European Union: its increasing democratic deficit. There is in the Union a lot of lobbying and there are lots of ideological controversies in the parliament, but what is missing is a serious public debate based on a public reasoning in which all the stakeholders of the European Union, including the ‘insignificant’ citizens can participate. In order to make this possible, Christian Traditions can be the mediators of the concerns of the poor. In doing this they can learn a lot from Nobel price Amartya Sen’s major book ‘*The Idea of Justice*’.

In this book Sen makes a fundamental distinction: public reasoning is something else than imposing the rational models of economists, more than imposing “top down” rational solutions.

Before we can impose solutions to problems, we must set the questions clear and in order to do so we must start from what Amartya Sen describes as the “relevance of the actual world” and “the life and the death of people involved”^{xi}. Public reasoning, is more than implementing rational solutions from bureaucrats and consultants. It is a complex endeavour, which requires wisdom knowledge, which must include the fundamental concerns of people, and it must be based on thinking beyond rational self-interest. It implies a vision about society as based on more than being merely a sum of individuals.

Public reasoning is, moreover, not about abstract or perfect institutional arrangements. It rests on a realistic vision of justice. What matters is *how justice can be advanced*” and not “*what would be perfectly just institution*” (p. 9). To express it with the words of Sen: “*we have to seek institutions that promote justice, rather than treating the institutions as themselves manifestations of justice*” (82). Hence structures and institutions are to be judged “*in the light of concrete social achievements*” (Sen, 83), not on the basis of ideological slogans. That is certainly valid for our search for new social models (cf. George Dassis, Bea Cantillon) and also for the European institutions and projects: the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

One of the most fundamental criteria for such a public reasoning is the idea of an open impartiality as “taking into account the interests” and also the “perspectives” (402) of even the distant “other”. One must look at the world “by the eyes of the rest of mankind” (406) and “arguments that may first appear

outlandish (...) may help to enrich our thinking” (407). Hence there need to be more than merely Eurocentric thinking. Sen refers here to “inclusional broadening”, “the broadening of the collectivity of people whose interests are seen as relevant” (199), hence even the ‘insignificant other’, such as the victims of austerity or free trade agreements are to be taken into account. Sen even explicitly writes: “if reason had to be a church, it would have to be a very broad church”.

Public reasoning finally implies democratic participation. One needs to pay attention “to the extent to which different voices from diverse sections of the people can be actually heard” (xiii). Creating a participative society is also one of the central concerns in the Christian traditions: the common good IS even the realization of a participative society in which social justice guarantees that people can make their unique contribution to the wellbeing of all. Participation, means – to quote Sen again- public discussion *of, for and by* the people”. That implies that citizens in general and the poor in particular, are respected as subjects and not merely as objects of decisions (p. 328). But, we also know that, where people take initiative, they meet resistance (cf. Reinhard Stransfeld).

That democracy requires active participation finally implies that it is not only a matter of public ballots, but also ‘*government by discussion*’. Christian traditions and the social movements connected with them, or inspired by them, can play here a crucial role, not only as participants in the conversation, but also as communities which ‘empower’ citizens to become active members of a participative society. Such a society is the essence of what we have always referred to as ‘the common good’. This is not an abstract principle, or merely an instrument (creating the conditions for a better life), but an end in itself, the realisation of a participative society in which social justice guarantees that people can make their contribution to the wellbeing of all. When we are convinced that people have the duty to contribute to the wellbeing of others (contributive justice) -as it has been suggested during this social week- we must also accept that the common good requires that the state and the whole of society create the conditions to *enable* them to do this (social justice).

Let me with regards to the political role of Christian traditions finally remind the words of Robert Schuman: “the unity of Europe will not be brought about only or principally by the European institutions; their creation will follow the course of people’s thinking...”. This can have terrible consequences if that thinking and

feeling is turning again in the direction of European disintegration. Hence the absolute necessity of critical communities of discourse, and Christian social traditions are such communities, who can influence how people at the grassroots and in the civil society think.

5. Responding to a lack of vision: being imaginative and creative

During this social week, several examples of new approaches to solidarity were presented, as well as examples of amazingly innovative expressions of cooperation. They are the result of imagining “something that is rooted in the challenges of the real world and yet capable of giving birth to what does not yet exist?”^{xii}. Everywhere, in teams, organizations, and social systems, there is much more happening than first thought^{xiii}. But as a consequence of conservative ways of thinking, busy lifestyles, and a lack of attention, we often don’t see what is possible and the result is that we continue the way things were^{xiv}.

In order to think and act beyond the status quo, we need a “forward looking imagination”,

- (1) “to perceive in the present the *disregarded* possibility hidden within it” and
- (2) to direct the present “towards a fresh future”^{xv}.

Instead of focusing on contemporary issues in terms of mere ‘facts’ or instead of sticking to established ideas that reduce the new into existing ways of thinking, Pope Paul VI proposes a profound new scrutiny of economic, political and social realities understood as a complex social field that contains hidden, and even *disregarded* possibilities for new developments. In other words, what matters is the discovery of new perspectives and new methods for action which the dominant discourse(s) do not allow us to perceive.

For example, the common good of the European society cannot be determined only by a thinking framed in terms of the dominant market oriented and consumerist values. The political answer to problems can’t be simply a matter of either a lack of regulation (neo-liberalism) or an overemphasis of regulation (bureaucratization). We need more alternative perspectives and also serendipity, paying attention to the ‘unforeseen’ and even what can’t yet be foreseen^{xvi}. According to Pope Paul VI, this scrutiny, moreover, “sustains social *dynamism* by the *confidence* that it gives to the *inventive powers* of the human mind and heart”. Such an imaginative dynamism breaks down the mental walls that

narrow the mind and “*breaks down the horizons*” *within which our understanding “likes to find security”*. In other words: we are invited to take the risk to abandon the comfort zone of seeking a false security and to seek the ‘magis’. Do we have the courage to do this?

6. Responding to a diversity of cultures and religions: being curious in the face of difference

Christian social traditions and their movements and networks can become examples of what “living together with difference” means, not only via ecumenism between Christians – which I hope will lead to the development of a common social teaching- but also via an open dialogue about the meaning of life and about a just society with members of other religions, particularly the members of the three most influential other religions on the European continent: the Jewish religion, Islam and Buddhism, and also the dialogue with open atheists can’t be neglected.

It is indispensable because our *common* humanity and the quality of life of *all* citizens are at stake. In this perspective Rowan Williams suggests: “Forget ‘multiculturalism’ as some sort for prescription; begin from the multicultural fact; we are already neighbours and fellow citizens; what we need is neither the ghetto nor the reassertion of a fictionally unified past, but ordinary intelligence, sympathy and curiosity in the face of difference – which is the basis of all learning and all growing-up, in individuals or societies (Faith in the Public Square, 112).

9. Responding to the lack of inner resources: answering the restlessness of our time with stillness.

During this social week we have listened to many speakers and even to inspiring music, but perhaps we have missed moment of common stillness. And yet, silence is the precondition for peaceful action. In our world with busy agenda’s and general restlessness, developing a culture of silence is a condition sine qua non for the creation of a good society. Hence the necessity of a ‘covenant’ between Christian social movements and abbeys and silence-centers, where people can not only escape the restlessness (which is part of the discipline of real capitalism), but where they can also learn the discipline of stillness and of discernment between the trivial and the essential. These centers are also places where managers, political leaders, union leaders and activists can rediscover the

most fundamental human re-sources, the deeper sources of being human. These are places where they can liberate themselves from the limits of functionally differentiated thinking which makes them blind for people's reality and the rich complexity of the social field in which they often run the risk, through managing mechanistically, to kill or eliminate the very conditions for meaningful future developments.

Conclusion

In order to create a just European society, Christian social traditions can and must act as responsible agents of change. This change is not only a matter of *thinking* differently, but also and primordially of *being* differently. During this social week many examples and experiences were given as clear testimonies of the fact that this is not only wishful but also possible and that much new initiatives are “emerging all around us as new realities”^{xvii}, as a consequence of an inspiring combination of individual commitment and solidarity, love and justice, deep convictions and public reasoning, contemplation and action, criticism and inspiration, knowledge of facts and forward looking imagination. Let us trust that the creative spirit of solidarity and sharing that we experienced during this 5th social week, will continue to inspire us in our common endeavour to build a European Union with a human face.

ⁱ Erik BORGMAN, *Metamorfosen. Over religie en moderne cultuur*, as quoted by Christophe Brabant, in: *Tertio*, 19 September 2007, p. 14.

ⁱⁱ Richard Wilkinson, Kate Pickett, *The Spirit Level. Why Equality is Better for Everyone*, London, Penguin Books, 2010, p. ix

ⁱⁱⁱ Daniel Dorling, *Injustice. Why Social Inequality Persists*, Bristol, The Policy Press, 2011.

^{iv} Otto Scharmer, *Theory U*, pp. 42-43

^v Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Second edition with a foreword by Margaret Canovan, , Chicago, 1998, p. 176.

^{vi} Amartya SEN, *The Idea of Justice*, London, Allen Lane/Penguin Books, 2009, p. 245.

^{vii} William Cavanaugh, *Theopolitical Imagination. Discovering the Liturgy as a Political Act in an Age of Global Consumerism*, New York, T&T Clark, 2002.

^{viii} Rowan Williams, *Faith in the Public Square*, London, 2012, p. 44

^{ix} Concrete proposals for Church action are described in a document of the Belgian and

Catholic Inter-diocesan Council *Christenen en de crisis. De tekenen van de tijd lezen in het licht van het evangelie*, Brussels, IPB, 2010.

^x Ibid.,249-250.

^{xi} Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice*, London, Allan Lane/Penguin Books, 2009, pp 212-213

^{xii} Op. cit. p. ix

^{xiii} This thesis can be corroborated in the light of the publication by Cooperrider about ‘corporate maieutics’ as ‘appreciative inquiry’. See Cooperrider’s unpublished dissertation : *Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a Methodology for Understanding and Enhancing Organizational Innovation*, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland (Ohio), 1986.

^{xiv} Otto Scharmer, *Theory U*, p. 135

^{xv} This is an idea from pope Paul VI, in his apostolic exhortation *Octogesima adveniens* (1971). It was reaffirmed in a document published by cardinal Turkson and the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace on the International Financial Crisis in 2011: “*Towards Reforming the International Financial and Monetary Systems in the Context of Global Public Authority*”

^{xvi} Paul VI’s approach can be compared with the method proposed by Schalk Engelbrecht, *Radical Business Ethics: A Critical and Post-metaphysical Manifesto*, in: *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 21 (2012) 4, 339-352. See p. 346.

^{xvii} Scharmer, op. cit., p. 29