

### *Summary of the Discussion*

From the point of view of life in the Third World, there is a dilemma about development. The tendency in developed countries seems to be to work so hard in order to be able to consume that there is less time for family and personal relationships. An Asian research project found Filipinos the happiest people in the region, despite their poverty. Therefore, do we have to catch up with other countries or should they emulate our family and community values?

(Prof. Morande). Although the same could be said of many Third World countries, where work is motivated by the thought of fiesta, however, I think that modern technology does not allow us to maintain a strong divide between work and leisure. Today we live in a continuous space and are permanently preoccupied with information. Life at home is far from immune and "leisure" is permeated with information from the media, creating a continuity between the two types of activity. The crucial distinction is not therefore between work and leisure, but rather between one kind of work where time is considered as a scarce good and the other kind of (family) work where time is abundant.

One of the problems of economic development is indeed the increased value of time. This means that the opportunity costs of leisure (i.e. the costs of being non-productive) are becoming higher and higher. This has various consequences. On the one hand, there is a consistent increase in remunerated activities over non-paid ones such as sociability. On the other hand, as the value of time increases, deferred gratification becomes more demanding. Hence the fact that in the more developed countries savings are less because there are more needs to be satisfied before people begin to save. Curiously the result of this increased value of time and associated growth of productivity, is that eventually it becomes necessary to introduce a compulsory reduction in working hours, which means more time for unpaid activities. This leads to the difference between modernity and postmodernity. In the former, people saved, made efforts, worked, upgraded their skills, because their time-frame included generations, the importance of inheritance for their heirs, etc. In postmodernity, where time

is more valued, the concern is not to protect the future but to valorize the present because the institutions which used to be conducive to a future-orientation in economic behaviour have begun to decline in importance. Paradoxically, the only method of resolving this conflict seems to be by increasing the amount of time dedicated to unpaid activities.

(Prof. Morande). I believe that it is very difficult to introduce legislation which effects a compulsory reduction in work time. It seems a better solution to induce an increase in time devoted to unpaid activities in other parts of society, fostering solidarity. The latter implies a long-term, inter-generational reciprocity, as in ecological efforts or as with the original builders of cathedrals and cannot be weighed in the monetary scales.

In the past philosophy influenced the sciences profoundly: today the reverse is the case with philosophy been formed by the economy. Hence philosophical concepts are being subordinated to the functional imperatives of market competition (e.g. "time", "efficiency"). Yet a broader philosophy, unrestricted to concrete practices, functional requisites and the here and now is essential in order to reflect upon these elements. Philosophy must not become the prisoner of the economy.

The evocative phrase, "work which gives current value to the future", falls within the entire Christian perspective on eschatology — where the future lies above and outside of time. Faith and the Sacraments anticipate the Kingdom of God and thus structure this world, its history and its temporality in the light of a future which is quite other than them. Today it is commonplace to hear it said that modernity has secularized Christian hope, curtailing its horizon to that which can be realized in time, in history. If the acknowledgement that history and transcendence will meet is perverted into the concept of realizing the perfect society within the human time-frame, we deceive ourselves. From the Christian perspective, time must never be devalued, but time derives its value from the future that it anticipates eschatologically, which is always above and beyond that which can be realized in time. This notion of unpaid time, of a time for service, for giving, re-invokes the same idea, even if not stated in eschatological terms. The idea of time which is not reified, commodified or quantified, compared with transitory (work) time, fits well with knowing that we live in two Kingdoms. Yet time is integral, past, present and future are intertwined, but what counts is the eternal — that which alone is durable and in the face of which humanity recognizes its transitory nature and incapacity to realize perfection on earth.

There are various changes which have an impact on how the culture of work can change; in particular the fact that a considerable time is needed for the formation of human capital prior to insertion on the labour market; that today's mobility of labour presupposes a continuous up-dating of knowledge; that manual labour is disappearing and intellectual work is on the increase. All of these elements are converging and becoming intertwined today. From this perspective, can we understand the culture of work which is emerging in a positive sense? It is argued that this is the case precisely because it now commits much more of ourselves in the transformation of reality. But how is it possible to bridge the two cultures, given that one of which (remunerated) is diminishing, whilst the other ("gratuitous") is amplifying?

(Prof. Morande). I believe that when one talks of unpaid time spent in the family, this can easily be understood as an abstract, unreal concept, but I think that this "gratuity" has a sense which surpasses any calculations we can make. For example, economists have attempted to attach a monetary value to domestic activities, yet how can a cash value be associated with the task of socialization? Nevertheless, many prospective employers attach more importance to personal qualities than to formal qualifications. Qualities like trustworthiness have an economic value which cannot be quantified. However, with the development of information technology, the division between work time itself and the time when human capital is formed has become more fluid and more mutually integrated.

Christianity is not like other-worldly religions: it treats of time and eternity, as does, above all, the incarnation of Christ. The history of eschatology has generated various outlooks on society, such as those who wanted to draw eternity into history and thus produced different forms of millenarianism. The philosophical tendency to distinguish eternity as transcendental and historical time as real, which is often to say that the idea of eternity only serves to signify the limit of historical time, is the notion which has most influence on intellectual life today. I see this as a modern version of the old heresy of Doceticism, where the reality of the incarnation was reduced to a sign, outside history. On the contrary, eschatology has a value in the present, not just as a mere hypothesis about a perfect future, but as a reality which is present in the world of today.