

nature. One effect of this globalizing crisis is technocracy. From Mancini's point of view, in fact, delegating historical change to innovation means disregarding our responsibility as co-protagonists of history and leaving the symbiosis between the financialization of the world and technocracy intact¹¹⁸.

2.3 *Economy and Death*

In the *Dialectic of the Enlightenment* (1947)¹¹⁹, Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer believed that the system of capitalist civilization was structured in line with a logic related to the imitation of death: *homo oeconomicus* is literally a "mortifying man".

The "exit from the economy", proposed by Serge Latouche, is probably utopian. According to the author, leaving the economy would mean: creating a change of values through a "dis-economization" of the mind, or decolonization of the "imaginary", in order to rediscover the sense of proportion, reinvent common goods and abandon the asocial and totalitarian leadership of the job, towards a model of sober and convivial coexistence¹²⁰.

However, I contend that "leaving the economy" would mean forgetting that it must legitimately contribute to the material conditions of social life. The economy should be a service and therefore a "fair economy", aimed at respecting human dignity and the value of the "common good".

The "energetic" space of ethics is fundamental in this scenario¹²¹, since it helps to counteract moral entropy, which is characterized by the banal theorization of the impossibility of

¹¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹¹⁹ Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2002.

¹²⁰ Serge Latouche, *L'invenzione dell'economia*, Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 2010; Id., *L'economia è una menzogna*, Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 2014; Serge Latouche, Anselm Jappe, *Sortir de l'économie, déconstruire l'économie*, Sesto San Giovanni (MI), Mimesis, p. 6.

¹²¹ See e.g.: Hans Küng, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.

making a distinction between “good” and “evil”. By virtue of this consideration, not only is everything relative, but is in fact lawful. The effect is precisely not only that of the banality of evil (Hannah Arendt), but also that of its trivialization (Christophe Dejours).

One of the fundamental characteristics of the global economy is, in fact, the so-called “necronomy”, which assumes death as a form of truth and as a criterion for measuring life. It follows that within this horizon, it would be normal to inflict various forms of death on people and nature to allow the “system” to function properly. The consequences of the global economy are, therefore, destructive, starting from the concept of “growth” which, as Mancini points out, is a “growth of destruction”. Latouche similarly states that growth is an “anti-growth”, whereas in Pope Francis’ point of view, it is greedy and irresponsible (while development would be genuine and long lasting). Totaro underlines that it is necessary to broaden humankind’s vision, in keeping with ontological coordinates which complement the dimension of “producing” with the dimensions of acting, and contemplating, towards a good life¹²².

The economy has claimed to be a kind of super science, capable of governing everything. It has taken on an integral value as a whole, which has also claimed to be self-examining, in accordance with its own criteria, through formulas such as “corporate social responsibility”. In reality, as Totaro well states, philosophy is the only form of knowledge that is able to bring the economy to a critical awareness and discernment. The arrogant protagonism of the economy was already evident to philosophers of the past. For example, Habermas spoke of market economy urbanization and Karl Polanyi brought the gap between the economy and its original social context to our attention. Even Aristotle, for his part, emphasized the contrast between the hegemony of the economy, on the one hand, and living well, on the other¹²³. After all, man is a fragment who

¹²² Francesco Totaro, *Filosofia ed Economia*, Fondazione Centro Studi Filosofici di Gallarate, Brescia, Morcelliana, 2019.

¹²³ Aristotele, *Politica*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 1993.

presumes and claims to be everything, thus hindering the “gift economy”, which is already evident in Benedict XVI’s *Caritas in Veritate*.

Overcoming capitalism requires the convergence of a spiritual turning point able to direct people and institutions towards a good life in common – and not towards death – in addition to a cultural and political turning point (which would develop the notion of democracy as a form of society), as well as a methodological turn, one leading to an alternative “path”, built through the integration of other models of economy, different from the capitalist one¹²⁴.

By “transformation of the economy”, Mancini means a change that affects its meaning, form, method, culture and moral sphere. It is necessary to put the economy under judgment, verifying its anthropological, ethical, political, ecological, and spiritual legitimacy. The economic system must not be an insurmountable and indisputable fact: it must have its own “honesty”. It cannot win without being right, and it cannot obtain consent by force. The economic system is relative and cannot claim any autonomy in formulating the rules of social order¹²⁵.

Furthermore, the concept of “transformation” implies a spiritual, anthropological and ethical discernment, which opens the doors to a solidary society that values human dignity and nature, harmony in justice, freedom, sustainability and an integrated form of wisdom. It is capable of developing critical-heuristic strength of thought, which diagnoses pathologies and determines paths of liberation. In fact, transformation occurs only if there is liberation. Our society has founded its rules of coexistence on power, which has victimized society. Therefore we need to get out of the “survival system”, which is imposed by the economy that forces us to a logic of universal competition. We also need to embrace both the essence of life – which is, first and foremost, a gift – and the principle of mutual care¹²⁶.

¹²⁴ Mancini, *Trasformare l'economia*, cit.

¹²⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹²⁶ Mancini speaks more precisely of a gift, acceptance, care, dedication, fraternal relationship and sorority.