

Athabasca University  Master of Arts - Integrated Studies

LABOREM EXERCENS - (ON HUMAN WORK): A RECONCILIATION OF AN
ENCYCLICAL BY POPE JOHN PAUL II ON CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING AND
LABOUR MARKET AND WORKPLACE REALITIES

By

LUCIANO CORBO

Integrated Studies Project

submitted to Dr. Richard Marsden

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – Integrated Studies

Athabasca, Alberta

December 2011

ABSTRACT

Given current global socio-economic realities, many labourers are faced with compromising their human dignity in exchange for their daily labour under increasingly volatile international economic conditions. Organizations have traditionally viewed labour as simply another resource to be managed and used in the pursuit and realization of economic gain (objective view) rather than from a more holistic point of view accounting for their humanity (subjective view). Through the theme of reconciliation, based on Catholic Social Teaching Principles found in Pope John Paul II encyclical *Laborem Exercens*, I will suggest that organizations can in fact introduce a spirituality into the workplace that would humanize the worker and his/her labour and still allow the organization to actively pursue and realize an economic gain based on a holistic approach to accounting, finance and profit. Through a twelve point 'Declaration', I outline a practical approach that would provide social and workplace activists, and those with an interest in labour and work related issues, opportunities for the introduction of Catholic Social Teaching Principles into the workplace, allowing for the return of dignity to the worker while creating a socially and economically viable workplace.

Table Of Contents:

Introduction: A Reconciliation	1
The Here and Now – Headlines	1
A Background to Laborem Exercens	3
Rerum Novarum - Pope Leo XIII	5
Rerum Novarum: A Foundational Analysis	6
Laborem Exercens: Paying it Forward	16
A Comparative Analysis	25
Breaking Down LE	28
Practical Approaches	32
Accounting And Finance For Dignity, Spirituality And CST	41
My Declarations	48
Conclusion	50
References	52

INTRODUCTION: A Reconciliation

The Here and Now - Headlines:

As I go about living and working through my daily life, in the background I pick up glances and nuances of human rancor, frustration, apathy, defeat, protestation, and violence, intermingled with a glimpse of hope. Each day the 'background noise' moves to a higher pitch, slowly increasing to what seems, at least to me, a coming crescendo of an *in-your-face*' reality. As society changes, is humanity being left behind? I will let these recent headlines speak for themselves (or perhaps they are speaking for me):

Jobs lost as Reebok transfers manufacturing from Quebec to Asia - Canadian HR Reporter, December 8, 2011

Economic hardship hits nearly all, from individuals to nations - Catholic News Service, December 9, 2011

Pope prays for refugees, stateless - AFP, December 4, 2011

Barclays CEO Pay 'Corrosive' for U.K. Economy, Study Says - Bloomberg.com, November 22, 2011

Europe's crisis putting Canadian households at risk, Bank of Canada warns - Toronto Star, Dec 8, 2011

Marystown plant workers vow to fight OCl closure - cbc.ca, December 7, 2011

Dow Gains for Second Straight Week - Wall Street Journal, December 9, 2011

Greece: Social Cuts to Impoverish Millions - Prensa latina, December 8, 2011

The Social Doctrine of the Church cannot be chained up - ZENIT.org News Agency, December 7, 2011

Boston Mayor Issues Deadline to Occupy Protesters - NY Times, Dec 8, 2011

Stock up on companies that relish a recession - Money Week, December 9, 2011

Pope slams selfish food speculators, urges curbs on world commodity markets - Reuters, July 1, 2011

Europeans fear debt deal could usher in a new age of crippling austerity - Washington Post, Dec 8, 2011

Treasury is forced to face the cost of euro failure - London Times, December 9, 2011

Archbishop says cuts are hitting the vulnerable the hardest - Catholic Herald.co.uk, Nov 23, 2011

National Bank posts higher profit, boosts dividend - National Post, December 8, 2011

The Real Sources of U.S. Inequality and Unemployment - Foreign Affairs November/December 2011

Cardinal: failure to address climate change is 'moral apartheid' - Catholic World News, December 5, 2011

Archbishop Dolan defines human dignity as 'primary doctrine' of church - Catholic News Service, December 7, 2011

I ask myself, what can I do? Following is an exploration of, and response to, my own question.

Through the theme of reconciliation, I will attempt to analyze Pope John Paul II's encyclical '*Laborem Exercens*' (LE) in relation to current global socio-economic realities. More specifically, I will attempt this reconciliation using John Paul II's focus on human labour and work as his foundational building blocks for the integration of Catholic Social Teaching (CST) into society through the workplace. John Paul II writes:

"In the midst of all these processes - those of the diagnosis of objective social reality and also those of the Church's teaching in the sphere of the complex and many-sided social question - *the question of human work* naturally appears many times. This issue is in a way, a *constant factor* both of social life and the Church's teaching...It is rather in order to highlight - perhaps more than has been done before - the fact that human work is a *key*, probably *the essential key*, to the whole social question, if we try to see that question really from the point of view of man's good. And if the solution - or rather the gradual solution - of the social question, which keeps coming up and becomes ever more complex, must be sought in the direction of 'making life more human', then the key, namely human work, acquires fundamental and decisive importance." (italics in the original - Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos. 3)

Why have I chosen to explore the encyclical through the theme of reconciliation rather than a straight forward comparative critical analysis of the encyclical text? I present the following reason:

As a practicing Catholic, the sacrament of reconciliation (confession) is intriguing to me because it accounts for human weakness yet gives hope of redemption. In this Catholic sacrament, one, through the mediating presence of a priest, presents their spiritual shortcomings to God in an attempt to reconcile one's life with the spiritual teaching of the faith based on the spirituality of God. In reality, an attempt to create a oneness of deep spiritual essence that one would take out of the confessional and try to live their daily lives by:

"The confession (or disclosure) of sins, even from a simply human point of view, frees us and facilitates our reconciliation with others. Through such an admission man looks squarely at the sins he is guilty of, takes responsibility for them, and thereby opens himself again to God and to the communion of the Church in order to make a new future possible." (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1995, nos.1455, pg. 405)

Thus one receives and gives in a simultaneous act within the community that one works and lives in. One takes this spirituality and shares it with those around him and builds on this spiritual foundation. Taken from the perspective of work, an organization or economic entity, in order to take accountability and responsibility for its actions must first *understand the 'nature of the consequences' of its actions and the resulting grievances*. It is only through an understanding of the *spirituality and dignity of work and labour* that an organization or an economic entity that employs labour or provides work, can reconcile itself through the Church with God and as a result do justice to humankind. My intent, through this paper is to create a living document. I will conclude it with an outline of a 'Declaration' that I believe, if actioned, will fulfill the Church's attempt at this reconciliation of capitalistic organizations to a spirituality based on CST and ultimately bring back dignity to the labourer and humanity into the workplace

"Indeed, the sacrament of Reconciliation with God brings about a true "spiritual resurrection," restoration of the dignity and blessing of the life of the children of God, of which the most precious is friendship with God." (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, nos.1468, pg. 410).

I believe that through reconciliation between the CST principles and the lived reality of the workplace, one may forge a foundational unit or element that is much stronger and durable than any individual economic or social order we are currently experiencing. By forging a unified base, a society is better equipped to build, grow, and expand as a cohesive and collaborative unit including the ability to make mistakes and recover given the proper mechanism to reconcile those mistakes or shortcomings - an opportunity for societal confession, penance and redemption within the communities we live, work and play in.

A BACKGROUND TO LABOREM EXERCENS:

Over the last two-thousand years or so of faith-based Christian spirituality the world was subjected to periods of glorious epochs where the Catholic Church played King-maker, made battle for faith, land and riches, developed, refined and grew her philosophical and spiritual foundations, inspired a global renaissance through the arts, and spread her influence, both spiritually, intellectually and materially, through the blood and sacrifices of her martyrs, saints and followers, across all the lands of the earth. During this period, the world was also subjected to a Church that reinforced its spirituality by sword and crusades, by clandestine political and financial influence, material possessions, and strategic alliances with those in power or to counter threats by those in power. Through it all, if one were to take a bird's eye view of this period, one would notice that all of this took place on the backs of labourers who were pushed and pulled figuratively and literally as pawns and foot soldiers for the Church and/or the wealthy landowners, who were at times viewed as part and parcel of the same family. Over the centuries, as the Church's influence waned, and she was placed under constant threat and attack by her enemies - physically, politically, financially and ideologically - she entered the tail end of the industrial revolution limping, weakened and with the realization that her foot soldiers, the labourers and her followers, were courting a new ideology, a new 'faith' not founded on spirituality but founded on alternative economic principles different than the ones espoused and administered by the Church and the wealthy land owners - Socialism and Marxism (Marx, 1848; Kennedy, 1988; Cantor, 1993; Bokenkotter, 2005; Judt, 2005).

If labour could not find justice and protection by the Church, those who employed them, or the wealthy merchants, industrialists and landowners (of which the Church was one), they would seek out help through a new energy espoused by a collectivist revolutionary fervor that was spreading its teachings, ideology, politics, might, influence, and social justice for labourers across the lands owned by the Church and the wealthy landowners and those who controlled the means of production (Marx, 1848; Cantor, 1993; Bokenkotter, 2005). This paper will look at the attempt by the Catholic Church to bring back her flock to her bosom using a spirituality based on CST that she fought so hard for over the centuries. Specifically, her attempt to reconcile the labourer back to the Church through a reconciliation of capitalistic organizations to

a spirituality based on CST. Through my concluding 'Declaration', that I believe does justice to LE if actioned, LE will fulfill the Church's attempt at this reconciliation of capitalistic organizations to a spirituality based on CST and ultimately bring back the labourers to the embrace and protection of her outstretched arms and humanity into the workplace.

Though we will focus on labour and human work, in essence this paper will explore labour and human work as a central focus through the lens of CST, in attempting to plant the seeds for actionable social change. Metaphorically and spiritually speaking, we will reconcile the interplay similar to that which takes place between 'Mother Nature' and natural destructive environmental disasters. For example, after a forest is devastated by fire or other natural disaster, 'Mother Nature', if left alone to do 'her job' on her own, away from self-interested human interference, will self-correct the devastated environment and restore it to a natural balance for all of the inhabitants of the preserve so that they may live together in natural harmony. The same can be said for spirituality of work and CST in the workplace. If organizations and society would be allowed to self-correct *through CST* within the working environment, without the interference of the political, ideological, and the self-interested economics of running an organization or a community, one would find that a *natural harmony* and balance amongst all the interested members of an organization or a community would evolve over time. Njoku (2008), reflecting on Pope John Paul II's writings on CST articulates this notion by challenging the Church to further build and push the boundaries of social justice in an effort to restore and bring back a natural harmony and balance - a metaphorical Garden of Eden - to society. Nojoku (2008) writes:

"The social tradition of the Church must accept both justice and charity as part of its heritage and incorporate them into its mission. The command to "give them something to eat" springs from the desire that "the other" may live a full human life. This realization may entail giving bread but may often require confronting the structures of social oppression. A vision of solidarity that is relevant in the face of contemporary challenges ought to involve both streams in a mutually supportive system - expressing the Christian commitment to neighbour love, not only through gifts and appeals to the powerful but also through questioning the structures of society and establishing such mediating institutions that give expression to the dignity of persons." (Njoku, 2008, pg. 542).

Nojoku is challenging the Church to go beyond the simple preaching and focusing on the fundamental teachings of the Church. He is asking the Church to challenge organizations, institutions and states, even those that the Church has had a close working relationship with, in order to bring back a natural harmony and balance to society. He is asking the Church to take back humanity from the grips of those who seek it for personal gain and allow humanity to self-correct through activist CST and through the spirituality of the Church so that the Church can restore dignity to humans and humanity back into the workplace.

Given this metaphor and in order to understand and conceptualize the completeness of Pope John Paul II message contained within the encyclical LE, we need to explore the background and history that led the Pope to write the encyclical.

LE was written and supposed to be released in May of 1981. Unfortunately, due to the assassination attempt on Pope John Paul II's life, and his long convalescence, the encyclical was not officially released

until September 1981 (Weigel, 1999). At the time, it capped a series of major encyclicals addressing CST written by his predecessors starting with Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891) followed by *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) Pope Pius XI; *Mater et Magistra* (1961) Pope John XXIII and *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971), Pope Paul VI. Taken as a whole these make up what is considered to be the current *foundational* writings on CST. (Curran, 1991).

All of these encyclicals elaborate, reflect and expand on Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (RM). In our discussion, we will explore RM as a foundational encyclical so that LE can be placed into perspective. Following this exploration of RN, we will focus mainly on Pope John Paul II's LE.

Rerum Novarum - Pope Leo XIII:

Rerum Novarum (RN) was issued on May 15, 1891 within the context of traditional CST in an attempt to address emerging tensions between labour, employers, the role of the state in managing that relationship and the potential of class conflict driven by socialistic/communistic ideological movements as a challenge to Western capitalistic economic systems and associated economic disparities. (Hauerwas, 1992; Zigarelli, 1993; Kelly, 1999; Baird. 2003, Bokenkotter, 2005).

Perhaps Zigarelli (1993) best captures the holistic vision of RN when he writes:

"The 1891 issuance of the highly celebrated encyclical *Rerum Novarum* ('Of New Things' - English Title: 'The Condition of Labour') is traditionally considered the advent of modern Catholic Social Teaching. Its author, Pope Leo XIII, responded to a European economic community saturated with impoverished workers, decadent owners, and moral deterioration by offering the Vatican's interpretation of scriptural mandates for pious behaviour. Through *Rerum Novarum* Pope Leo XIII sought to ameliorate the intolerable conditions of the employment nexus in a non-violent, non-revolutionary manner." (Zigarelli, 1993)

Though Zigarelli (1993) takes a holistic approach to the issuance of RN, other writers have taken a more cynical view of the reasons behind the issuance of RM, focusing on the self interest of the Church and its survival. Preston (1992) elaborates:

"RN as its title implies, was in many respects a new start in papal social teaching. Throughout the nineteenth century the Roman Catholic Church had been reacting against the French Revolution and its aftermath. It had seemed like a beleaguered fortress. Leo XIII was the first Pope not to have lived through those tumultuous years. Meanwhile old teaching continued, as on slavery and usury, but had no influence. A new kind of civilization based on industry was rapidly taking shape in western Europe, a new phenomenon in human history. A new vigorous wealth-creating class was growing which challenged the traditional, landed, hierarchical society with which the Church was allied. Status came from land, not money. Leo XIII was close to the conservative, aristocratic elements in society." (Preston, 1992, pg. 405)

This dichotomy between Zigarelli's observation and Preston's is significant in that it highlights the tension within the Church, the pressure from without and the political role it played within society. The question then becomes, which aspect of the inter-play between the social-economic-political-spiritual realms formed the most influential basis or foundation of RN and all subsequent CST on work and labour and what impact did

this trajectory have on CST relevancy to future generations of workers and employers? In essence, could there be a reconciliation between CST as it evolved through the last century and current neo-conservative approaches to the globalization of economic systems and its impact on the labour? (Anthony, 1977; Baum, 1982, Beed & Beed, 2005)

In an effort to explore this aspect of CST we need to take a closer look at RN focusing specifically on Leo XIII's commentary on work/labour, employers and the State, despite the fact of RN's wide scope and breadth as it relates to all aspects of society.

Our goal in exploring RN is not simply to gain an understanding of RN as it relates to work and labour in the current era, but to help us assess and to place LE into context within CST and how LE attempts to reconcile CST, as it relates to work and labour, with current economic realities.

Rerum Novarum: A Foundational Analysis:

For the purposes of this paper, I will focus on Pope Leo XIII's commentary on labour and work rather than on his political, economic commentary (unless they directly relate to his commentary on work and labour), We must also account for his ideological commentary which runs through in the forefront and background of the encyclical and played a definite role in how Pope Leo XIII saw the world and society and how it may have impacted the Church and its ability to inform society.

Pope Leo XIII had a number of motives for writing RN. In addition to the negative ramifications that a free market economy was having on labour, there were political and spiritual motivations as well.

At the time, due to the heavy handed manner in which employers, in particular those that owned the means of production, treated employees, many labourers were seeking refuge by participating in 'revolutionary' activity such as happened with the French Revolution. In essence, workers were seeking refuge in a socialistic/collectivist type of social/economic movement, where the means of production were owned outright by the State or a collective/community of labourers. (Marx, 1848; Baum, 1982). The fear that the Church had was that through a socialistic or collectivistic economic system, power would be centralized into the State or governing body representing the people thus usurping the influence of the Church (Spillanne, 2001; Fleckenstein, 2002; Kelly, 2010).

Though Pope Leo XIII may have been motivated by the potential loss of influence, it is by no means the sole motivation. There was still a deep spiritual context to his message. Pope Leo XIII explains in RN:

"God has not created us for the perishable and transitory things of earth, but for things heavenly and everlasting. He has given us this world as a place of exile, and not as our abiding place. As for riches and the other things which men call good and desirable, whether we have them in abundance, or are lacking in them - so far as eternal happiness is concerned - it makes no difference; the only important thing is to use them aright. Jesus Christ, when He redeemed us with plentiful redemption, took not

away the pains and sorrows which in such large proportion are woven in the web of our mortal life. He transformed them into motives of virtue and occasions of merit; and no man can hope for eternal reward unless he follow in the blood-stained footprints of his Saviour." (Pope Leo XIII, RN, nos. 21).

The two polar extremes that Pope Leo XIII was attempting to reconcile (spirituality based on faith and the social/political/economic realities he faced at the time) seemed to be *mutually exclusive*. How can one argue spirituality and 'Truth' in the same breath as one seeks to address politics, economics, and science? The common denominator in both instance was labour and work. Pope Leo XIII used labour as the 'mediating factor' to address the 'social question'. It was through labour, Pope Leo XIII argued, that 'man' found his dignity, his 'being' and his 'meaning'. This, he argued, was consistent with ancient biblical teaching and writing and in fact came directly from the utterances of God, which He put into action through the process of creation (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1995, nos, 2427- 2428).

Beed and Beed (2005) in their article, '*Applying Judeo-Christian Principles to Contemporary Economic Issues*' (2005), present a variety of cases and examples (using a number of different Christian economists) where spiritual writings are mediated with economic related issues through the concept of work from both a Catholic and a Protestant perspective. My purpose here is not to present a spiritual thesis on work but rather to point out that mediating spirituality and economic concepts through work is in fact a potential academic, intellectual and practical feasibility and consistent with Pope Leo XIII's arguments in RN. In fact, RN cannot be looked at simply as a spiritual document, but rather a document containing both spiritual and economic principles that are cohesive, collaborative and in many cases academically supported (Gruenberg, 1998).

Pope Leo XIII clearly outlines the mediating role of the labour through the Church when he writes:

"It is the Church that insists, on the authority of the Gospel, upon those teachings whereby the conflict can be brought to an end, or rendered, at least, far less bitter; the Church uses her efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by her precepts the life and conduct of each and all; the Church improves and betters the condition of the working man by means of numerous organizations; does her best to enlist the services of all classes in discussing and endeavouring to further in the most practical way, the interests of the working classes; and considers that for this purpose recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the intervention of law and State authority." (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 16).

Not only has Pope Leo XIII highlighted the mediating role of the work and labour, but he has done so in the context of societal realities - law and state - not simply the spiritual.

We do need to address one further principle in CST that distinguishes CST from Socialism and Marxism, and that is the issue of the right to possess property and thus the means of production.

Pope Leo XIII argues that man has the right to possess property by divine right, that God Himself granted man possession of the earth (Genesis 1:26 - 1:28, *Good News Edition Bible*, 1976). He makes a clear distinction between individual possession and communal possession. He argues that though the earth is to be possessed by 'man', the earth can be divided and possessed by individuals based on earthly remedies,

process and laws, but that as individuals the land is to be used for the *benefit of all*. (Pope Leo XIII nos. 8).

It is through the labour associated directly or indirectly with the possession of land that provides man with his dignity. Through labour on one's own land or through one who possess the land, man is exercising his divine right and putting into practice God's will. Though on the surface, this seems to be a spiritual approach to connect possession of land and the dignity of labour, it in fact holds a powerful political principle that allows Pope Leo XIII to distinguish between CST and Socialism/Marxism and assert the Church's right to oversee her charges and influence societal matters doing the work of God on earth. By supporting the right of man to possess property (and by default the tools of production and all that results from the tools and means of production), Pope Leo XIII is able to argue that Socialism and Marxism are inherently evil in defying the will of God since Socialism and Marxism support the principle that the tools and means of production are owned by the State or the community at large in commune. (Marx, 1848; Kelly, 1999)

Pope Leo XIII then narrows his focus as he works his way down to the individual person. He felt that the family unit, the most important of all associations and divinely inspired, had specific unalienable rights that were distinct from, and should not be subject to, State rights. Again, Pope Leo XIII was directly addressing the Socialist/Marxists' threats to the Church's influence on society and the community. Pope Leo XIII argued that since a child was derived from his parents, and his parents through time were created by God, then it is only reasonable to claim that the State has no right to force itself into the dealings of the family unit. The only case where Pope Leo XIII felt that the State could intervene was if the family unit was in dire straits with no other alternative to the State for assistance, then the State had a right and the *obligation* to intervene to protect the family unit, in fulfillment of God's will. The state was a last resort and subjugated to preserving God's will on earth. By keeping it a last resort, the family unit was assured of its independence even in times of need.

What has this to do with work and labour? Again, Leo XIII by making the family unit the centre of a community, he was able to lay out the ground work for the distinction between labour and capital since work was divinely inspired by God and the labourers require work to support their family, thus labour should be catering to the needs of the family and society in general rather than the needs of the organization. This argument was the central thesis of his encyclical. The family unit, divinely inspired becomes the wedge between production and labour. Furthermore, this wedge separates the distinctive rights of the Church, which were divinely inspired, from the rights of the State, which were an *earthly* concept. This line of thinking again supports the Church's argument that Socialism and Marxism, whose principles are based on the ownership of the tools and means of production and thus cannot appreciate the distinction between God and earth, are inherently wrong (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 14)

Having moved from the whole (society), and focused on the family unit (individual), Pope Leo XIII then focuses on the relations among the family units and their individual members. He focuses on the distinction

between classes in society, namely the rich and those in need. In making veiled references to Socialism and Marxism, Pope Leo XIII argues that class conflict between the rich and poor is not a natural order but in fact parts of the whole that need to work together for the betterment of society rather than against each other at the expense of society. He writes:

"Just as the symmetry of the human frame is the result of the suitable arrangement of the different parts of the body, so in a State is it ordained by nature that these two classes should dwell in harmony and agreement, so as to maintain the balance of the body politic. Each needs the other: Capital cannot do without labour, nor labour without capital. Mutual agreement results in the beauty of good order, while perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and savage barbarity. Now, in preventing such strife as this, and in uprooting it, the efficacy of Christian institutions is marvelous and manifold." (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos 19)

Following this argument, Pope Leo XIII then sets out a series of duties and obligations that workers have to their employers and employers have to their workers. The important point made in this collaborative relationship, again, is the distinction between the view of class conflict (labour versus employer) and that of labour and employers *working as part of the same whole*. This distinction, again was important for Pope Leo XIII to make since it differentiated the approach that the Church took to labour and capital in relation to the Socialist/Marxist view of labour and capital.

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical, slowly peels away at the outer layers of society to reveal the inner sanctum of God, faith, Church and divine duty. Unfortunately, the central weakness in his CST argument is the fact that its strength is also its weakness. If one is a follower of Catholicism or a Christian, all that Pope Leo XIII states is made relevant. The only question would be for that individual to follow the tenants of the faith or 'knowingly', defy them. This is a powerful tool in the Church's arsenal. Unfortunately, this does not hold true for those who *choose not to actively* participate in the faith due to non-belief or they are adherents of some other faith. This posed a greater influence in the time of Pope John Paul II due to the diverse natures of society than at the time of Pope Leo XIII when Europe and America were more cohesive between their daily lived lives and the Christian faith. (Kelly, 1999)

I believe that Pope Leo XIII understood this weakness and that if faith in God would reconcile labour and employers, and if one lacked faith, this house of cards would tumble, Thus I believe that Pope Leo XIII had to anchor his argument on something more earthly since faith would only cover those who actively believed and practiced the Christian faith. The issue of *right to ownership of property* is where I believe that Pope Leo XIII anchored his argument since now he was relying on logic and reason. It is through a skillful combination of faith, logic and reason that I believe Pope Leo XIII was able to transcend the spiritual reasoning and make it cohesive with earthly reasoning and feed into the human psyche. Though the argument for the possession of property is based on faith in God, the *exercise* of that right is based on logic and reason. Pope Leo XIII created a win-win for the faithful and non-faithful alike. Given the circumstances that workers were subjected to at the time, one can see the interest in his argument. Pope Leo XIII writes:

"To sum up, then, what has been said: Whoever has received from divine bounty a large share of temporal blessings, whether they be external and material, or gifts of the mind, has received *them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own*

nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the steward of God's providence, *for the benefit of others*. "He that hath talent," said St. Gregory the Great, "let him see that he hide it not; he that hath abundance, let him quicken himself to mercy and generosity; he that hath art and skill, let him do his best to share the use and the utility hereof with his neighbor." (italics added - Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 22)

This is consistent with Pope Leo XIII's argument that though one possess property individually, the use of that property must be for the common good. This is not to say that the ownership must be distributed, but that the benefits derived *from the ownership of property* must be shared. This places into question our current thinking within a Capitalistic economic system where one has both the ownership *and* derives the complete benefits and those benefits are subject to distribution only at the owner's will. Given Pope Leo XIII's argument, one can see why he felt that the distribution of the wealth must be based on faith in God, in particular Catholic teaching, since it provided guidance to this ownership issue. If he did not, then what would guide an individual owner to share the proceeds of his/her property? It would remain 'at will' and subject the community to wide ranging disparities which in turn would force them to look for alternatives of which Socialism and Marxism were several (in addition to other forms of revolution and dictatorships). Pope Leo XIII made this anchor in faith the common denominator of all people, thus, in faith, averting a class-struggle. In faith all are equal:

"From contemplation of this divine Model, it is more easy to understand that the true worth and nobility of man lie in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is, moreover, the common inheritance of men, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness....These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of the well-to-do, and to give heart to the unfortunate; to move the former to be generous and the latter to be moderate in their desires." (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 24)

One may question the validity of Pope Leo XIII's arguments since they are anchored in the Christian faith. It seems as if Pope Leo XIII may have anticipated this line of questioning because he then goes into a lengthy discussion based on logic and reasoning about the role the Church played in society in the last several millenniums. He argues that civilization (predominantly Europe and North America) were based on Christian values and as a direct result, these civilizations were successful (though his definition of successful may not be consistent with those that oppose the Church's teachings). So based on this successful track record why would one question faith? So rather than simply asking society to take a 'leap-of-faith' (which practicing Christians would normally do as a matter of faith), he is *providing two-thousand years of track record* for one to take into consideration and review.

For example, if I was a member of a faith that only allowed one to practice natural and healthy dietary habits, would it matter whether one followed these principles out of 'faith' or out of a healthy-conscience life style? The bottom line is that healthy natural food is part of a healthy life style regardless if it is being promoted as part of a faith-culture or not. Pope Leo XIII is arguing the same principle. Let alone the fact that the Church encourages its community to live, think and act a certain way. As long as the bottom line shows a benefit to society why not simply follow this dictate? I believe this to be a powerful argument since it addresses both sides of the coin - believers and non-believers alike. Pope Leo XIII in RN never made any

attempt to change one's religion. He simply explained how society can benefit if it practiced CST principles - he did not necessarily encourage one to subscribe to the faith.

Pope Leo XIII, having discussed arguments in favour of faith based CST rather than Socialism and Marxism, then moves on to the role of the State. It is important to keep in mind that the Church, through its history, has had a long running conflict with this principle of the role of Church versus the role of the State in societal matters. The Church has always felt that it stood above the State rather than be a subject of the State (Cantor, 1993; Bokenkotter, 2005, Hart, 2007)

Pope Leo XIII sees the role of the State as one of 'remedy and relief' rather than as an active player in the community. He felt that the State should be *responsive* rather than *directive* (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos 31). This is a very significant distinction since it goes to the heart of the matter of ideology. By wanting to limit the role of the State to 'remedy and relief', Pope Leo XIII is actually going 'head-to-head' with the Socialist and Marxist movements taking shape in the Western world at the time since Socialists and Marxist saw a much more 'direct and control' role for the State. On a much more subtle level, the Pope was also seeking to enhance or at least fortify the role of Church as shepherd of its flock without the interference of the State, and thus no competition for power. Pope Leo XIII writes:

"By the State, we here understand, not the particular form of government prevailing in this or that nation, but the State as rightly apprehended; that is to say any government comfortable in its institutions to right reason and natural law and to those dictates of the divine wisdom which we have expounded in the encyclical *On the Christian Constitution of the State*." (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 32)

He clearly lays out the view that the role of the State should be consistent with the teachings of the Catholic Church and embedded in the teachings from the scriptures. He felt that the State should step in when society or the community itself could not support or defend itself or the least fortunate among the people. Even in that role, he envisioned a role of support, as a safety net, to help the unfortunate to get back on their feet. As for the community, again, he felt that if the community could no longer support itself or had no other alternatives in providing for its citizens, that the State should step in to provide those services or support that the community cannot provide on its own. In all circumstances, the role of the State, consistently, is that of support and provider to *all classes, rich and poor*, (thus avoiding the thorny issue of class conflict) to ensure the community can live within a society based on CST principles rather than State controlled principles. This again assured the position that the Church stood supreme over the state and not vice-versa.

Pope Leo XIII felt that since the working person was the greatest contributor to the wealth of a society or community, the focus of the state should be to support the worker to the common benefit of the community and not the worker supporting the State for the benefit of the State. But Pope Leo XIII does not simply focus on the role of the State within society or a community, he also prescribed a role for the individuals in that community. He felt that as the State's role was to support the community, so too was it the role of the

individual to support the community, in particular those who worked for the common benefit of society.

Pope Leo XIII felt the central unit of organization was the family, that the families were the building blocks of society. Thus, the individual worker worked to ensure and maintain the structure and viability of the family. This, he felt, meant that the individuals, in particular - workers, were to live a life of virtue based in morality founded on the teachings of the Church. He extended this duty of morality to the public sector and not simply to the self interest of the family, thus ensuring all families were supported by the community. He then claimed it was a duty for all workers not to engage in activity that disrupted society or a community and thus place the viability of the family in peril.

The duty to support the family was not only the individual's responsibility through work, but also the State's responsibility to ensure the worker was provided for his familial needs. This holistic approach cocooned the 'family unit' thus ensuring its viability *at all times*. The important point in all of this discussion is, again, the fact that the issue of work is central to society because it is based on a divine duty as prescribed in the book of Genesis, that man is to subdue the earth (Genesis 1:26-1:28) Thus, work becomes a spiritual activity, bringing one closer to God. Since it brought one closer to God and it was a spiritual activity, work then had to be accorded the importance and dignity as one would for any divine proclamation stemming from the word of God.

Having laid out a holistic approach in support of the family through the spiritual aspects of work, Pope Leo XIII then addresses insidious factors working within the community. Here, Pope Leo XIII takes a direct aim at those who incite the community, workers and other individuals, in particular those disadvantaged within the social order, to revolt against the social order especially against those holding property or the means of production. In essence, to incite a class conflict. It is important to note and place this into perspective. If the family unit is the foundation of society, and through the spirituality of work one supports this foundation of family and as a result, the community, and if this whole structure is founded on the premise that it is divinely inspired or ordered, then, to revolt or incite revolution is nothing less than a declaration of war on God by those lacking in virtue, morality and spiritual direction. Pope Leo XIII felt that the role of the State was to intervene in such matters. This is an interesting point because the Pope is directly attacking any State that is formed on the basis of this violent revolution. In other words, how can a State, which is created on this violence be divinely inspired to support the family since in its creation, it destroyed the foundation that, in the Church's eyes, it was supposed to protect?

Why did the Pope take such a long arduous route in the encyclical before he formally addressed the more practical matters of work within a workplace environment? The Pope had to ensure that the *practical had to be embedded in the spiritual*. He had to anchor it in a belief system that lends itself to a practical application in earthly matters. To simply address the 'worker's issues' by dictate would provide no basis for the practical application of any declaration about the central role of labour or work in society and the relationship it held to the means of production and employers, two powerful sources of control and influence. By placing the full weight of the divine behind the Pope's practical view of work and the workplace, he was not simply

leveling out the playing field, he was now calling the plays.

Pope Leo XIII having established work as the spiritual centre of life, had to also address it from a practical aspect since the work was directed by employers or professional managers whose motivations may not be so spiritually inclined nor consistent with Church teaching. So based on the Spiritual foundation of work, Pope Leo XIII set out to proclaim how the Church viewed the practical application of CST in the workplace.

Leo had always maintained that rich and poor, privileged and not privileged, were in fact in the same family and that there should be no distinction, that it was *society's duty* to help those less fortunate. This teaching was based on long standing biblical teachings, for example, the Sermon on the Mount (Mathew 5,6,7, *The New King James Bible*). Pope Leo XIII did distinguish between those that helped their fellow man and those that used their fellow man based on personal greed. In particular, he admonished those who used workers for the simple purpose of exploiting them for personal gain. He laid out a series of requests such as proper rest time and reasonable work hours. He also addressed women and children and their specific needs. Regarding the issue of women, this has to be taken in contexts and reflects the times (late 1800's). But one cannot simply dismiss this as a reflection of the times, though this does need to be considered. The important point is how, through spirituality and practicality, one may be able to address the spiritual needs of society. At the time, women had specific societal roles to play and the Church, rightly or wrongly, had specific views on women. Despite this view, the Church felt that women played an important and central role in the family. By 'protecting' women's rights (as the Church saw them in relation to the role they played in families), Pope Leo XIII was in fact protecting the family, which the Church felt was the foundation of society and divinely inspired. (Kelly, 1999)

In further developing his practical arguments, and in support of the Church's view of associations of employees, the Pope decreed that an employer cannot opt out of an agreement between a worker and an employer that was made in good faith or take advantage of a worker's circumstances to coerce him into an agreement that is detrimental to his overall wellbeing, since the rights and duties of workers were divinely inspired and in fact represents a covenant (Spiritual agreement) with God. This reflected the eternalness of the relationship between God and man. A man or an employer could not break this bond with God

Pope Leo XIII also addresses the issue of wages. Though he recognizes that wages can be freely negotiated between an employer and the worker, nonetheless, he reminds us that wages must be a living wage since the purpose of the wage is for a man's sustenance of his family, again, which is divinely inspired. It is not meant for an employer who has the upper hand to exploit his laborers, since by doing so, his profits would be equal to 'blood-money' since he directly contributes to the destruction of the family, the foundation of society and thus goes against the will of God. But the onus is not simply on the employer. Since man and work are divinely inspired, and wages are a means of sustenance for man and family, the worker must also be prudent and watchful with his wages so that he too does not run afoul with God. The two, worker and employer, become one in divinely inspired spiritual synthesis via a covenant of faith. This relationship goes back to Pope Leo XIII's contention that there should be no class conflict but a mutually

rewarding relationship between employers and workers. (Zigarelli, 1993)

Pope Leo XIII did not stop at fair wages. As we have seen, he encouraged workers to be prudent. He encouraged this in order that a worker need not stay in the same place economically but may, through his financial, economic, and spiritual prudence move up the social ladder, further securing the current and future necessities for his family (and perhaps the viability of the Church) and thus fulfilling his obligation to be fruitful, multiply and subdue the earth.

Besides wages, the only other way a worker could move up was to become an owner of property himself. I believe that the Pope himself saw that in reality this would be a tough struggle with the powerful and exploitative employers and the limited ability of workers to work their way up the social ladder. Here, he fell back on his principle of the right to ownership of property or the means of production for workers. He then admonished the State not to use excessive taxes to fill their coffers and further subjugate the community of workers and thus control their livelihoods. With the cooperation of the employers and State, the Pope felt that workers can in fact have the opportunity to become owners in the means of production as well. It was hoped, by the Church, that the simple fact that this was seen as an opportunity would be enough for workers to shy away from class conflict and remain within the cradling arms of the Church rather than the revolutionary 'arms' of the Socialists and Communists (at least in the eyes of the Church)

He finally galvanized all the workers' issues and claimed that an association of workers is right and just to protect their interest. The Pope, though, just like he did with the employers, admonished the workers who formed or joined associations to be just and fair in their dealings with the employers as well and not be selfish or greedy in dealings through the association. Fundamentally, he felt that a collaboration between employers and an association of workers would benefit the community since the needs of the worker would be satisfied and thus provide support for the family. At a much deeper level, Pope Leo XIII was hoping to bridge the gulf that existed between the haves and have-nots thus limiting or eliminating the need or the opportunity for class conflict or revolution. In effect, this was a direct strike at the Socialists and Marxists who may have been seeking to exploit class conflicts for their own ideological/political/economic needs. (Gruenberg, 1998; Fleckenstein, 2002; Baird, 2003)

Again, with an eye on the Socialists and Marxist and one on the State, perhaps wanting to hold on to control and power on society, Pope Leo XIII further extends the argument that the right of association should also be extended to religious groups and that it is the *obligation* of the State to ensure that these associations are protected from external threats, namely the Socialists and Marxists. Again, it can be seen that using the wedge of associations and the role of the State, Pope Leo XIII further drives it deeper between the State and those seeking to keep separate, workers and employers, rich and poor, and create class conflict and revolution. Pope Leo XIII writes:

"We find therein grounds for most cheering hope in the future, provided always that the associations we have described continue to grow and spread, and are well and wisely administered. The State should watch over these societies of citizens banded together in accordance with their rights, but it should not thrust itself into their peculiar concerns and their organization, for things

move and live by the spirit inspiring them, and may be killed by the rough grasp of a hand from without." (Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos. 55)

As a reinforcement of this principle (and an opportunity to take advantage of the protection of the state), the Pope also encouraged the workers to form associations that allowed them free practice of their Christian faith. Again, this afforded the Church a further channel of support and influence over society

Pope Leo XIII, having laid the macro view of how society should be structured between workers, employers and the State, he then addresses the micro view, on how individual Christian communities should relate to each other. One can readily see throughout the encyclical Pope Leo XIII tightening his hold on those that compete against the Church for power and influence. Pope Leo XIII envisioned that the offices held by those in the community should be for the sole benefit of that community not the municipal office holder himself. Similar to his views on the role of the State, he thought that the office holders had to ensure that there was harmony, peace and balance in the community and should that balance be disturbed, it was their role to help place it back into balance, respecting rights of employers and workers alike, but should not interfere in the normal relations of the community unless it was required.

Having come complete circle in a holistic approach to work, the Holy Father concludes his encyclical by directly speaking to those who were living in physical and spiritual turmoil and societal hardship. His concern here was to address those who were at the crossroads of their religious faith and the daily demands of the drudgery of life, complicated by the punishing ill treatment of their employers driven in an ever greedy pursuit of money for personal gain at the expense of the worker. Pope Leo XIII understood this and wanted to talk directly to them rather than simply *write about them*. His emphatic exhortations calls them back from joining in revolutionary causes and class warfare:

"They cannot but perceive that their grasping employers too often treat them with great inhumanity and hardly care for them outside the profit their labour brings; and if they belong to any union, it is probably one in which there exists, instead of charity and love, that intestine strife which ever accompanies poverty when unresigned and unsustained by religion. Broken in spirit and worn down in body, how many of them would gladly free themselves from galling bondage! But human respect, or the dread of starvation, makes them tremble to take the step."(Pope Leo XIII, 1891, nos 61)

To these individuals he encouraged them to join or return to Catholic associations that are rooted in Catholic teachings, practices and principles rather than other secular associations or groups steeped in revolutionary aspirations and inciting class warfare. He reminded them that through their Catholic association they would find a community that would nourish them both spiritually and physically. He concludes by ensuring them that the whole weight of the Catholic Church was behind them. (Pope Leo XIII, 1891. nos. 62 - 63)

I have taken such an arduous and convoluted journey in addressing RN because LE is founded on the principles of RN and Pope Leo XIII's thinking and arguments. LE does not directly reflect back to RN to make direct connections but does so in the *spirit that it was written*. As we explore LE, we will find that this analysis and understanding of RN will help us navigate through Pope John Paul II's LE encyclical written a

full 90 years later. As we explore Pope John Paul II's LE, we must keep in mind that as Pope Leo XIII wrote to address the current threats facing the Church and its communities back in 1891, Pope John Paul II wrote LE looking *forward to the future*. Seeing the writing on the wall over the last 90 years, Pope John Paul II reflecting on the past and the current, writes *for the future generations of humankind*.

Labourem Exercise: Paying it Forward

On the surface, one cannot help notice the stark contrast between RN and LE. The contrast is driven by the different time frames they encompass - written in different centuries - and the circumstance surrounding those particular timeframes. As we have seen, RN was written in the context of worker uprisings and revolts, popular support of Socialism and Marxism, and the onslaught and associated consequences of an industrial revolution well on its way to ushering in the modern era of capitalism. LE was written in an era when Socialism and Marxism in the Western world was under attack from all side, as was evident during the Cold War and symbolically ended with the destruction of the Berlin wall. Where RN was addressing employers, business moguls and State bureaucrats operating less complex organizations and social structures, LE was addressing globalization and the resulting consequences of globalization (environmental destruction, erosion of wages and living standards. work/life/family balance, the destruction of the family unit and complex social structures), multinational corporations, advanced technology, the sexual revolution, human rights challenges and the declining role of the Church (Baum, 1982; Schultze, 2002, Bokenkotter, 2004; Guitian, 2009)

How do two encyclicals written under differing circumstances and contexts relate to each other? Through the divinity and spirituality or work as seen from the Church's eyes.

Pope John Paul II, in a few simple sentences is able to transcend a century of CST, place it into perspective and position the concept of work in preparation for the twenty-first century. He writes in his introduction:

"Because fresh *questions* and *problems* are always arising, there are always fresh hopes, but also fresh fears and threats, connected with this basic dimension of human existence: man's life is built up every day from work, from work it derives its specific dignity, but at the same time work contains the unceasing measure of human toil and suffering, and also of the harm and injustice which penetrate deeply into social life within individual nations and on the international level." (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos 1 - italics in the original).

It is important to note, that LE did not reflect on RN directly, but rather built on and integrated itself into RN, using RN as an anchor, keeping in line with CST traditions based on the teaching of Jesus as quoted in Mathew 5:17:

"Do not think that I have come to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I have not come to destroy but to fulfill." (New King James Bible, 1980)

This is important for several reasons. Firstly, it emphasis the fact that CST has been growing, developing

and adapting over the last century grounded in biblical teaching based on the book of Genesis. Secondly, though there is an adaption, the fundamental basis of the spirituality of work, the divinity of the concept work, has not changed. It simply encompasses a more diversified version of life reflecting current societal perspectives. Pope John Paul II specifically addresses this relationship with RN and CST:

"The present reflections on work are not intended to follow a different line, but rather to be in organic connection with the whole tradition of this teaching and activity. At the same time, however, I am making them, according to the indication in the Gospel, in order to bring out *from the heritage of the Gospel "what is new and what is old"*. Certainly, *work is part of "what is old"* - as old as man and his life on earth. Nevertheless, the general situation of man in the modern world, studied and analyzed in its various aspects of geography, culture and civilization, calls for the discovery of *new meanings of human work*. (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos. 2 - italics in original)

One of course can take it a step deeper and view it from a political stand point. The Church is stating that it stands united and unified in one belief system through time, and changes within that time frame despite the current challenges to the foundation of the Church (Cantor, 1993; Bokenkotter, 2004). Deeper still, the message is that the Church has stood by workers and will continue to do so because *that is the will of God*.

Pope John Paul II, also shifts the focus of the argument as it relates to work from the class-struggle argument of the Marxists and Socialists to a much more global focus - encompassing a geo-socio-political reality. Though he claims to address the class issue by globalizing the issue of work, in essence, by globalizing the issue he has in fact weakened a central thesis of the Socialists and Marxists position. He has steered the argument to one of inequality and injustice *between nations* as opposed to injustice or inequality *between classes* of people. The argument now takes on a political and ideological persona that encompasses a much more diversified and complex consideration than the simple class struggle between the rich and poor, the owners of capital and the non-owners of capital. (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos 2; Ginsberg, 1987)

Pope John Paul II emphasized that through the centuries since the book of Genesis, work has been analyzed and discussed by every generation, each reflecting on its own time, but the spiritual foundation of work has remained intact since God's declaration to Adam and Eve, in the Garden of Eden, to subdue the earth. In essence, by regressing the concept of work to the beginning of days, according to the Catholic teaching, establishes the Catholic view of work as a "Truth" within the faith. Establishing it as a Truth thus gives it a permanence. Who or what can argue against this Truth particularly when it is spoken by God Himself? So the focus becomes an adaption of work reflecting current and future times as opposed to questioning the divinity of work itself. Pope John Paul II summarizes this argument early in the encyclical:

"It is rather in order to highlight - perhaps more than has been done before - the fact that human work is a *key*, probably *the essential key*, to the whole social question, if we try to see that question really from the point of view of man's good. And if the solution - or rather the gradual solution - of the social question, which keeps coming up and becomes ever more complex, must be sought in the direction of "making life more human, then the key, namely human work, acquires fundamental and decisive importance." (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos.3 - italics in the original)

Through this statement, Pope John Paul accomplishes several things. Firstly, by speaking of 'work' as a

singular concept, he reinforces the permanency, including its spiritual dimensions, as a non-changing entity within CST. How can the Pope speak of 'work' if work has a changing context throughout the ages? Secondly, by establishing work as an essential key to the social question, more specifically, 'making life more human', he sets the foundation for moving the concept of work away from a strictly productive dimension within a commercial context, to a much more philosophical and holistic consideration. This in turn accomplishes two things. It makes work the determinant of life rather than materialism, and by moving work away from a strict economic consideration, it dismisses any arrangement or consideration from a Socialist or Marxist perspective, whose emphasis is on the economic considerations or principles of work rather than a philosophical/spiritual realm. This significantly skews the analysis of work to an intangible consideration (from a practical matter) rather than a tangible one, making it difficult to argue from a strict economic or materialistic perspective (Hopfl, 2007). For example, in looking at shade or a shadow, one cannot actually touch shade, it is simply created, yet the impact is felt immediately, more importantly, the shade is created via an interaction of a light source and an obstruction. The true essence of shade then is the interaction of a light source and an obstruction, not shade itself. One can never win a boxing match with a shadow.

It is interesting to note that Pope John Paul II takes a deconstructive approach to CST and work. He acknowledges that by making work the central focus of the 'Social Question', this may have certain impacts on society and communities. His position is that *technical* ramifications are not for the Church to consider. The Church's role is to state its 'Truth' regardless of the consequences. It raises questions to deconstruct thinking about accepted views of work. How society reconciles CST with societal/economic/cultural systems is up to society. In an address to Argentinean entrepreneurs, in 1987, Pope John Paul II reflected this sentiment:

"I insist that I am aware of the existence of these problems, which are often objectively most serious. However, permit me to remind you that the great concern, the great business affair that you must conduct in your life, is to conquer heaven, eternal life. The Lord says to you: "What gain is it for a man to have won the whole world and to have lost or ruined his very self?" This has to be made at least when the one who speaks to you is a Bishop, a Pope, a Pastor, one who is responsible for a higher economy, the divine economy." (Pope John Paul II as quoted in Kennedy, 1994, pg. 35-36)

As long as the result is that human work is treated as a spiritual and divine activity, the Church has no obligation to the consequences that may result. I believe that the Pope knew exactly what the results of this approach would be. He felt that if work was given the spiritual berth it demanded, it 'naturally', would result in addressing the 'Social Question'. This would be the *inevitable consequence*. Viewed from a secular society, this may be a negative consequence, viewed from a CST viewpoint, this is a positive consequence. Pope John Paul II was simply asking society to '*deal with it*', allow it to take its natural course. This may be akin to a doctor prescribing one medication that may taste bitter and perhaps upset the tummy, but eventually, it will cure your illness. This point is highlighted in an interesting observation made by Anthony (1977) when he writes:

"The oddity is only superficial because the notion of alienation is a very useful formulation of what managers identify as one of the most important problems which confronts them in work, the obstacle to the realization of their own objective which is

presented by their subordinates' withdrawal of co-operation. One of the most appealing paradoxes to emerge from an area particularly full of contradiction is that alienation is not simply a concept which is useful for managers, it is, in essence, a managerial conception. The essential paradox of alienation is that it emerges with any meaning only as the result of an over-emphasis on a work ethic and work-based values. Man can be regarded as alienated from his work only when he has been subjected to an ideology of work which requires him to be devoted to it." (Anthony, 1977, pg. 304)

Anthony argues that alienation in this case is only viewed from the perspective of the one defining it - the employer or his/her representative. In this case, an employee not meeting or wanting to meet employer expectations or obligations is 'alienated'. What of the employee perspective? Who will define that perspective? On one hand, the Capitalistic system demands that everything is based on economic terms, yet, when it comes to its own needs, it expects an emotional, spiritual commitment to its goals, objectives and financial obligations via work and the worker. How can it claim to want an 'emotional investment' by a worker if a Capitalistic organization does not recognize such spiritual realities and commitments from a social stand point? According to Capitalistic principles, the workers commitment should only be for a financial reward for services provided. Perhaps, as Pope John Paul II (and Anthony) argues, that this ideological perspective on work needs to be revisited, implying a fundamental flaw in its approach to workers and its own thinking rather than CST or the worker's perspective on work.

Though Pope John Paul relies on the creation story of humans from the Book of Genesis (1:26 - 1:28), he explains that work is a transitive activity (John Paul II, 1981, nos. 4), initiated by a human and involves directing his energy towards the non-human. In essence, Pope John Paul II, is showing that it is humans, through work, that shape their societies, it is not work that should shape humans for its materialistic and economic wants. Pope John Paul II relies on history to claim that work, in its historical context, has always been about man creating his own environment. He claims that this is a historical reality and a constant. Using work to 'shape man' is not a historical reality, but an abomination of it (John Paul II, 1981, nos. 4)

Pope John Paul II addresses the issue of transitive work via the concept of technology. He openly acknowledges that technology is in fact a 'double-edged' sword. On one hand, technology has elevated society to unimaginable heights and standards. This does not change the fundamental role of man and work since subduing technology is still the role of man. On the other hand, he also recognizes that technology may be a cause of suffering among man since through technology man runs the potential of being secondary to technology, from his own choosing, which is contrary to CST and the spirituality of work.

Though Pope John Paul II does not provide a solution, rather, he acknowledges the challenge to the spiritual divinity of man, he nonetheless still claims that this needs to be resolved by all parties associated with human work while still maintaining that work is a divine activity. This is still a work in progress and a complex problem to resolve. The obvious solution is to eliminate machinery since it diminishes the divinity of human work but this will simply fly in the face of mans divinity since it was through mans work that machinery was invented in the first place, and, additionally to support him in his efforts to subdue the earth. Implicitly, it is also man's weakness for materialism and greed that allowed man to subdue himself to

machinery. One, through this discussion of machinery, can readily see the distinction between work for man versus man made for work. It is only through an understanding of CST that one is able to fully synthesize Pope John Paul II's view of human work. Pope John Paul II clearly delineates between the objective and subjective view of work. He acknowledges that both exist within the single realm of work but that the significant view is the subjective view since this view states that man 'self-actualizes' through work and finds meaning in life through work. Work does not define man, but man is defined *through* the process of work itself, in the subjective sense. (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos 6)

If work from a CST perspective was viewed in the subjective sense, then, Pope John Paul II argued that any reference to work from an economic or materialistic perspective had to be confronted. Though Pope John Paul II argued this from a philosophical/spiritual sense, it is evident that his targets, I believe, were Socialists, Marxists and secular Capitalists (as opposed to practicing Christian Capitalist as defined by CST). Pope John Paul II makes his feelings known regarding which economic system he prefers. For example, we have reviewed a number references in LE/RN where Popes Leo XIII and John Paul II directly attack Socialism and Marxism. In LE he also attacks Capitalism, but not as a whole. He specifically attacks the fact that Capitalism reverses the order of subjective and objective view of work. Specifically, he claims that Capitalism focuses on work as a productive means to profit rather than work as a means to create meaning in life. Despite this, he uses the term 'Error of Capitalism' in reference to the objective view it takes on work. This clearly implies that Capitalism is the preferred economic system for CST to be practiced but that it simply needs to address this 'error'. He does not outright dismiss Capitalism wholesale, as he does with Socialism and Marxism.

Though Pope John Paul II acknowledges this error, he is realistic and acknowledges that despite the constancy of the subjective view of work, it's objective status is always changing due to the external factors that influence the objective view. Thus from an objective perspective, 'work' comes and goes in many forms. It was in response to the objective influences on the dignity of human work, that workers sought to form associations in order to protect themselves, more specifically, their subjective nature, from the objectifying nature of a corrupt and/or unfair economic structures. This association of workers was supported by Pope Leo XIII and by subsequent Popes (including Pope John Paul II) over the last century. Pope John Paul II comments on this aspect of solidarity:

" The call to solidarity and common action addressed to the workers - especially to those engaged in narrowly specialized, monotonous and depersonalized work in industrial plants, when the machine tends to dominate man - was important and eloquent from the point of view of social ethics. It was the reaction *against the degradation of man as the subject of work*, and against the unheard - of accompanying exploitation in the field of wages, working conditions and social security for the worker. This reaction unified the working world in a community marked by great solidarity." (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos. 8 -italics in the original)

One weakness in the argument for the divinity of work is the fact that its divinity is based on the book of Genesis from the Christian Bible. The Church obviously looks at the Bible as the spoken truth of God (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1995). Unfortunately, in a secular world, not everyone believes in a

universal truth. Though this can be perceived as a weakness, I will also argue that it in fact, can be a foundational strength of the argument for the divinity of work. Simply, solidarity or an association of workers, if it is truly based on the subjectivity of work and man, that subjectivity is derived biblically or at the very least spiritually. Then, directly or indirectly, that solidarity is based on a form of a biblically or spiritually based truth. How else can one define the divinity of work or man? One can say man should be placed above work, but if I were to ask that individual why, how would he or she respond? On what basis is man placed above work? Pope John Paul II has provided society with *one explanation*. Whether one argues the point from a Christian perspective or any other religious or belief system, the bottom line is that if one argues that man is superior or above work, then there must be a spiritually based explanation or foundation for this view of which CST is simply one.

Taking it a step further, how can an economic system conceptualized by humans compare with a "Truth" justified by a divine being, God. Ultimately, this comes to a complete circle since the economic system is to benefit the *wants* of man at the expense of his subjective needs (in many circumstances). Man can never be placed above a divinity (God in the case of Christian faiths). Of course, all of this argument hinges on the fact that one is in one form or another spiritual in a secular or non-secular sense. If one is an atheist with no spiritual beliefs of any sort, then the whole argument falls flat on its face. Nonetheless, Pope John Paul persists and does not bow down to any form of atheistic or secular view of work that is not spiritually based. He insists, in LE, that unless one understands the relationship between work and personal dignity, one can never understand the divinity of work (Wiseman, 1998; Mizzoni, 2004). Thus he places the onus on those holding non-spiritually based views of work to try to understand the *error of their ways*. Unless one attempts to understand CST as it relates to work, how can one defend his/her secular, non-spiritually based view of work? This at the very least allows those with a competing view of CST, to perhaps see the world from a different point of view - a complex deconstructive process to breakdown the opposition to CST and attempt to bring back the 'lost sheep' into the fold of the Roman Catholic Church and CST. Perhaps Pope John Paul II's postmodern approach to spirituality?

Having thus established an argument for the subjectivity of work. Pope John Paul II now hones in to the central or main thesis of his encyclical, the conflict between Labour and Capital. In order to understand this conflict, one must first understand the subjectivity of work since it is the subjectivity of work that uniquely separates and drives a wedge between the dignity of human work, and man used as a part of a productive process in the manufacture of goods and services. Pope John Paul II takes great effort to distinguish and place the conflict into its proper context, that it is a spiritual conflict. He argues:

"This conflict, interpreted by some as a socioeconomic class conflict, found expression in the ideological conflict between liberalism, understood as the ideology of capitalism, and Marxism, understood as the ideology of scientific socialism and communalism, which professes to act as the spokesman for the working class and the worldwide proletariat. Thus the real conflict between labour and capital was transformed into a systematic class struggle conducted not only by ideological means but also and chiefly by political means." (Pope John Paul II, 11981, nos. 11- italics in the original)

Simply put, what Pope John Paul II was attempting to do with his encyclical in reference to the spirituality

and dignity of work and encouraging non-spiritual secularists to at least try to understand this tenant of CST, the Marxists and Socialists had already been doing for well over a century, but their focus was based on economic theory rather than the spiritual. Furthermore, by focusing on the opposing views as ideologically and politically based, simply meant that they were self-serving, thus exploitative rather than worldly holistic and unifying like CST. He summarizes the argument and places a questioning spirit of self-serving motive in the minds and hearts of those most affected or influenced by the Socialist and Marxist movements:

"This is the goal of the struggle carried on by political as well as ideological means. In accordance with the principle of 'the dictatorship of the proletariat', the groups that as political parties follow the guidance of Marxist ideology aim by the use of various kinds of influence, including revolutionary pressure, to win *a monopoly of power in each society*, in order to introduce the collectivist system into it by eliminating private ownership of the means of production. According to the principle ideologist and leaders of this broad international movement, the purpose of this programme of action is to achieve the social revolution and to introduce socialism and, finally, the communist system throughout the world." (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos. 11- italics in the original)

Pope John Paul II is insinuating that the true interests of Marxists are self-serving for an elite group of individuals who seek *dictatorial* power, not the subjective interests of the individual workers. Thus the workers have a choice of two-evils, *exploitative capitalism* or *dictatorial communism*, with no prospect of ownership of production, *unless* they form associations within CST and with the support of the Church, in which they may influence their own workplaces from a subjective perspective and address their fundamental and spiritual needs as human beings. Again, the Pope is guiding those workers who support a socialist agenda to question the true nature of the movement - he is asking them to deconstruct their long held assumptions.

Pope John Paul II, builds on this argument by arguing that in fact, capital and labour are not distinctive adversaries, but in fact capital and labour work hand in hand. This distinction is important because once again, the Pope whittles away at the Marxist assumptions of the separation and opposition of capital and labour. He argues that since capital and the means of production were developed by workers in the subjective sense, then the means of production and capital should be used for the dignity of human labour and not the exploitation of it. This would be consistent with the biblical teaching that man was to subdue the earth, and the means of production were simply an additional tool to allow for that. In essence, by supporting an economic system that separated labour and capital, it would be contrary to the biblical teaching and make human work less dignified, exploited and lacking in spiritual validity. The Truth would be found in subduing capital and the means of production for the subjective enhancement of human labour in the spiritual sense and not the political, ideological and economic sense. This would call for a cohesive approach rather than a divisive approach to the management of the means of production. Anthony (1977) makes an interesting observation regarding labour and morality. Just as Pope John Paul II anchored his argument for the divinity of work in biblical teaching, industrialists, Anthony argues, sought to elevate laissez-faire to an acceptable level a moral principle as well, to counter such positions. Anthony commenting on the neo-liberal approach to economics writes:

"The resolution of this contradiction was bold; it required self-interest to be seen as a moral principle. Almost every other moral system has emphasized concern for others; Victorian business ideology was distinguished in its promotion of self-regard to a moral duty. Adam Smith begins by recording, often scornfully, that men behave selfishly. We end with the conclusion that men *should* behave selfishly. We have already observed that Smith bore little responsibility for this conversion except to the extent that, as he had defended self-interest on economic grounds, he had contributed to the destruction of an ethical or religious position from which it could be attacked." (Anthony, 1977, pg. 67 - italics in original)

In reality, the economic theories that support Capitalism and Marxism were not based or founded in the historical founding of man (in the biblical sense) but were a human response to the industrialization of the society, thus these economic systems have no basis in 'Truth' (in the biblical sense) such as the divinity of human work has. Thus, production and the means of production become 'materials' for the use of human work in the process of subduing the earth. Again, Pope John Paul II justifies the primacy of man over the means of production and the resulting economic systems that industrialization gave birth to. The only way to accomplish this, to reverse this order, is through CST (Porth & McCall, 2001; Elshtain, 2002; Marens, 2005).

As part of this collaboration between labour and capital, and in an effort to further distance CST from a collectivist economic system, Pope John Paul II suggests that workers should hold some say or decision making capacity in the production process through the ownership of the tools and methods of production or at the very least an involvement in those decisions directly and indirectly affecting the labour pool. Let us be clear about this. He was not simply suggesting superficial, ideological or political roles steeped in a sense of egalitarian principles. He was again basing his argument on the principle of the divinity of work. That man should, despite any role he plays within an organization or the work floor, still maintain as his goal the subduing of the earth. That would entail him to have the opportunity of ownership of the means of production or at the very least a say on how the tools and means of production were to be applied in the workplace. In an address to workers at a chemical factory in Solvay, Italy (March 19, 1982) Pope John Paul II makes this point absolutely clear, that his vision of co-ownership is not limited:

"The implementation of the proposals put forward in the Catholic field in order to ensure that the worker be considered a co-owner of the great workbench is a basic element of that proof to which I have already referred; not only that man of work find full satisfaction in his aspiration to just remuneration, but above all that justice be safeguarded *in all the structures of the economic process.*" (Kennedy, 1994, pg. 184 - italics not in original)

Man would have the primacy over work and have the opportunity to control his own destiny and not the other way around. The labour should produce goods and services in the service of humankind and the spiritual fulfillment or self-actualization of humankind. This is key since if man is afforded the *right* to ownership and decision making, then he is afforded the right to make decisions affecting the wellbeing of man including his human rights (based on CST), conditions of work, work/life balance and all other related workplace issues and concerns that one would normally ascribe to, in a subservient nature, to the administration by employers or those who manage organizations on behalf of employers or the owners of capital. No longer would decisions be made for the primary purpose of economic concerns, rather they

would be made in keeping with the divinity of human work, the dignity of the laborer and consistency with CST.

Pope John Paul II does not simply stop at worker ownership of the means of production or a role in decision making, he argues for a holistic approach encompassing all of parts of society that have a role in influencing the worker. All that we discussed to this point involves the direct employer or his representatives. Pope John Paul II argues that in fact, any person or institution that has even an indirect effect on the worker should respect the dignity of the worker and interact with that worker from a subjective perspective and not simply as a tool or a cog within a work process having an economic gain as its main focus. This is a very important point for two reasons. The first being that even an indirect relationship with a worker can weaken any gains a worker makes, from a subjective sense, from his direct employer. What good does it do if I build a roof over your house and a band of individuals come by and burn it down. If an indirect employer interacts and is obligated to interact with a worker as a direct employer would (in the subjective sense) this would ensure that there would be no erosion on any gains the employee may make in his role as worker. The second reason the Pope's argument is important is that as a direct employer I may have met my obligation to my worker, but the worker is still suffering via the indirect employer. In the previous roof building example, I have simply stated that the employer by building a roof has met their obligation as a direct employer. This is only superficial. In order for the direct employer to meet *his full obligation* to the worker, the employer must ensure that the indirect employer interact with the worker from a subjective perspective. If the direct employer fails in this secondary role, they have not met their obligation in treating their worker in the subjective sense, and are in violation of that workers human rights from the biblical or CST perspective.

In keeping with the holistic theme, Pope John Paul II argues that if work is to be considered a divine activity that is spiritual in nature, then the lack of work should be considered a grave injustice since it limits the ability for a worker to fulfill their subjective nature. There would be a disconnect between themselves and their spiritual journey. In order for the worker to limit his exposure to the risk on unemployment, Pope John Paul II asks that both the direct and indirect employers, in particular indirect employers that have access to or can/may influence global, national or local employment opportunities, to take extra care to ensure that they introduce measures that enhance the opportunity for the continued employment of workers or limit the risk of unemployment. This coordination does not simply stop at policy making, it should also address the issues of living or family wages (direct or through social agencies) and benefits so that a worker may support and meet his/her obligations to their family without having his/her partner work as a matter of need, so that the stay-at-home partner can support and take care of daily needs of the family, in particular the children.

The indirect employers should not only focus on the economic ramifications of decisions, but should also take into consideration cultural issues affecting the worker as well. It is only when both the direct and indirect employers work and coordinate their efforts that the worker is assured, within reason, that he and

his family will be taken care of. Ultimately families, from the perspective of CST, are the foundation of societies. In essence the coordination of efforts of direct and indirect employers assures that the foundation of society will be strong, ensuring that that particular society will be perpetuated into eternity or the end of times.

A Comparative Analysis

Having reviewed both *Rerum Novarum* and *Laborem Exercens*, only allows us a glimpse of CST through the eyes of Pope Leo XIII, Pope John Paul II and my interpretation and internalization of their encyclicals. In order to truly assess their messages, we need to bring in critical writings that both challenge and support the positions both Popes take on CST, in particular as it relates to work and labor. The focus here will be two-fold. To review the critical writings as they relate to the encyclicals and to critique the arguments presented by the critical writings

As we proceed through this analysis, we need to keep in mind several questions. Were the encyclicals religious/philosophical/spiritual writings or were they political/ideological writings? In essence, whose interest did these encyclicals serve? Furthermore, given the nature of the encyclicals, can there ever be a practical application of CST in our secular workplaces?

I will be focusing on the major themes of spirituality, economic/political ideology, association, ownership, human rights and employee work/life balance. I have chosen to focus on these themes to remain consistent with the major themes found within both encyclicals.

As I reviewed and studied LE, one particular thought kept coming to mind: Can the Church truly separate the secularly led technological changes in industry, that have significant ramifications for workplaces and the role of the Church, from CST? Specifically, can the Church, as Pope John Paul II alludes to, ask the world of commerce and industry, to follow CST and let industry solve the consequences of that direction? Preston (1983), had similar concerns. He writes comparing LE and *Octogesima Anno* (Pope Paul VI. 1971):

"In *Laborem Exercens* John Paul II in referring to the social changes taking place says, 'It is not for the Church to analyse scientifically the consequences that these changes may have on human society', but it is for her 'to help guide the above-mentioned changes as to ensure authentic progress by man and society'. *Octogesima Anno* reflects exactly the kind of inter-confessional, inter-disciplinary group work which is needed in social ethics, and is more adequate than *Laborem Exercens*. John Paul II's statement makes too sharp a break between science' and Church teaching; in group work they react reciprocally upon one another." (Preston, 1983, pg. 23)

Preston obviously feels that some sort of cohesive approach would give the Church a greater opportunity to allow its teaching to adapt to or reflect current thinking and trends in society rather than create a distinct 'us and them' scenario. Preston seems to take issue with the fact that LE was anchored in biblical teaching, specifically, he questions the fact that Pope John Paul II relies so heavily on the creation story found in the Book of Genesis (King James Bible, 1:26 - 1:28). This line of thinking is consistent with Curran (1991), who

argues that Pope John Paul II in his teaching (not simply in LE), tends to take a top-down approach to CST and feels that the Pope relies heavily on natural law (Curran, 1991). Curren argues that perhaps the approach should be a bottom up approach (which he refers to as Christology), where the emphasis is on Christ, as he lived and how he addressed and interacted with the 'sins' of the world, using Christ as an example of how society should relate *within*. He felt this was more realistic and reflects a soteriological philosophy founded in a theology of salvation, much like liberation theology focuses on Christ and his relations with those oppressed and their oppressors (Curran 1991).

Where Preston (1983) and Curran (1991) take a much more integrative position on LE, Schultze (2002) is able to address the natural law approach used by Pope John Paul II based on biblical teaching and still offer an integrative position on CST. Preston (1983) and Curran's (1991) positions would entail an individual that would like to live and work according to CST, as described in LE, to abandon references to natural law and biblical teachings and anchor their belief systems in a much more postmodern teaching reflecting and adapting to current realities that may not be consistent with the teachings of the Church. Schultze, takes a two step approach. He first acknowledges that there does exist a world outside of strict rationalism. Second he acknowledges that toil and suffering are part of the work process and lead to a deeper understanding of goodness in life as outlined in biblical teaching (Book of Genesis). Addressing rationalism through the writings of Charles Taylor, (1989), *Sources of The Self, The Making of Modern Identity*, Shultze writes:

Taylor, however, sees some movement out of the confines of a self that is solely disengaged and trapped by instrumental rationality - the iron cage of rationality; He finds it in epiphanic art. Epiphanic art combines the aesthetic of the artwork and the person of the artist - that is, who she is and her place. Through the epiphanic art the human person is aware of the spiritual whole, which implies a moral source. The individual who experiences this art is able to engage a framework outside of the self-determined, disengaged self because she "sees and shows' the world as being good. There is therefore, a constitutive good." (Schultze, 2002, pg. 36).

Having acknowledged that perhaps there is a higher order in play, Schultze addresses the issue of toil and suffering in work as a creative force for the self, providing meaning to life itself. Schultz, building on his argument of epiphanic art writes:

" Taylor suggests that this transformation in the epiphanic expression could be thought of as a grace and offers Dostoyevsky as one author who has written about this creative imagination and power that is part of the self. This view of the self then allows what is ordinary in life to be extraordinary, a transfiguration occurs, and life has meaning...I argue that in our understanding of work, we need to acknowledge the presence of toil, personal sacrifice, and perhaps grief, in any work life, not to make self-sacrificing behaviour the end, but to acknowledge it as part of the constitutive good."(Shultze, 2002, pg. 37)

This would be consistent with Pope John Paul II's view that it is through work that man finds meaning. Furthermore, as Schultze, quoting Taylor, alludes to, sacrifice through work simply for the sake of sacrifice is a selfish act and not anchored in any spiritual basis. It is when work complies with God's command to subdue the earth, and despite hardships one proceeds in subjugating the earth that one is acting within the will of God and thus finds meaning in life.

I can understand Preston's and Curran's frustrations with LE given its tendency to rely on the spiritual rather than the rational, but trying to argue that Pope John Paul II should have taken a much more rational approach to labour and work would have simply meant that Pope John Paul II would have to deny his foundational truth that is based on bible teaching. In order for the LE, as a CST source document, to be relevant to CST, Pope John Paul II had no choice *but to* base or anchor it in biblical teaching. If he did not, he would not be in a position to counter the arguments of the Socialists, Marxists and Capitalists, which he vehemently challenged in his encyclical as did Pope Leo XIII. He needed to create a *distinct alternative* to these economic systems, *not an adaption*.

Gaburro and Cressotti (1998), take a slightly different approach than Preston, Curran and Shultze. While still supporting the notion of the subjective nature of the worker, they struggle with the 'transedental' nature of work (Gaburro and Cressotti, 1998). In essence, they feel that one could live their spirituality through work, showing society the ethical nature of life lived *through* work, and that man truly finds spirituality through societal relationships. It is through one's relations within the community in which one lives, works and plays in, from a holistic perspective, that gives meaning to life *not work itself*, though work would be influenced by this ethical nature and one's approach to it (Gaburro and Cressotti, 1998). Gaburro and Cressotti argue:

"Yet to find spirituality in man's work we need not look for transcendental things. We need to examine above all people's way of life and relationships with each other in society as a whole. As a person, man can devote himself to other people, the only beings who have his same nature. The man who refuses to transcend himself or to live out the experience of being part of the human community ends by alienating himself because by so doing he adopts a materialistic way of life." (Gaburro and Cressotti, 1998, pg. 1621).

Though Gaburro and Cressotti (1998) acknowledge the subjectivity of work, they shy away from its divinity based on biblical teaching and instead focus on a more practical, though ethical approach via societal relations. This begs the questions, "From where are the ethics that one is to address society derived from and how can one look at work from the subjective if that work is not divine?"

Though they do not provide a response to these questions they do question the divinity of work from a rational perspective. They argue that at one time, work may have been a process where one could have garnered meaning in life given a much more simplistic society not founded on industrial principles of Taylorism and modern capitalism. For example, they argue how can one find meaning in the daily drudgery of mind numbing repetitive work? If the drudgery of work itself is mind numbing, and one looks for an escape or an avoidance of work, how can one argue that it is divine and spiritual in itself? I can see the merits of this argument and the weakness in Pope John Paul II argument *only in the context of rationalism*. If one were to look at Gaburro and Cressotti's argument from the perspective of Shultze and Taylor above, one could also argue that the mind numbing work can in fact, as in the epiphanic art (Shultze, 2002), transcend into the spiritual and provide a meaning for life.

My purpose in highlighting these philosophical arguments prior to addressing the more practical aspects of

LE is that the practical aspects of LE are argued, by different writers, based on how close their philosophical realm falls within the LE sphere of spirituality as defined by Pope John Paul II in his encyclical. An understanding of some of those positions, will place the practical aspects of LE, as viewed by other critical writers, into perspective.

Breaking Down LE

One of the more significant impacts of LE (and RN) was its endorsement of associations of employees and, more specifically, the formation of unions. Perhaps Pope John Paul II's strong stance against Socialism and Marxism may have caught some people off guard in that he would be endorsing an associative structure that was more aligned to a Socialist economic structure rather than a Capitalistic one. Pope John Paul II's call for associations of workers was in direct response to the degradation of the worker when viewed strictly from the objective rather than the subjective sense. As a result of this objective view of work, workers over the last century were treated inhumanely in many aspects of their employment role including work/life balance. It was the biblical teaching of Jesus Christ to help the poor and those less fortunate that was the driving force in proclaiming worker associations. Again, the foundation of this view was founded in spirituality rather than economic necessity. This is an important distinction since the alternative would be to view worker associations from the perspective of 'proletarianization', which would entail a class structure and a division in society. The driver behind Pope John Paul II's declaration in the encyclical was that through worker associations based on CST the worker was better able to find meaning in life through his work in the subjective sense by being in a better (stronger) position to associate with and relate to employers who simply wanted to use workers in the strictest objective sense with complete disregard to their earthly and spiritual wellbeing. (Pope John Paul II, 1981, nos. 8)

Baird (2003), makes an interesting observation on how far the unions in America have drifted from the original vision of the early union's view of unionism, which seemed to be more consistent with the CST and RN than is prevalent in current times. Baird argues that under current US legislation, unionism is compulsory for all if the majority vote it in so it is not as voluntary as CST would suggest. Baird feels that by not keeping with CST views on worker associations, the workers are forced to support unions that form alliances or associations with organizations not in keeping with CST and further perpetuate class conflict, political, ideological, economic game playing and bias, rather than supporting workers in the subjective sense. One simply needs to look at the current political associations of Canadian and American political parties with the various unions and worker associations whose goals are self-servicing in the political sense. Baird cites Samuel Gompers as an example. He writes:

"Samuel Gompers (1850 - 1924), who founded the original AFL in 1886 and who is revered by unionists, would have no part of compulsory union affiliation....Samuel Gompers was not a Catholic, and he was a self-proclaimed democratic socialist; but, in my judgment, he had a clearer grasp of the moral issues involved in compulsory unionism than some who claim to speak authoritatively on CST. He would not tolerate the notion of any kind of obligation to support unions. It is sad to note that Gompers successors in the union movement paid no attention to his admonition to eschew compulsion. Eleven short years after his

farewell speech they all endorsed the extremely coercive NLRA." (Baird, 2003, pg. 2-3)

Gompers, truly reflected the essence of Pope Leo XIII vision of worker association in the last speech he made as president of the AFL at their 1924 convention (as cited in Baird, 2003) - he states in part:

"I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty - the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible...I want to say to you, men and women of the American labour movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labour's structure has been builded (sic) - but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes - human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense." (Gompers, 1924 as cited in Baird, 2003, pg. 2)

Though not a Catholic, Gompers fundamentally understood the ethical dilemma in forcing workers to join unions or associations they do not wish to be part of. By forcing workers to join associations, one can argue that this is a form of coercion by the state, no different than that of the unethical employer. Thus, the worker has lost his subjectivity since, by forcing him to associate, he is being viewed simply from an objective viewpoint, for the financial funds and political clout an organization can carry into the workplace negotiations rather than in a humanely dignified way.

Baird (2003), clearly states that he supports and agrees with the CST when it comes to unions and associations of employees. Citing current/recent examples of how worker associations have moved away from CST at the peril of workers and their subjectivity, Baird writes:

"Leo doesn't think workers have a moral obligation to join or support unions whose actions are either unchristian or contrary to the public interest. The whole idea behind such arrangements as closed shops, union shops, agency shops and forced dues is to shut out workers who do not affiliate with unions from employment, and the unions couldn't care less about whether those they have shut out starve inasmuch as it is well documented that many contemporary American unions - e.g. the Teamsters, the United Mine Workers, the Laborers International, and the International Longshore Workers - frequently turn to violence to get what they want, there is no moral obligation to support them." (Baird, 2003, pg. 7)

Gruenberg (1998) takes a much more global view of worker associations and unions in her interpretation of LE. For example, she argues that the early CST of Pope Leo XIII regarding the freedom of worker association was a delicate balance for him due to the fact that not all countries had the same standards when it came to union movements. This would result in a labour movement that favored some and not others if standards were not equal. She also argues that Pope John Paul II recognized this weakness and vulnerability and encouraged nations (in his subsequent encyclical, *'Centesimus Annus'*, 1991), to not make labour a scapegoat and not pit labour union against labour union. Traditionally, the Church's strong stance against Socialism resulted in nations and employers taking a strong stance against unions. She felt that the Church must move away from this stance in order that nations and employers accept unions across borders as a matter of business.

The interesting point she makes is that by allowing unions free access worldwide (under equal standards), this would limit the ability of international employers from taking business to the lowest bidder nation. Though on the surface this would make a reasonable argument, Gruenberg does not account for the limited

role of the state in national economic activity. In order for the standardization of labour policy across the world to take place, at least within trading blocks, would require a great deal of state intervention directly and indirectly via international economic, financial social and cultural organizations. This would be in direct conflict with the CST of LE. She places the Church in a dilemma. Does the Church tradeoff potential gains for the labour movement in many if not most of the developing nations worldwide at the cost of moving a significant distance to a more socialistic world view, or does the Church stay true to her CST and at the potential expense of worker gains in developing nations? It boils down to a classic battle/trade-off of the subjective view of the worker versus the objective view in many of the developing nations as a result of capital invested from the western economic powers and organizations. This scenario obviously will have to play itself out over the coming decades and generations.

I found Abbott (2008) particularly interesting for several reasons. Firstly, while focusing on unions and associations of workers he takes them to task for the very same reasons as a number of other writers (including Pope John Paul II and Pope Leo XIII) for focusing on the material rather than the subjective view of work. Specifically, he challenges unions in Australia to reframe, as part of their negotiation strategy or issues management, their position to a more moral and ethical stance rather than the 'material or instrumental' (Abbott, 2008). Abbott argues that by framing their positions from an ethical or moral basis, it will not only move the base to act and support the positions taken since the positions are deeply moving to the spirit and emotions, it would also, I believe, force their counterparts to argue out their positions from a similar perspective rather than simply focus on the bottom line. This would allow an additional consideration to enter into the dynamic of labor-management relations and perhaps a common language of mutual; dignity and respect of work and workers may evolve over time. At the very least, it *creates the opportunity* for this to happen. The second point Abbott makes, that I believe reflects a struggle within the Church, is that the Church perhaps needs to move away from the Neo-liberal camp and perhaps move a little further left. It seems that Abbott has picked up the sensitivity the Church has to Socialist/Marxist ideals and has no choice but by default, due to its weakened state to no longer strongly influence government and industry, that in Industrialized countries it *needs to stay to the right 'field'*. Abbott points out an observation that probably reflects the Church's challenges not only in Australia, but worldwide:

"For much of the past 30 years these internal disputes have seen the Church withdraw into itself, with the disintegration of the former basis of Catholic unity seeing Australian Catholicism exhausted of its former social and political dynamic. The Church has consequently sought to avoid political involvement and public controversy - the latter unsuccessfully in the wake of numerous child abuse scandals (McGillion, 2003: 1-36). The circulation of Catholic newspapers has plummeted and the mass media has either ignored or trivialized Catholic opinion on social and political matters." (Abbott, 2008, pg. 168)

The key here is that he is not stating that the Church should move wholesale and give up its influence over Catholics, but to simply introduce these socialist ideals into its repertoire since it is consistent, fundamentally if not in spirit, with CST and its ideals. What Abbott leaves unspoken, I believe, is that in order for the Church to truly protect and support the dignity of the workers it needs to challenge *directly*, the neo-liberal organization's approach to labour relations and workplace issues in general rather than in a

more *apprehensive* approach. Though I would agree with Abbott in reference to RE, where in fact Pope Leo XIII had very little 'wiggle room' at the time when it came to challenging industrialists given the fact that labour organizations were extremely weak or non-existent, I do believe that Pope John Paul II did take neo-liberal organizations to task for not showing more dignity for human work in the workplace.

Abbott, in this case is consistent with both Pope Leo XIII and Pope John Paul II by suggesting that there should really be no separation between the employers and workers. In fact, by admonishing workers to be less materialistic he is simply asking them to do no more than what he expects from employers. To work together for the common good of the worker and for political or ideological self-interest (Carroll & Burke, 2010). He addresses the sensitive issue of ethics and morals from a CST perspective in relation to the challenges that a worker movement may have to its diverse workforce:

"Catholic social doctrine is an ideal; a uniquely Catholic ideal as it pertains to the moral and ethical treatment of workers. The labour movement need not adopt its spiritual language and underpinnings, indeed it could not, but it can certainly learn from its rationales as to why unions are deemed important for securing economic justice for workers, and why the rich and powerful have a moral and ethical responsibility to secure the interests of those less advantaged than themselves." (Abbott, 2008, pg. 171)

Abbott does not stand alone in his view on how unions should be approaching employers. Abbott finds support from Naughton and Laczniak (1993) in their review of CST via the tradition of encyclicals. Their focus was a justification for the ethical and moral provisions of work. They took a perspective on work that encompassed both subjective and objective foundations. They argue that the subjective and objective are intermingling simultaneously. This is a significant statement since what they are saying is that to take one perspective over the other, one would have a limited understanding of work and addressing any practical issues surrounding work would be biased, disoriented or tainted. The four factors they looked at were:

(a) *formation* - how work effects the person; (b) *remuneration* from work; (c) the *process* of the workplace; and (d) the *product* which is produced." (Naughton and Laczniak, 1993, pg. 982 - italics in the original)

Unions and employers simply focusing on the objective, or where one party focuses on the subjective while the other on the objective are simply building a bridge on different planes - the two halves will never line up. The final result is a rickety weak bridge yet all parties are *forced to rely on it*. Naughton and Laczniak summarize:

"Work, then, is an activity that causes changes in the subject and the object. Whether these changes are positive or negative will depend to a great extent on how the work is organized, the workers themselves, and the object that is produced. Because work has a personal effect on the subject and a social effect on society, it is a peculiarly human activity...Any comprehensive vision of work then presupposes a vision of the person and consequently an ethic for the workplace. CST provides such a vision and a set of ethics." (Naughton and Laczniak, 1993, pg. 982)

Though their position is consistent with the position Abbott (2009) is suggesting, it is not consistent with Pope Leo XIII and Pope John Paul II. In the case of the Popes, the subjective *always* stands above the objective view, while Abbott (2009), and Naughton and Laczniak are suggesting a much more integrative approach. I believe that their position weakens the hand the worker holds because there is no discernable

way to measure out what is the appropriate balance between the subjective and the objective. In the case of the Pope's, the balance is simple, the subjective trumps the objective. Let us not be fooled by this simplicity. It is in fact a complex interplay. If one were to draw out both positions one would find that Abbott (2009) would subject the worker to an uneven playing field and they would have to rely on the good faith of the employer, whose management mix changes with passing time. At the end of the day, the employer is still holding the ace since the employer still holds the resources, and as a result, the power and influence that comes with them. As long as the balance is in the employers favour, they will play along. In the case of the Pope's position, the worker is clearly viewed in the subjective. The role of the objective *is to service the subjective*, the power resources are being used for the good of the workers and the community they live, work and play in. The workers are not subjugated, hat in hand, trusting on the goodwill of their employer. Rather, the subjective, in a proactive fashion, dictates the *nature* of the objective. This is a significant deviation from Abbott (2009), and Naughton and Laczniak (1993) and clearly places the worker in a position of dignity. Were Abbott (2009) and Naughton and Laczniak (1993) simply making the best of a bad situation - a realistic view of a workplace dominated by neo-liberal interests? Perhaps a bird in the hand is truly worth two-in-the-bush. I believe that they were simply taking an incremental approach in the hopes that employers may 'catch-on and buy-in'. Perhaps I am more cynical and I am counting on human weakness to dictate the outcome of that incremental relationship.

Having looked at a number of writings on both sides of the argument, we can focus on practical approaches to introducing CST into the workplace.

PRACTICAL APPROACHES

A good example of a practical approach to CST was a study conducted by James and Spillane (2001) of the hospitality industry from the perspective of CST. Specifically they focused on 'spirituality of work' as seen through the eyes of job satisfaction. They chose to focus on an industry that involved a human interactive dynamic at multifaceted-levels, in particular, workers, employers and guests, creating a complex yet holistic experience for every encounter. This dynamic was further complicated by the fact that the interactions, simply through the nature of the positions and the services provided, required a cohesive cocktail of technical knowledge, emotion, and behavior which is further complicated by individual philosophic, ideological and spiritual approaches to life. One can argue that this may hold true for all human interactions. I am simply stating that the hospitality/service industry simply *amplifies* this 'nature' and as a result one can see the dynamic at work much easier since the *ramifications are so obvious* - excellent/poor service, customer comments/complaints and opportunities for numerous repeated human interactions. I have personally worked in the hospitality/service industry for numerous years as a labourer and as a manager and I believe I have a fundamental understanding of this dynamic. James and Spillane (2001) summarize this dynamic in the following way

"Work in the service sector is quite different from that in agricultural or manufacturing. A service has been described as a 'deed,

act, or performance'[1:24]. Two functional issues are at whom (or what) is the act directed, and is this act tangible or intangible in nature?" (James & Spillane, 2001 pg. 17)

James and Spillane (2001) reflecting on RE and LE connect faith, work and wealth creation by reiterating the basic fundamental teaching in both encyclicals: that humans spend the vast majority of their time at work in some form (thus implying a connection between life and work and ultimately its dignity if it is a major part of one's life) and that through the creation of wealth or providing services, humans are able to satisfy their needs and wants and support themselves and families through the lifecycle (again, in the holistic sense).

With this in mind, James and Spillane outline four aspects that Christians find difficult to reconcile in their work lives. In short, the post modern emphasis on science/rationality at the expense of God and religion; the harsh realities of work in a neo-liberal global economic/industrial environment; the discounting by Christians of active living versus contemplative living; the unfair denigration of the wealth process versus realistic expectations of personal/private wealth, (James Spillane, 2001). Why is this important? According to Panmunin as cited by James and Spillane (2001) (reflecting on the Thai hospitality worker experience):

"Panmunin concluded that to improve public perceptions and enhance employees experiences, industry must create a working climate that is challenging, secure, trusting, caring and promising. Unfortunately, employees' eroding working conditions have eroded the traditional Thai spirit of hospitality. Ensuring the return of Thai hospitality will take some doing in areas like nurturing pride in serving, wearing a service uniform, providing the opportunity for learning and advancement, and demonstrating employer appreciation both in words and pay." (James & Spillane, 2001, pg. 18)

Panmunin is not only consistent with the teaching in RE and LE, but is also advocating the primacy of the subjectivity of work versus the objective view. He also, by addressing workplace reality, sets some expectation that workers must inherently meet in collaboration with their employer at a much more fundamental spiritual level (pride in serving and wearing a service uniform). This latter point is important because what Panmunin is alluding to is that the worker must focus on the dignity of work via the subjective rather than the rational and superficial (materialism or ego). Though this point is valid, the challenge is that under normal circumstances, employers and unions are simply responding to the environment created by employers that most likely is not consistent with CST. Despite this challenge, James and Spillane (2001) propose a 'workable' definition of spirituality that has practical applications in the work place:

"The features of a workable definition of spirituality should (1) limit the material to what is expressed, and (2) contain the idea of personal growth. Thus, spirituality is the expression of a dialectical personal growth from the inauthentic to the authentic....According to Thompson, a person's spirituality is individual *and collective*, and reflects how a person responds to God's initiative while facing the challenges of everyday life within his her specific historical and cultural environment." (James & Spillane, 2001, pg. 19 - italics in the original)

Of course this presupposes one following the Christian if not the Catholic faith, but the point James and Spillane make is that the emphasis on spirituality of the Catholic Church and a broadened view of spirituality since Vatican II, has inspired a new interest and movement in spirituality and related experiences in general, encompassing a variety of other faiths that reflect common themes when it comes

to spirituality though not necessarily based on the same belief system.

James and Spillane, in their study rightly come to the crux of the issue of CST in the workplace. They argue that in the pre-industrial age where work fell along the lines of craft work and agricultural related work, one worked in an environment where there was a connection between the work one did and the ultimate purpose, consistent with much of biblical teaching dating back to the book of Genesis. Unfortunately, how does one reconcile the same principles of work, when one works on an assembly line performing the same mind-numbing task repeated over the length of a long day?

James and Spillane, citing Velasquez's work highlight two specific determinants of job satisfaction and 5 influencers (James & Spillane, 2001 pg. 21 - italics in original):

1. *Experienced Meaningfulness* - the individual must perceive his or her work as worthwhile or important by some system of values he or she accepts.

2. *Knowledge of Results* - The worker must be able to determine, on some regular basis, whether or not the customers of his or her work are satisfied.

Influencers:

1. Skill variety

2. Task Identity

3. Task Significance

4. Autonomy

5. Feedback

These determinants and influences would be consistent with CST since they support the subjective view of work. The challenge is in creating a work environment that would include much of the above. Having worked as an HR Manager for over 20 years and much of them in the hospitality or service industry, I can assure you, that the tools *do exist*. Each aspect mentioned above *can be put into practice*, in fact they are already in practice in many workplaces. The unfortunate thing is that they all address the *objective view of work* and *not the subjective*. Here is the fundamental problem. It is akin to a sword. I can use it for an attack or for defense and the preservation of life. It is still the same sword. I do believe that what James and Spillane propose would in fact enhance the dignity of work and the spirituality of the worker and still not negatively affect the bottom line (we will address this point further down). These tools simply require a *shift in focus* by the employers and their managers.

The problem is that most of our business/management schools do not teach the subjective, but rather the objective nature of work. The spirituality is not addressed in any fashion. A student would have to deviate on their own and take specific courses that address this. I speak from personal experience. I currently sit on several committees at the local Community College where, as a representative of the

community, I assist the College by reviewing its curriculum and course offering in its business programs, among other things. It was not until I was exposed to Athabasca University Master of Arts - Integrated Studies program that I was exposed to anything resembling a subjective view of work. All of my business and administrative studying/training in the past focused basically on how to *maximize profit*. The worker was, as RE and LE clearly point out, reduces to a cog in the system. Furthermore, in my Organizational Behaviour studies (and related courses), the focus on behaviour and employee development was with an emphasis on how to best meet the needs of the organization and *not the employee's*. Superficially, we were taught to keep the employee *satisfied* so that he/she will perform and not complain. It is akin to keeping an addict drugged up so that they do not know the difference and live, as a famous line in a song by Pink Floyd states, 'comfortably numb'. devoid of any spirituality.

James and Spillane conclude that:

"...hospitality work needs to be seen simultaneously in all its dimensions: economic, human, professional, moral, cultural and spiritual. Because of the interpersonal nature of their work, hospitality workers *need to* consider the guests they serve. In other words, hospitality is a single phenomenon that simultaneously involves three components - employers, employees and guests - in different and interacting ways." (James & Spillane, 2001, pg. 23 - italics in original)

Though James and Spillane's conclusions are generally consistent with RE and LE, they seem to focus on the guest experience as a determinate of the worker satisfaction. In essence, the better the employee serves the guest, the better the guest experience, the greater the worker satisfaction in his/her work and, in keeping with CST, their life. Unfortunately, they seem to have lost sight of the fact that the focus should always remain the worker if one is to truly follow CST. Through this focus, the employee will find dignity in his/her labour and thus ensure the objective needs are serviced and addressed through their subjectivity. James and Spillane have emphasized the dignity of work in reverse. If the objective is met (the need of the guest and ultimately the need of the employer) they feel the subjective will be addressed as well since the guest is satisfied and this will provide meaning to the work the employee performs or the service he/she provides. This, I believe, is a fundamental flaw in their argument. Nonetheless, they do outline a clear set of determinants and influences, that if addressed appropriately from the *subjective perspective*, I believe would provide a series of foundational steps in creating dignity in the workplace.

Where James and Spillane attempted to address the subjectivity of work through worker satisfaction, using the hospitality industry as their 'workbench', Klay and Lunn (2003), looked at LE through the eyes of just remuneration focusing on Pope John Paul II's argument that just remuneration is a key problem of social ethics. Klay and Lunn view just remuneration not simply as a base pay, but as a broader definition of remuneration including all earnings and benefits the worker may earn in his/her lifetime. They take the position that just wages do not include a minimum living wage for the poorest of workers. In fact, they argue that wages should be set by supply and demand (similar to how prices are set in the markets). They argue that though the intentions of RE and LE were noble, the reality of compensating workers according to need rather than the market demands would in fact result in workers suffering and creating obstacles for the poorest or create hardships for others. For example, if workers were paid according to family status,

employers would simply hire the low cost single employees thus causing suffering and hardship for those workers supporting families (Klay & Lunn, 2003).

I have personally experienced this from the context of the broader definition of remuneration. A number of years ago, I found myself out of work during a prolonged economic downturn. I was the sole supporter of my family (a spouse and one very young daughter). An opportunity became available in Russia. An American company was opening up a large hospitality complex on behalf of a Russian organization and was specifically recruiting in North America due to our much more sophisticated approach to hospitality, business and commerce. I was preparing to apply, but the contact said that the Russian organization would not accept family oriented individuals and specifically wanted single workers due to the fact that the health insurance coverage for families would be extremely expensive. The decision was based on the cost of my remuneration, based on my family status, rather than my skills, knowledge and abilities as a worker.

Klay and Lunn, take an economic view of the whole remuneration argument and as far as the laws of economic supply and demand go, they make absolute sense. By setting higher minimum wages (remuneration) to meet the concept of the living wage (a wage that one could reasonably support him/herself and if applicable their dependants) would positively affect those who are better educated, experienced and healthy. If an employer is going to pay two individual the same remuneration, the employer will choose the one who will provide the greatest opportunity for productivity, efficiency and financial gain. Thus, a living wage would adversely affect those most likely in greater need due to unfortunate circumstances in life. This would create a downward spiral for these workers since the less work they get, the less opportunities for self-development and experience they have, thus limiting even more their opportunity to find gainful employment. Taken a step further, this may create a class structure in a society, which is what the Church has consistently argued against. Klay and Lunn's findings in their study support this downward spiral (Klay and Lunn, 2003).

A significant finding they made is that the long term prospects of young workers are enhanced by entering the market place and finding a 'first job' (Klay and Lunn, 2003). By finding a first job, the worker gains experience and is able to develop his/her skills. They argue that:

"Without the acquisition of human capital provided by additional schooling, the individual needs work experience to acquire human capital and to command higher earnings in the future. For low-skilled workers that is, young relatively poorly educated workers, obtaining job experience is crucial." (Klay and Lunn, 2003, pg. 188)

If employers are required to pay higher minimum wages, they simply will not hire these unskilled or low-skilled labourers, which will severely impact their ability to gain the valuable 'first job' and thus work experience. They supported their finding by citing studies from several economists (Welch, 1974; Klay and Lunn, 2003, citing Topel & Ward, 1992) that supported this exact point. From this economic and human capital perspective, their argument is reasonable and thus it pokes a 'hole' in LE's assertion that a living wage is good for the wellbeing of workers. Furthermore, Klay and Lunn suggest that to regulate remuneration would involve a greater role for government or the state thus further complicating and

intruding in the free movement of capital and labour and the natural working of the market to balance the interest of all parties and stakeholders involved through supply and demand.

In summary, Klay and Lunn feel that in LE, Pope John Paul II's expectations of the market and its adaptation to address the social issues is flawed due to the fact that it does more harm to the poor than help them. Rather than take Pope John Paul II's approach that commerce should adapt to the needs of the worker, Klay and Lunn feel that the *CST should adapt to the needs of the market* by addressing the following questions:

"Finally, we encourage Christian scholars - both theologians and economists - to actively pursue answers to three questions: (1) How can justice be understood as a dynamic process? (2) How (and in what domains) do markets serve the cause of justice? (3) How can the unique process and limitations of markets, governments and intermediary institutions be harnessed to provide real help for the poor?" (Klay and Lunn, 2003, pg. 197)

Klay and Lunn anchor their argument from a very technical economic point of view. They view the organization as a profit making entity and that the organization must make decisions in the best interest of its shareholders. Strictly speaking this has been the practice of most organizations in the Western world since the industrial revolution. I believe that they misunderstood what Pope John Paul II was proposing through LE and Pope Leo XIII through RE. They (the Popes) were not stating 'business as usual', they were in fact asking for a *shift in perspective*, the view of the business enterprise and the role it plays in society. Pope John Paul II realized that on one hand the organization was committed to shareholder value, but on the other hand, Pope John Paul II realized that to maximize shareholder value, the organization uses a number of societal resources, tangible and intangible, as well as tax-supported governmental resources both tangible and intangible to acquire and increase shareholder value. In essence, Klay and Lunn were simply focusing on one side of the economic formula in the *strictest sense* of the concept (where it involves societal values) but the most *broadest terms* when it comes to shareholder value. They perhaps neglected to address how a more holistic view of the organization would address the strict economic view of the shortcomings of remuneration based on CST. This is exactly what Pope John Paul II and Pope Leo XIII were arguing against. Klay and Lunn simply perpetrated the same errors as Pope Leo XIII identified over the last century or so.

Klay and Lunn's assertions, I believe, can be countered by arguments put forth by O'Boyle, Solari Marangoni (O'Boyle et al, 2011) that addresses the 'other side' of the economic formula. O'Boyle (et al) identified and understood the workings of the market that Klay and Lunn speak of. They also understood that this view did not fully account for shareholder value since it did not account for a number of factors that add value to shareholder value yet remain unaccounted for.

The focus of O'Boyle et al is the central role the organization plays within a community or, taken as a whole, society:

"Even so, common sense tells us that shareholders have no *absolute* right to achieve their ends at the expense of others. That right is constrained by others who rely on the company to meet their needs. For its managers and workers, the company is a

source of employment. For its suppliers, it is a demand for their products and services. For its customers, the company is a supply of goods and services. For the community where it operates, it is a taxpayer and an environmental steward. Subject to the company's *ability* to support its stakeholders and still survive as a profitable enterprise, meeting the needs of others whose fortunes are tied to the company gives meaning to the good company." (O'Boyle et al, 2011, pg. 65)

O'Boyle et al, present an interesting concept, the moniker of 'The Good Company'. This conceptualization of the Good Company (GC) seems to be consistent with CST and in particular RE and LE. In fact O'Boyle et al are specifically indicating that an organization can balance the interests, indeed it should balance the interests, of *all stakeholders* and not simply focus on the shareholder. The shareholder value is simply an amalgamation of all the benefits derived by the activities of the organization as it involves itself with all stakeholders and not simply for the shareholders exclusive use or benefit, but for all stakeholders.

O'Boyle et al identify the following characteristic as being reminiscent of a GC (O'Boyle et al, 2011, pg. 66):

1. subsidiary and decision making in economic affairs
2. justice and ill-gotten gain
3. the duty of the firm in selling to the poor
4. leisure
5. workers' rights, private property, and work as such
6. labour's priority over capital
7. personalist capital; and
8. sustainable development

I will not go into specific detail on these characterizations since I have addressed all of them in some form or another previously in this paper and it would be repetitive. The key point to recognize here is the flawed view that O'Boyle (et al) highlight when it comes to serving the needs of the shareholder at the expense of the *stakeholder*. Furthermore, looking at the eight characteristics of a GC, one can still address these requirements and remain efficient, effective and productive as an organization. The key here is collaboration among the workers, employers and the state, which is what both RE and LE were arguing. Of course one would have to make economic trade-off's. In essence, it is not in the best interest of any organization to run itself into the ground, but this does not mean that an organization cannot introduce measures and concepts that create a more humane workplace and dignity for the worker. RE and LE never listed *what* an organization specifically had to do, they simply outlined the organization's responsibilities and accountabilities to society and all stakeholders in particular the workers. It is up to the organization and its stakeholders to determine how it is to be done. These eight characterizations provide organizations with a framework to work with in developing their programs and initiatives.

The obvious question arises, "What about profits?" This is a valid concern since profits provide an organization with the necessary financial resources it needs to reinvest back into the business to ensure it remains viable. O'Boyle (et al, 2011) explain that in CST making a profit is not the only objective; it is *one of a number* which includes, as part of its consideration, the other previously discussed stakeholders. Profits simply become a *barometer* for the success of an organization rather than its sole purpose. O'Boyle (et al, 2011) believe that by following the 8 characteristics of a GC, an organization can compete with those simply working towards a profit as their only goal. Virtue, of all stakeholders, they argue, will lead to success. Though O'Boyle (et al) do provide some antidotal evidence (particularly in the section addressing subsidiary and decision making in economic affairs - only one of eight), it does not collaboratively tie all eight characteristic together to form one cohesive example. In support of their anecdotal evidence, I will supply one more. In my many years of Human Resources and Labour Relations Management experience, many organizations tout the value of employee engagement and the potential impact on productivity, service and ultimately profitability. Thus, anecdotally, if organizations can connect employee engagement to profits, why cannot they do the same with CST?

The conflict between mainline economic theory (mostly from the conservative end) and CST is also brought to light by Keating and Keating (1998). Keating and Keating reported that upon its release, LE was systematically ignored by most economists who felt it ran afoul of Capitalism:

"Mainstream economists, trained in a discipline characterized by logical positivist methodology, could read previous encyclicals outlining Catholic social thought and find support for their initial assumptions. *Laborem Exercens*, to them, misrepresented capitalism, ignored essential aspects of economic value and dismissed scarcity, the fundamental basis for all economic theory. They believed John Paul II failed to provide practical guidelines for economic policy in an imperfect world." (Keating & Keating, 1998, pg.1791 - italics in original)

This was the specific item that O'Boyle et al (2011) had to contend with and their 8 characteristic of a GC was their response. Unfortunately, the economists had many years of 'logical positivist methodology' to base their critical comments on versus the more anecdotal evidence and reasoning by O'Boyle et al (2011).

Keating and Keating (1998), in their study, compare Pope John Paul II's vision of CST with the 'normative' positions of the free enterprise market economists. They specifically addressed, the individual, private property rights, contracts, a limited role for government and an economic safety net. They conclude:

"John Paul II's vision of man transcends the constrained economic vision in which given scarcity, more goods and services are necessarily better than less. His almost utopian vision, restricted only by natural law, contrasts with the resource and time constraints of the 'dismal science'. Furthermore, the common good is a goal to be sought after in John Paul II's vision not merely a byproduct of the economist's invisible hand. In economic theory, extreme inequality is tolerated for the sake of efficiency or individual freedom; to the extent that inequality is the result of personal sin, John Paul sees it as evil that must be fought." (Keating and Keating, 1998, pg. 1801)

Though Keating and Keating clearly lay out what differentiates Pope John Paul II's CST position from the 'dismal science', they do so with an interesting choice of words. In particular, I focus on the word, '*tolerated*'. This implies that in fact the inequality, in an economic system devoid of CST and thought, does create a

disturbance in society but for the sake of economic gain (at the expense of others), it is 'tolerated - a selfish motive. This clearly is in contrast to Pope John Paul II's vision of a more humane society. I ask, "Is current economic theory designed to narrowly fit within this concept of self-centeredness or is it simply a reflection of human behaviour? In my opinion, human behaviour is broad in scope and unpredictable in general. The point I am making is that it is not 'scientifically' discernable since it cannot predict and account for *the full spectrum of human behaviour*. If it is not scientifically discernable, then human behaviour cannot fit comfortably into current mainline economic theory and vice-versa.

Current mainline economic theory is narrowly defined to fit a very specific motive of 'self-centered profit' rather than profit being a byproduct of *common good* (Keating and Keating 1998), which is what Pope John Paul II argues. Whereas mainline economic theory is *narrowly defined*, CST is *broadly and holistically defined*. CST takes current economic theory 'into account', but it is not the *basis* of a just society, it is only a part. CST is *inclusive* whereas current mainline economic theory is *exclusive*. That in itself makes current economic theory an anomaly within society. It can define narrowly, but it cannot define definitively. Not to say that CST does, but CST at the very least takes much more into account, thus it reflects a much more *realistic accounting* of society, a 'social economics', than does the 'invisible hand' of the economists, which, as the Pope John Paul II alludes to, dabbles in *sin*.(O'Boyle, 2001; Keating & Keating, 1998)

This much more holistic view of the organization where profit, though playing a significant role in the organization, is not its central purpose for existing, is supported by a study conducted by Abela, (2001). Specifically Abela studied the correlation between the findings in Collins and Porras', (1994) study, *Built to Last* and arguments contained in a subsequent encyclical by Pope John Paul II, *Centessimus Annus* (1991), celebrating the 100th. anniversary of RE. Abela was trying to determine how complimentary the two documents were. This analysis was important because the Collins and Porras study was not intended to be a spiritual text but rather a business text, where, Pope John Paul II's encyclical was spiritual, theological and based on natural law. Abela noted that in their study, Collins and Porras (1994) found that:

"Most successful companies "pursue a cluster of objectives, of which making profits is only one" (8). For these companies, "profit is a necessary condition and a means to more important ends, but is not the end itself" (55). Collins and Porras define what they call a "core ideology", which contains the objectives of the company as well as a set of core values that support objectives (73). This "ideology" appears to infuse everything that the company does (201), and it is "fervently held" (122). It helps the companies to remain focused on their objectives across the company and over the years." (Abela, 2001, pg. 109).

Abela notes that Collins and Porras, in their study, highlight Proctor and Gamble for their active and practical focus and application of continuous self-improvement, honesty and fairness, and respect and concern for the individual - themes that run through RE and LE and subsequently *Centessimus Annus* (1991).

Abela makes an interesting observation when he cites a study by Amartya Sen (1997), a Nobel Prize winning economist (Abela (2001, pg.112). In that study, Sen highlighted the consequences of inequality and unemployment and the associated social costs. Abela argues, given the social and economic impact, it

is only logical that the role of organizations in a community is not simply to make a profit, but also involves all of the economic and social consequences, positive and negative, associated with its viability as an organization. From my perspective, an organization does not simply materialize out of nowhere, it requires resources that have been acquired via the community at large and the stakeholders associated with that community. For example, the labour, the support services, the laws and regulations that protect the organization and allow it to exist and conduct business. These are contributions from the community. I argue that the organization, as a result, must contribute to the community in the form of 'Social Compensation or Remuneration' and is accountable and responsible for the community it conducts business in. Ethically and morally, it cannot simply take and not give back to the community. Can there be such a thing as a social accounting or a system of finance reporting that addresses stakeholders as opposed to simply shareholders?

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE FOR DIGNITY, SPIRITUALITY AND CST:

One of the greatest difficulties in trying to introduce CST into the workplace is the narrow mindset that may be found in employers, executives, managers, union representatives and government officials, that hold the keys to the physical/financial resources, assets and the general apparatus of commerce, industry, labour and government. In particular, how does one argue for the spirituality in the workplace, the dignity of the worker, the priority of humans over capital, in the boardrooms and shop-floors of the nation if it cannot be quantified, if one cannot produce a figure for a return-on-investment? After all, is not the purpose of the organization to maximize profit for the shareholder?

Grassl and Habisch (2011) in a study of the encyclical, "*Caritas in Veritate*" (2009) (CV), written by Pope Benedict XVI, that builds on some of the CST principles of LE, argue that in fact, spirituality, morality, ethics and, economics and finance can simultaneously and collaboratively work as part and parcel of the financial administration of an economic enterprise or interest. They specifically argue, on the strength of Pope Benedict XVI's encyclical CV, that the old thinking of there being a dichotomy between spirituality and economics is not correct. They write:

"The Encyclical itself provides examples of this new thinking. In discussing the economic recession of 2007-2010, for example, the Pope does not see the flaw of the investment banks in having sought profit; he sees it in their pursuit of profits without productivity. They were not doing what they were supposed to do - provide capital to drive the economy. The financial sector is by its nature and calling an "*instrument directed towards improved wealth creation and development*" (S.65). The billions of dollars invested in derivatives might have been used instead to set up new firms, hire new workers, and furnish new products, and thus to make life better for millions of people. The crisis was an instance of finance having lost its proper purpose (S. 40; Zamagni, 2009)." (Grassl and Habisch, 2011. pg. 47 - italics in the original).

Pope Benedict makes a unique connection between spirituality and economics. He does not condemn the profit motive in itself, but does condemn the profit motive if it is for its own sake. He provides a *meaning* to the profit motive rather than simply a *financial value*. This is an important distinction since he is saying that profit (economics) works in tandem with spirituality rather than two separate competing entities based on a

'zero-sum' game. This is a practical application of Pope John Paul II's contention in LE that profit is an indicator of performance rather than an end in itself. Furthermore that end should be the spirituality and dignity of man and his work, thus providing meaning to that profit both as a financial indicator and a spiritual indicator (Grassl and Habisch, 2011). How does one apply this teaching in the practical sense?

Peace (2006), proposed a practical application similar to what Pope Benedict XVI in CV and Pope John Paul II in LE have advocated. His focus is on creating a covenant with the client the accountant represents and the community it serves. He relies on the biblical definition or inspiration of the term 'covenant'. Peace explains

"A covenant, in this context, is a relationship premised on the interactions of people entrusting and accepting entrustment. This covenant relationship is a binding, enduring relationship of mutual loyalty that aspires to the common good. The mutuality of entrustment puts the parties in the same moral community, with responsibility to and for one another in an enduring relationship (Allen, 1984). Entrustment involves giving over something to another for care, protection, or performance." (Peace, 2006, pg. 782)

By coming to a common understanding of the moral and ethical considerations of the business relationship, one is in a better position to include, highlight or point out deviations from this covenant in their 'official' reporting, auditing or presentation of the 'true' nature of the organization. This provides not only internal and external transparency, but also accounts for the social/community implications of an organization's decisions and actions. More importantly, it helps initiate, develop and grow a culture of mutual respect among all parties

Peace argues that the professional positions (medicine, law and accounting - I would also include teachers, professors, instructors and engineers), are inherently associated with or carry power and influence in organizations - commercial/industrial sectors, social/community and government. As such, to create covenants as part of their normal dealings allows for these covenants to become significant tools in addressing a more ethical, moral and just society. Peace also argues that though these specific positions are not necessarily based in any religious practice or belief, that it is foolish to think that historically, the cultural influences of faiths and religion would not influence behaviour, thinking and decision making. Thus, Peace argues that through covenants, the opportunity for religion (and for our purposes, CST) to make its way into the powerful decision making conclaves of business, society/culture, labour organizations and government is increased or enhanced (Peace, 2006). This line of thinking would be consistent with Pope Benedict XVI argument in CV that spirituality and economic considerations in organizations can and should work in tandem.

Peace does make a very important distinction between contract and covenant. I want to establish this point, because this distinction is relevant to CST. Peace provides the following distinction:

"Covenants in contrast to contracts, binds people to one another in ways that are not always reciprocal and not dependent upon economic value. Covenant is established through interactions of entrustment so that the parties belong to the same moral

community and assume a responsibility for one another. The relationship is enduring. (Peace, 2006, pg. 785).

What is important in this distinction that Peace outlines is the fact that in contracts, there is *always* an economic consideration between both parties, thus, bias, influence and power relations become part of the relationship. In an covenant relationship, the relationship is founded on a set of *core beliefs* on how the relationship will be conducted. The obligation is not to each other so much as it is to meeting these core beliefs and working with these foundational beliefs, codes and morals. More importantly, since the relationship is founded on this covenant, there is the inevitable 'rooting' of this relationship into the fabric and culture of the organization or entity since in order to support this covenant, it cannot simply be spoken about but rather supported by action and practice - lived (O'Boyle, Solari & Marangoni, 2010).

If there is a fundamental 'rooting' the ultimate goal would be that economic decisions will have to account for the covenant relationship. At the very least, it will allow the organization and the community to observe how close or how far the organization has strayed from this covenant. Furthermore, it assures that the organization at all levels will be making daily decisions that at the very least have to take these covenant agreements into account at its most fundamental operating level, ensuring further 'rooting' and culturalization in support of the covenant. I do not believe that Peace (2006), in his study took the concept of covenant far enough in its logistical and operational implications for an organization, but I make this argument based on my fundamental understanding of organizations based on over 25 years of managerial experience in the decision making process and culturalization of organizations. . Where I believe Peace makes a significant point is by arguing that the support and development of this business philosophy among the professions needs to come through the accrediting agencies or associations. He uses the accounting profession as an example:

"Accountants have adopted a rulemaking philosophy, similar to the lawyers' rules of conduct, in setting the standards for an accounting practice. There is little evidence in the context of the standards of public accountants being involved in activities other than helping their clients avoid the adverse effects of their standards board's pronouncements (Zeff, 2003)." (Peace, 2006, pg. 786).

In essence, to keep their client out of the fire and to justify their business decisions, no matter what the ethical, moral or negative impacts it may have on the workforce and the community it operates in. This is a direct reflection of a *contractual relationship* versus a relationship based on a covenant. By allowing its members to be exposed to such concepts related to CST, the accreditation agencies and associations provide the potential for carryover into the mechanics of organizations, communities and society as a whole.

Peace puts forth a strong argument against the perception that the professions must operate in a neutral capacity. He argues that professionals constantly make recommendations that have significant and important impacts on communities, nations and society based on contractual arrangements with finances being the core influencer. Thus, if there are social impacts to these decisions, would it not make sense to

take these into consideration via a relationship based on a covenant? It is the contractual arrangement that dictates how the professional handles decisions and recommendations. If it is simply based on finances, that is the ultimate consideration. If it is based on a much more holistic concept like a covenant, then the decisions or recommendations takes on a much more holistic persona (Peace, 2006; Sandelands, 2009).

Peace (2006) also raises a strong point in that the scope of most accounting decisions are of short-term timeframes focusing on immediate financial payback yet they may carry significant (and at times long-term) social impacts and costs. Should not the accounting analysis include a long-term perspective on the social ramifications - a 'social accounting'? Peace highlights four sectors where accountants can make significant impacts on the social fabric of a community - retirement, health benefits, public utilities, and environmental protection. In each sector, an accountant, taking a short versus a long term perspective, can alter significantly the impact on a community of an organizational decision in relation to these four sectors.

Similar to Peace (2006), Gallhofer and Haslam (2011) offer a unique perspective on spirituality, emancipation and accounting. Though they focus on the social considerations of accounting practices (as did Peace, 2006), their justification seems, to me at least, to be more *ideological* than reasoned and anchored. For example:

"...in more general theoretical terms, governance-accounting may be conceived of at any moment in the three dimensions of praxis. That is, it may be understood by the situated analyst critically and contextually; it may be envisioned as a future better governance-accounting in a future better world; it may be a focus for strategic emancipatory intervention and may indeed itself in this respect be understood as an element in or a dimension of strategic intervention for progress to the better state (Gallhofer and Haslam, 2008)." (Gallhofer and Haslam, 2011, pg. 506)

Unlike Pope Benedict XVI, Pope John Paul II and Peace (2006), who anchor their arguments on natural law, and economics, Gallhofer and Haslam (2011) seem to rest on 'ideas', rhetoric and abstract considerations of spirituality. Though I cite this as a weakness in their argument from a practical sense, I also must comment that its strength is precisely a result of its 'perceived' weakness. I believe that it is through this abstractness that Gallhofer and Haslam force the accounting (and other) professions to step outside of a profession riddled with rules, regulations, contractual obligations to clients and historical practices and take a second look at how they conduct business. The arguments Gallhofer and Haslam raise are not defensible from the perspective of the hard-core financial executives who only speak 'bottom-line' and shareholder value, but they do not need to be. They are creating *'tension'* in considerations that would not normally occur to an accountant. For example, how many times has one watched a clip of a fashion show where the models are dressed in outfits that are impossible to wear on a daily practical basis. The fashion designer is not attempting to introduce that *particular* fashion design, he or she is simply attempting to break a current mold of thinking in the fashion world and take the industry to a different level of playing field - perhaps a paradigm shift. This is similar to what 'New Country' did for Country & Western music as it shed its old image and launched a new perspective on a traditional mode or form of music.

Looking back on this approach, one can argue that perhaps LE and RN, in attempting to stay close to arguments that went head-to-head with current established economic/commercial/industrial thinking and practice, that both Popes were, in fact, attempting to start a hockey game inside a baseball diamond. Gallhofer and Haslam, (2011) conclude:

" Is it not clear, in relation to ecological and social dangers but also in relation to positive possibilities that a change in our ways of seeing and acting are desired and hence a better way of governance? Is it not the case that designing and promoting emancipatory accountings (financial and beyond) towards emancipatory context, to better or to progress these phenomena, are worthy aims calling for effort, even painstaking effort, towards their realization? In respect of these questions or issues, a spiritual dimension - a dimension of inspiration and orientation - may play a positive role." (Gallhofer and Haslam, 2011, pg. 508)

This abstract approach is also supported by Shapiro (2009), in his study of emancipatory praxis through accounting. Though Gallhofer and Haslam (2011) remain consistent with the 'principles of spirituality' outlined in Shapiro's study (2009), Shapiro does take a much more practical and reasoned approach to emancipation. In his study, Shapiro recognizes that the 'material' is essential to any operation, but he also feels that a more holistic approach focusing on the emotional, psychological, aesthetic, cultural, and spiritual elements of the accounting profession is required. Shapiro actually places a foot in two core fields - the abstract/spiritual and the practical human social/behavioural sciences. This is an important aspect of his approach since it is consistent with Pope Benedict XVI's *CV positive-sum game* approach as opposed to a zero-sum game approach. I believe, going back to my hockey versus a baseball diamond example above, that Pope Benedict XVI realized that rather than *changing* the game completely, that one may be better off *introducing* changes within a game, and adapting the changes to the current rules of the game.

Shapiro accomplishes this positive sum game by focusing on three principle objectives (Shapiro, 2009, pg. 945):

1. To provide a comparative analysis of critical perspectives and Jewish and Christian theological perspectives on emancipatory praxis
2. To consider the impact that accounting education may have on how accountants think reflectively, ethically and spiritually about themselves, their profession, and other people, and
3. To explore how alternative accounting reporting and disclosure practices can promote the spiritual development and transformation of individual persons and communities.

I do believe that of the three objectives that Shapiro addresses, the second one has the greatest potential to influence the profession since the holistic approach is introduced at a much earlier period in an accountant's career. Additionally, it also provides the opportunity to diversify the message among all levels of the profession and the client bases they deal with. This would also be in keeping with Pope Benedict XVI's positive sum game approach. Shapiro showcases his much more practical approach when he summarizes the bias that accounting reporting has as a profession and how, by addressing the three

objectives he has set up above, this approach has the potential to bring to light shortcoming in the reporting:

"The critical accounting literature recognizes in general that accounting reports create and sustain problematic social orders when they focus attention on some dimensions of social experience and render other dimensions invisible. (Gallhofer and Haslam, 1991, p.488; Gallhofer and Haslam, 2003 pg. 6, Tinker and Newark, 1987, pp 365-395). A more emancipatory accounting would reinterpret and reconstruct social history to reveal what is currently hidden (Gallhofer and Haslam, 1991) and ultimately would transform people's thinking and behavior. An accounting system that is committed to human development should measure progress in part by how well the entity supports its employees' spiritual development and their cognitive awareness of problematic social orders. This awareness can in turn encourage people to find better ways to serve others through their work. (Shapiro, 2009, pg. 950).

To further support his contention, Shapiro (2009, pg. 952-953)) recommends the following reports and disclosures:

1. Work and belief statements with a focus on spirituality and the dignity of workers and the work they do.
2. Expanded list of resources (assets) to include references to social, spiritual and community resources and assets.
3. Expand list of obligation (liabilities) to include "a moral obligation to use the entity's resources and activities to promote the development of its people", recognizing that, "the possession of assets imposes a moral obligation to use those assets for the benefit of others."
4. Narrative statement of operating activity describing, "in qualitative terms how the entity's activities during the reporting period enabled workers to develop themselves spiritually, find meaning through their work, and also maintain sufficient autonomy from their work to pursue other life activities in their families, religious institutions, and other institutions,"

With this particular recommendation, Shapiro recognizes the fact that the social/spiritual is difficult to report in quantitative terms and thus he opts for a qualitative narrative. Though I agree in most part, I do believe there can be a quantifiable reporting. For example, in my organization (Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation - OLG). We contribute funds to and support 'Responsible Gaming' initiatives in the province to address problem gambling. This is important for two reasons. It publically acknowledges that our industry has the potential to negatively affect those prone to gaming addictions, and also, through that recognition, we are attempting to help them with this problem - a bearing of our soul so-to-speak. In addition, we contribute, via a corporate obligation, to the 'Trillium Fund', a fund that supports charities across the province. Furthermore, we also contribute 5% of gross slot revenue to our host communities/municipalities. The host communities typically use the funds for infrastructure projects and community services, such as healthcare and social services. All of this is reported in both a quantified and qualitative fashion, supported by public statements to the local community and the people of Ontario at large. In essence, Shapiro is

right-on-the-money (no pun intended).

5. Number of actions taken to improve human development: "An entity's reports and disclosures provide the entity with evaluative feedback about how well it achieved its human development and environmental impact objectives." This I would consider an accountability/responsibility statement.

Shapiro has been able to meld the spiritual considerations with a practical application of reporting within the accounting function/profession. This, I believe, is in line with RE, LE and Pope Benedict XVI's CV positive sum game approach to humanizing the workplace, by humanizing the organization.

Despite the reasonableness of Shapiro's approach, we must highlight a cautionary note. As with all ideas based on the spiritual, issues of interpretation and religious beliefs come to play. Though my study is focused on CST, what approach would organizations take when addressing spiritual matters in the workplace? Spiritual ideas range from the extreme orthodox, based on the major fundamental religious orders to the cultish and abstract. Even within the Christian communities there are arguments as to how one would interpret Jesus Christ's message. For example, liberation theology has a view of Christianity that is not supported by the Roman Catholic Church, yet, it has a large Christian following in many developing nations, particularly in South America. McPhail (2011) points this out in his study.

"On what basis are we then to negotiate competing claims about what Jesus really meant? The second methodological point relates to how these individual sayings are subsequently combined into a unified system of spirituality. The "awakened thinkers", Buddha, Lao Tzu, Jesus Christ, Krishna, Mohammed and Ramana Maharshi, are all made equivalent, presumably based on some normative pluralist view of these traditions." (McPhail, 2011, pg. 521)

Though McPhail concedes this argument, he also counters it by arguing that traditional orthodox/radical Christianity, historically, has been the only religious viewpoint, in comparison to "liberal and postmodern" approaches to Christianity, to confront the shortcomings of Capitalism (McPhail, 2011, pg. 524).

I believe McPhail, in concluding remarks about his study, places the issue of critical accounting as it currently stands into perspective.

"As the post secular field of accounting research emerges and begins to shift from accounting in religious institutions to a more direct engagement with spiritual and religious traditions, various theological positions have been adopted, from (sic) liberation theology to negative theology with hints of a spiritual psychology perspective in Molisa's latest contribution. However, as yet there is little serious critique within the critical accounting literature of these readings. Neither is there any critical engagement with the radical possibilities of a more orthodox Christian master narrative. While aspects of the Radical Orthodox position are obviously problematic, it does however provide one basis for critically engaging with the work that has emerged to date, while proposing an alternative more orthodox but postmodern theological reading of the prospect of a more emancipatory accounting."(McPhail, 2011, pg. 527)

McPhail (2011) clearly summarizes the apathy of the accounting profession to accept more socially and critically oriented accounting practices and the potential difficulty that one encounters when attempting to introduce and sustain such new practices in the profession. If one simply looks at the accounting and finance professions as one block to be addressed when looking at CST in the workplace, then, yes, one

would have difficulty in making any significant changes. I believe that one must look at CST in the workplace from a holistic perspective. This perspective would look at *all the functions in an organization*, from Finance to Human Resources to Operations. Furthermore, one would also have to look at the community at large including labour organizations, social agencies, faith institutions, community support services and in particular educational institutions *at all levels*. Finally, one needs to have the full support of municipal, provincial and federal governments. This is a daunting task, but one that I believe can be accomplished.

With this daunting task in mind, I will now lay-out my declarations on what I feel needs to be accomplished from a holistic point of view, gleaned from my studies and research for this paper, in order to introduce, if not CST, at least a semblance of spirituality and humanization in the workplace, resulting in the long sought dignity of the worker, who in essence, spiritually speaking, is carrying the weight of the world on his/her shoulders. Through these declarations, it is my hope that those who seek to promote or create a workplace that adheres to CST will find these declarations a practical approach, a set of goals and objectives that take the spirituality of RN and LE *right to the shop floor*. These declarations are meant to work in tandem with each other rather than independently of time and space. They are to work cohesively and collaboratively if they are to have any effect at all. Any headway made by any one of these declarations will create an opportunity for anyone of the others. Any weakness in one will potentially create a weakness in the others. Finally, the declarations involving the larger institutions should be considered those that need to lead the charge, the battering rams of spirituality of work and the dignity of the worker.

MY DECLARATIONS:

1. There must be a *collaboration* among International Labour Organizations, particularly those that currently espouse CST, to 'evangelize' CST at the International level and across International borders. CST principles should be practiced internally by all International Unions to acclimatize their executives and senior members to CST. In particular they must establish a *practical* and principled connection between CST, and positive labour/employer/community/state and Church relations.
2. National/regional/local Labour Unions must spearhead the CST principles in the workplace by negotiating and including practical and actionable contractual and covenant language reflecting CST principles into collective agreements. In addition, CST should be included as part of the daily local union business operations at the work floor level. It should permeate all communications between union members, their union local and employer representatives. Furthermore, the CST language should not be used as 'fodder' language to trade off for gains in financial resources offered by the employer, but should be self-standing negotiating language that the union is willing to take 'action on' such as a strike or take less on the financial side of any settlement they reach. The focus should be long term and not immediate gains for the membership.

3. The Roman Catholic Church must fully support the principles of CST as historically proclaimed by the Popes. This would include the Church at the international level and at the local level working collaboratively with labour groups, employers and state representatives helping them to understand and formulate policies, principles and practices in support of CST in the workplace. The support of Catholic lay groups and networks *is essential*. Furthermore, the Church should form strategic alliances with organizations at the community level that support and practice CST principles to better connect with organizations that can provide practical applications of CST in a community on a daily basis.
4. Business/professional schools must introduce, as part of their *core curriculum*, 'spiritual related courses' exploring ethical, moral and social justice themes to better prepare students for the reality of their profession in its full spectrum and in a holistic fashion rather than a narrowly defined technical application of learning principles based on *positivist principles and applications*. What I seek is not indoctrination, but introduction to and an exploration of these complex themes as *practical professional tools* at their disposal should they wish to use or promote them.
5. Graduate and Post Graduate students studying CST should further study, research, analyze, critique and generate scholarly discussions on O'Boyle's et al (2009) 8 characterizations of a 'Good Company' or similar research reflecting CST in *practical applications*. O'Boyle et al (2009) have produced a foundational article that does justice to RE and LE and, based on my understanding of RN and LE, properly outlines the theoretical, biblical and practical principles. The article, I believe, successfully straddles both the academic field and the economic realities of business/industrial organizations. The article presents RE and LE (CST) in a way that allows for scholarly examination yet is practical enough for business, community and state non-academic professionals to understand.
6. Catholic economists, accountants and financial professionals need to develop social economic/finance theory, research methods, practices and analytical methods that help support CST principles in workplace decisions, national considerations at the state level and in the social fabric of communities. This would also include supporting research at the academic institutions as well. There has to be a distinct move from simply conceptualizing 'the spiritual' to actually setting practical applications of 'the spiritual'. As part of the practical applications, internal organizational reports need to be developed that account for a social accounting of the organization. In particular, accountants and finance professionals need to develop business economic/financial concepts that allow the organization to look at profitability as an indicator of success rather than its sole purpose. Financial success needs to be *redefined* using CST principles.
10. Organizations that are serious about work/life balance, the holistic wellbeing of their employees, human rights, employee engagement and community support, must develop, promote and action

vision and mission statements that reflect CST as a starting point. They must also explain, educate and provide practical examples of how they expect their employees, and managers to adhere to these vision and mission statements. They cannot simply post them on the wall for all to see - they *must be lived*.

11. Governing bodies of professional Associations should introduce value/mission statements and professional standards for members that reflect CST or at the very least elements of spirituality focusing on ethical and moral standards, practices and considerations for the profession. This should be holistic in nature. In other words reflecting *all stakeholders*. Furthermore violation of these standards should result in a discipline that reflects the severity of the violation and does justice to those who were violated, and to those who consistently strive to meet these standards.
12. State Governments must allow for the *liberalization* and the *free practice* of faith and spirituality in government workplaces while maintaining a secular position as far as the *endorsement* of any particular faith. or belief system is concerned. As with the professional associations, governments must also introduce value/mission statements and professional standards that reflect CST principles (in a secularized format) or spirituality focusing on ethical and moral behaviour. This 'workplace spirituality' should be part of the orientation training for all new employees and any employees entering or being promoted to a supervisory or management position.

My attempt at outlining this declaration is not to provide specific practices, but to allow *opportunities* for the natural development and growth of CST or at the very least an introduction of spirituality into the workplace. Though CST, in my opinion, is the most developed foundation for providing dignity to workers and humanizing the workplace, any form of spirituality that allows the movement away from strictly or narrowly defined profit oriented organizational goals or objectives to one that is more holistic and employee/community inclusive/centered in its view is a step closer to humanizing the workplace and providing a workplace where the dignity of the worker remains the primary focus of the organization.

CONCLUSION

In *Laborem Exercens*, Pope John Paul II, takes a passage from the book of Genesis, that has been vetted through *Rerum Novarum* and other encyclicals reflecting CST, and parlays it into a global perspective on labour and work. Its strength is its weakness from the perspective of those that view the world strictly from an economic stand point. Namely, that its focus is spiritual and it is difficult to argue against spirituality from an economic standpoint, yet, he is able to argue against economic perspectives on work and labour from a spiritual platform since spirituality works at a much more deeper fundamental level of the human psyche, and encompasses emotion, belief systems, psychology and human behaviour. Economic systems have to assume the human is not a human but a group entity, as part of a system, an item, a process or a function stripped of its humanity. It is not real from the perspective of the worker and not real from the perspective of

the economist who cannot predict and base economic models on emotion, sentiments, beliefs and spiritual behaviours, in essence, the economists and those that build the models that ultimately become ideological and political know and understand that their perspective is not *real* from a human standpoint (Comsa & Munteanu, 2009). Pope John Paul argues:

"This teaching on the question of progress and development - a subject that dominates presentday (sic) thought - can be understood only as the fruit of a tested spirituality of human work; and it is *only on the basis of such a spirituality* that it can be realized and put into practice. This is the teaching, and also the programme, that has its roots in 'the gospel of work'. (Pope John Paul, 1981, nos. 26 - italics in the original)

Economic systems, be it Capitalism, Marxism, Socialism or Communism, are devoid of humanity in the sense of allowing a person to be a person - to self actualize, to humanize. These economic systems, as Pope John Paul II argues, are self-serving at the expense of the worker. The only way to reconcile the spiritual and the economic is to introduce humanity into economic models creating a holistic approach to commerce, business, labour and industry (Barrows, 2011). The reason that you need to introduce humanity into the economic system rather than the other way around is simply that humanity is not self serving and *adds to* the economic model, while economic systems *are self serving* and introducing them into the spiritual realm would simply *take away* from the humanity and spirituality of work and therefore cannot and will never be reconciled with the human spirit, the spirituality of work and the dignity of all humankind. Pope John Paul II eloquently summarizes this argument, quoting from the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council (*Gaudium et Spes*, 1966):

"Earthly progress must be carefully distinguished from the growth of Christ's kingdom. Nevertheless, to the extent that the former can contribute to the better ordering of human society, is of vital concern to the Kingdom of God." (Pope John Paul, 1981, nos. 27)

REFERENCES:

- Abela, Andrew V. (2001). Profit and More: Catholic Social Teaching and the Purpose of the Firm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 31 107-116
- Abbott, Keith, (2008). Catholic Social Thought and Labouring Ideals in Australia's New Industrial Context. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, (50), 157-174
- Anthony, PD, (1977). *The Ideology of Work*. Oxfordshire, UK, Routledge (Taylor Francis Group)
- Baird, Charles W. (2003). Catholic Social Teaching and Unionism. *Journal des Economistes et des Etudes Humaines*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Article 12, 1-23
- Barrows, Stephen P, (2011). Labour Economics and the Development of Papal Social Encyclicals. *Journal of Markets and Morality*, Vol. 14, No. 1, Spring, 7-22
- Baum, Gregory, (1982). *The Priority of Labor*. New York, USA, Paulist Press
- Beed, Clive & Beed, Cara, (2005). Work Ownership Implications of Recent Papal Social Thought. *Review Of Social Economy*, Vol IX, No. 1, March, 47-70
- Beed, Clive & Beed, Cara, (2005). Applying Judeo-Christian Principles to Contemporary Economic Issues. *Journal of Markets and Morality*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring, 53-79
- Blaisdell, Bob; (Eds.) (2003). *The Communist Manifesto and Other Revolutionary Writings*. Mineola, New York, USA, Dover Publications Inc.
- Bokenkotter, Thomas, (2005) *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*. USA, Image Books - Doubleday
- Cantor, Norman F. (1993). *The Civilization Of The Middle Ages*. New York, USA, Harper Perennial
- Carroll, Norman & Burke, Molly, (2010). The Social Responsibility Of Labour. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 12, December, 113 -118
- Catechism of the Catholic Church, (1995). New York, USA, Image Book - Doubleday
- Collins, James C. and Porras, Jerry I, (1994), *Built to Last*, HarperCollins, New York, USA
- Comsa, Petre & Munteanu, Costea, (2009). Economics and religion. - a personalist perspective. *The Journal of Philosophical Economics*, Vol. II, No. 2, 5-33
- Coulombe, Charles A.; (2003) *A History of Popes*. New York, USA, MJF Books
- Curran, Charles E. (1991). A Century of Catholic Social Teaching. *Theology Today*, (48), 154-169

- Elshtain, Jean Bethke, (2002). Work and Its Meaning. *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture*, Vol. 5, No. 4, Fall, 15-24
- Fleckenstein, Marilyn P. (2002). The "Right to Associate" in Catholic Social Thought. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 38, No. 1/2, June, 55-64
- Gaburro, Giuseppe. & Cressotti, Giancarlo. (1998). Work As Such - The social teaching of the Church on human work. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 25, No. 11/12 1618-1639
- Gallhofer, Sonia & Haslam, Jim (2011). Emancipation, the spiritual and accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 22, 500-509
- Grassl, Wolfgang, & Habisch, Andre, (2011). Ethics and Economics: Towards a New Humanistic Synthesis for Business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 99, 37-49
- Ginsberg, Helen, (1987). Teachings of John Paul II on work and rights of workers. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, Vol. 3 No 2-3, 46-59
- Gruenberg, Gladys, (1998). Papal pronouncements on labor unions and workplace democracy. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 25, Iss. 11/12 1711-1726
- Guitian, Gregorio, (2009). Conciliating Work and Family: A Catholic Social Teaching Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 88, 513-524
- Hart, David Bentley, (2007). *The Story of Christianity*. London, UK, Quercus
- Hopfl, Harro, (2007). A Catholic Work Ethic. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 398-417
- Holy Bible, (1976). *Good News Edition Bible*. UK, The Bible Societies
- John Paul II, (1981); *Laborem Exercens*. Boston, USA, Pauline Books and Media
- Kelly, Eileen P. (1999). Labor, capital and the Church: a call for action. *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 5, Iss. 5, 241-251
- Kelly, Joseph, (2010). Vincent McNabb, Agrarian Utopia and The Theology of Work. *The New Black Friars*, Vol. 91, Iss. 1033, May, 286-303
- Kennedy, Paul, (1988). *The Rise And Fall Of The Great Powers*. London, UK, Fontana Press,
- Kennedy, Robert G. (Eds.). (1994) *Dignity of Work - John Paul II Speaks to Managers and Workers*. Maryland, USA, University Press of America,
- Hauerwas, Stanley, (1992). In Praise of Centesimus Annus. *Theology*, (95) 416-432

- Judt, Tony, (2005). *POSTWAR - A History of Europe Since 1945*. London, UK, Penguin Books
- Klay, R, & Lunn J. (2003). Just Remuneration Over a Worker's Lifetime. *Journal of Markets and Morality*, Vol. 6, No. 1, Spring, 177-199
- Leo XIII, (1891) *Rerum Novarum*. Retrieved May 8, 2011 from The Holy See Website (Official website of The Vatican), http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/index.htm
- Marens, Richard , (2005). Timing is Everything: Historical Contingency as a Factor in Impact of Catholic Social Teaching Upon Managerial Practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 57, 285-301
- Marx, Karl; (1848) <http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html> (accessed September 19, 2011)
- McPhail, K.(2011). A review of the Emergence of post-secular critical accounting and a provocation from radical orthodoxy. *Critical Perspectives in Accounting*, Vol. 22, 516-528
- Mizzoni, John,(2004).Perspectives On Work In American Culture. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 16, 97-110
- Naughton, Michael; Laczniak, Gene R. (1993). A Theological Context of Work from the Catholic Social Encyclical Tradition. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 12 No. 12, December, 981-994
- New King James Bible, (1980). Nashville, Tennessee, USA, Thomas Nelson Inc. Publishers
- Njoku, Uzochukwu, J. (2008). Re-thinking Solidarity As A Principle Of Catholic Social Teaching Going Beyond *Gaudium Et Spes* And The Social Encyclicals of John Paul II. *Political Theology*, PT (9.4), 525-544
- O'Boyle, Edward J., Solari, Stefano, & Marangoni, Demetrio G. (2011). The Good Company. *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 64-76
- O'Boyle, Edward J., Solari, Stefano, & Marangoni, Demetrio G. (2010). Financialization: Critical assessment based on Catholic social teaching. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 37, No.1, 4-16
- O'Boyle Edward J. 2005). John Paul II's vision of the social Economy. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 6, 520-540
- Peace, R. (2006). Accountants and a religious covenant with the public. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 17, 781-797
- Porth, Stephen J. & McCall, John, (2001). Contemporary Management Theories and Catholic Social Teaching: Similarities and Differences. *Review of Business*, Vol. 22, No. 3, Fall, 8-15

- Preston, Ronald (1983). Pope John Paul II on Work. *Theology*, (86), 19-24
- Preston, R. H. (1992). Centesimus Annus: An Appraisal. *Theology*, (95), 405-416
- Sadelands, Lloyd, (2009). The Business of Business is the Human Person: Lessons from Catholic Social Teaching. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 85, 93-101
- Sen, Amartya, (1997) Inequality, Unemployment and Contemporary Europe, *International Labour Review*, 136, pg. 155-172
- Schultze, George, E. 2002). Work, Worship, Laborem Exercens, and the United States Today. *Logos: A Journal of catholic Thought and Culture*, Vol. (5), No. (4), 25-48
- Shapiro, Brian, (2009). A comparative analysis of theological and critical perspectives on emancipatory praxis through accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 20, 944-955
- Spillane, James, J. (2001). The Christian Humanization of Work: Job Satisfaction in the Hospitality Industry. *Review of Business*, Fall, 16-23
- Topel, R. & Ward, M. P. (1992) as cited in Klay and Lunn (2003). Job Mobility and the Careers of Young en. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 107, May, 439-79
- Weigel, George, (1999). *Witness to Hope - The Biography of Pope John Paul II*. New York, USA, Cliff Street Books - Harper Collins
- Welch, Finis, (1974) as cited in Klay & Lunn, (2003). Minimum-Wage Legislation in the United States. *Economics Inquiry*, Vol. 12, September, 235-318
- Wiseman, Jon D. (1998). Christianity, John Paul II and the future of work. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 25, Iss. 11/12, 1658-1671
- Zigarelli, Michael, 1993). Catholic Social Teaching and the Employment Relationship: A Model for Managing Human Resources in Accordance with Vatican Doctrine. *Journal of Business Ethics*, January, Vol 12, Iss. 1 75-82