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In this first annual event of the Maryville Symposium, a fair question to ask is: why should a small liberal arts college host a scholarly meeting, “Finding a Moral Compass in a Global World,” under the heading of “Conversations on Faith and the Liberal Arts?”

The short answer is this: it springs from the twin pillars of Maryville College’s identity and aspiration, that is, a liberal arts consciousness formed in a church-related context. On the one hand we join with many other liberal arts colleges in supporting the ideal of the free and untrammeled pursuit of truth in all academic disciplines. We are unafraid of where ideas might lead us. At the same time, the church-relatedness of the college invites the perspectives of faith-based inquiry. Even as we are unafraid of where ideas lead, we are unembarrassed that faith is part of the mix in the education to which this community of learning aspires.

We are not unaware of the tensions and contradictions that this conjunction might leave us with. But, we choose to embrace those tensions, and not give up just because it is hard. We are aware that in North American higher education, a majority of liberal arts colleges, despite the religious roots of most of them, have elected to distances themselves from their religious heritages. They say that striving for academic quality must mean keeping religious viewpoints marginalized, in what one scholar has called “the God box,” i.e., the religion department and the chaplain’s office, and/or in the realm of private belief. We are also aware that a minority of liberal arts colleges take the opposite tack, that is, they believe that faith-based ideas must lead the discussion, and, in some cases, be the essential filter through which all academic work must done. For them, “God” is not in the box but on the throne of the college.

Maryville College and this Symposium take a determinedly moderate approach in this regard. We embrace the tensions involved, and acknowledge that the seeming paradoxes are hard to resolve, if they can ever be resolved. On the question of “Faith and Reason” that has animated Western Culture for many centuries, at least since Thomas Aquinas, we insist that to offer the kind of education to which this community aspires, we cannot do without both, even if that means unrelieved tensions.

For me this was put in a classic yet homely formulation by Cotton Mather
in eighteenth century New England, in his sermon “The Two Callings,” by which he meant a person’s earthly calling and her heavenly calling. Translated into a college context, that’s something like “faith and reason.” For Mather it was like being in a row boat and wanting to get to the other side of pond; you need to use both oars to get there. If you use just one oar you will go around in a circle. As the Vatican recently stated in a wonderful paper, “Fides et Ratio,” the one needs to inform the other. We cannot let human reason trump faith, or other-worldly faith trump reason. This moderate approach is not some feckless compromise in which we take the two ideals and do them both sort of half-way. No, we pull on both oars fully and with equal strength.

By my count, there are about eighty colleges in North America committed to this determinedly moderate approach. It is Maryville College President Gibson’s hope that we might join with them in this on-going discourse, and that our Maryville Symposium might play a modest part in it.

Thus, “Conversations on Faith and the Liberal Arts.” For me, the operative words are “Conversations on....” This weekend, and in future Symposia, we hope to continue this way of going about it: civil conversations between colleagues that are meant to open discourse, not close it, to see what can be learned not what can be told; to include rather than exclude, and to value new conversation partners.
Ethical and Theological Challenges in Globalization

Douglas A. Hicks

On July 7, 2007, the ethical and theological challenges in globalization were visible for all to see. The global challenges were transmitted in vivid, HDTV color from concert venues on all seven continents into my living room and yours. The Live Earth concert organizers, led by Al Gore, were harnessing the technologies and resources of globalization to attack one of the world’s most pressing problems: global climate change. Gore and his team had recruited the latest, hippest celebrities and musicians to shout out the “inconvenient truth” of global warming and the human factors contributing to it. As higher education faculty and administrators, we know that today’s college students are not tremendously engaged in civic life. But of all the issues, global warming promises to capture our students’ attention. It appears the concerts reached that important audience and in many others.

There they were: the Dave Matthews Band, Keith Urban, and Bon Jovi in New Jersey, Genesis and Madonna in London, Shakira and Snoop Dogg in Hamburg. There were also hundreds of other performers. The organizers called it the largest entertainment event ever held, with a television audience estimated between 1.2 and 2 billion persons. In order to transport these artists and support personnel to a dozen venues around the world, the environmental costs of air travel in particular were staggering. One organization estimated the total “carbon footprint” of Live Earth at 75,000 tons, that is, thousands of times an average westerner’s annual environmental impact.\(^1\) The organizers claimed their concerts were carbon-neutral, thanks to the practice of carbon offsetting, by which the participants essentially funded the planting of about 100,000 trees in order to make up for this damage. Was the promotion of the world’s largest rock concert a good way to decry the environmental damage of the global economy? As one critic put it, would we throw a pig roast to promote vegetarianism?\(^2\) Do our means match our message?

To add to the complexity of the concerts, during the U.S. broadcast of the event, the television emcees featured a discussion about the excessive use and environmental impact of disposable plastic water bottles. The following musical group (like most of the others during the day) appeared on-screen with a half-dozen water bottles lined up behind them. The sense of irony was present even for the most avid supporter of this event.
Lest we criticize these Hollywood types and politicians too quickly, however, we must realize our own global challenges. Live Earth’s moral quandaries are simply ours, writ large. As former US poet laureate Robert Pinsky once said to a conference on global citizenship: We who would gather to tackle the problems of globalization are “happily situated members of the large, powerful nations, prosperous and mobile individuals, able to serve on UN commissions, who participate in symposia, who plan the fates of other peoples while flying around the world and staying in splendid hotels.”³ We may not be living high on the hog in Maryville today, though the RT Lodge is quite nice, but we have come from near and far, at significant cost to the environment, for the opportunity to think together about hard global questions. Like the organizers of Live Earth, we are contributing to multiple parts of globalization, some of which are contradictory with each other. Globalization: Are you for it or against it? That is, I hope to show, the wrong question.

Let us begin our conversation by acknowledging just how challenging these global problems are and how wrapped up in them we find ourselves. The first president George Bush famously said that the U.S. lifestyle was not up for negotiation.⁴ In a similar vein, and in the effort not to offend constituents, some Live Earth performers suggested that solving global warming was just a matter of small habits, like turning off our stereo when we were not using it. However, we intuitively know that the moral and theological challenges of globalization are greater than changing the kind of light bulbs we use, even though this is a good practice. We require a wider-angle lens that allows us to question the economic, political, and social systems in which we and our institutions are located.

How should we think about the ethical and theological challenges in globalization? How do we shape our higher education institutions to serve as a moral compass in a global age? In this paper I hope to shed some light on those questions and to provoke our collective imagination for our ongoing discussion. In order to present these challenges, I will first offer a working analysis of the term globalization itself. I will then consider an extended example of the question of global inequality and its complexities. Finally I will pose some key challenges in the form of five questions that we might seek to address together.

**Globalization: Competing Meanings⁵**

What do we mean by globalization? Few current topics are more contested than globalization: its definition, causes, and social and moral implications.
Indeed, some critics maintain that globalization is a faddish term encompassing too many ideas to be coherent. Yet it is hard to deny that some kinds of global interaction are taking place that are significantly reshaping life for many human beings. Debates swirl around how most efficiently and equitably to steer globalization, if indeed it can be guided in some way.

Rather than being a unified phenomenon, globalization is better understood as a set of processes that are sometimes competing and sometimes complementary. It refers to economic, political, technological, social, cultural, and ethical developments, principally in relation to changes after about 1980, even though many scholars now assert that earlier periods of history also contained elements of globalization. In general, globalization is the process of extending the worldwide reach of activities, or frames of reference that would otherwise remain local, national, or regional in scope.

Although globalization includes a variety of dimensions, the term commonly refers to economic factors. This concerns the expansion of production, trade, savings, and investment to markets beyond national and regional ones. Trade has always crossed national boundaries, from spice routes to the East, to trade in the Roman Empire, to international shipping between Europe, Africa, and the Americas. But the level of international trade has skyrocketed since about 1980.

With strong encouragement from leaders in private enterprise, political leaders have pushed for the reduction in tariffs on the trade of goods and service across national lines. The Uruguay round of trade talks (1986 - 1994) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, established in 1947), created the World Trade Organization (WTO). The WTO, which began officially in 1995, is an international institution consented to by various partner countries. It has the power to enforce agreed-upon treaties and to mediate trading disagreements among member countries. Critics maintain that the WTO governance is not democratic and privileges an ideology of the free market over social values. In this view, economic globalization that promotes free trade and growth of production comes at the expense of weaker economies and nations (who consent to membership out of a very limited set of options) and undermines the rights and protections of laborers, and environmental health.

The increased international flow of commodities is a visible form of globalization, but the rise in global financial markets dwarfs the markets in goods. With the technological developments discussed below, trillions of dollars change hands every day electronically. In unprecedented ways, global capital
and currency markets have reshaped economic investment. This is not to say that investment across national lines is new; foreign investment as a share of total investment is not larger today than it was in the pre-World War I period.

Globalization has not occurred as readily for human labor as it has for capital. On the labor front, political questions of national sovereignty confront globalizing economic trends. A number of nations have addressed the labor issue through legalized migrant- and guest-worker programs. Some permit immigration and offer citizenship to persons who can fill certain kinds of gaps in the national labor force. Yet, the majority of persons are not able readily to move their labor power across national lines, as they would be able to do in a fully globalized society.

Alongside the economic, recent technological innovations are major components of globalization. A series of developments in the telecommunications and computer industries has made immediate, coordinated, and sustained communication possible among multiple geographic locations in the world. The cost of a one-minute phone call from New York to London has dropped precipitously, by about 99 percent, over the past seven decades. Cell phone technology has made communication to many remote areas affordable; entire nations appear poised to skip a generation of wired technology and adopt wireless communication systems.

The Internet, developed as a way of communication within the military and university sectors, has made instant interaction and a common pool of information potentially available to persons around the world. Internet access and usage vary by country and socioeconomic status, but at its best, the Internet promises a cheap and reliable medium for global interaction. It has led many thinkers to champion the egalitarian potential of globalization, including Thomas Friedman in his book *The World is Flat.* Critics call attention to the shortfalls of this sort of interaction, including entrenched inequalities of access and influence, the over-commercialized use of the World Wide Web, severe threats to privacy, and the lack of direct person-to-person communication. Also on the technology front, the decline of prices of international air travel, in addition to contributing to the global trade of time-sensitive products, has increased international tourism. Persons who can afford this form of travel comprise a global tourist industry. Yet, the cost of a standard coach-class seat on a roundtrip transatlantic flight exceeds the annual average income of almost half of the world’s nations.

A different kind of globalization, of a political nature, has taken place more slowly and less directly than the economic and technological dimensions. Market
structures readily transform themselves from a national to an international level, but a political system based on national sovereignty faces, by definition, structural issues in international contexts. The founding of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 offered the promise of a global community of nations working together to address social ills and, at a minimum, to reduce the probability of conflict on a global scale. The UN charter did not usurp national sovereignty; indeed, it was built upon it. While the Security Council, whose five permanent countries hold veto power, assures that a set of dominant countries has undue influence, the UN structure is still more democratic and participatory than international financial institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization. The former Secretary General, Kofi Annan, of Ghana, questioned the absoluteness of national sovereignty when it comes to issues of the violation of human rights within national boundaries, helping to shape a discussion about limiting sovereignty in extreme cases like the genocide in Darfur but, thus far, effecting little practical change.

We have seen the emergence of a global culture and structure of human rights. The UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the Security Council in 1948 and now ratified by at least 140 countries, set the stage for a series of human rights conventions and treaties, including international statements on: civil and political rights; economic, social and cultural rights; and the rights of women, racial minority groups and children. A web of non-governmental human rights organizations, including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, endeavors to protect human rights around the world. At present, we see ongoing international negotiations to forge new conventions of global climate change.

Some commentators understand cultural difference to be a significant barrier to any form of global community. Samuel Huntington’s thesis about a clash of civilizations has received the most attention, drawing renewed interest after September 11, 2001. Huntington asserts that a set of civilizations, no longer national boundaries or Cold War alliances, has created and will maintain the fault lines of the global order. These so-called civilizations – the West, Islam, Confucianism, and so on – are not easily reconciled, integrated, or transcended by any global political or economic process. A particularly important tension, Huntington maintains, is between the West and Islam. Respondents have questioned his framework, particularly the simple categorizations of civilizations, the assumption that cultural difference necessitates often-violent conflicts, and a thinly-veiled preference for “Western” civilization. Amartya Sen has rightly
noted the dangers of reducing the multiple, complex identities of human individuals into monolithic groups determined by their culture or religion, and to a large extent to where they live. Do we not reinforce cultural and religious tensions by referring to “Islamic countries” and to regions as “the Muslim world”?

In addition to tangible transformations on economic, technological, political, and cultural fronts, globalization entails a less visible transition in frames of reference, or ways of thinking, about identity, affiliation, time, and geography. The concept of neighbor changes as technology and communication make people who are geographically far away become, in real senses, proximate. For many persons, an international or even truly global perspective is added to other frameworks such as family, neighborhood, city, and nation. As leaders seek to address problems, even apparently very local ones, it is important to understand the ways in which the relevant issues have global dimensions. Yet, the popular activist slogan, “Think globally, act locally,” captures only some of the complexities of thinking and acting at various levels. We need to be thinking and acting at local, regional, national, and international levels at the same time.

Since the 1970s, political philosophers have built up a literature on global justice and the rights and responsibilities of a global community. The philosopher John Rawls adapted his famous work *A Theory of Justice* to entail certain limited trans-national duties that are contained in a “law of peoples.” Marxist and post-colonial scholars have emphasized the need to understand struggles in various parts of the world as part of a common fight against forces of oppression and for human dignity. *Empire*, the celebrated book by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri portrays globalization as a complex movement that creates a hegemonic global order but that also provides opportunities for mass resistance to it. Other scholars, including Martha Nussbaum, Peter Singer, and Hans Küng, have offered “cosmopolitan” visions of moral obligation and global community. In cosmopolitanism, national citizenship has very little relevance to the rights and duties that humans share with one another. Some analysts have retorted that global citizenship is an interesting concept, and perhaps a worthy ideal, but it is only the “global class,” i.e., those who can afford to debate such topics, and who have the privilege to dream of such a condition.

Paradoxically, the successful organizing efforts against economic globalization tend to be highly global in terms of technology and communication. That is, movements against economic globalization employ the Internet and international networking as principal means for organizing. While some groups of complete anti-globalizers prefer communal separatism – or the paradoxically
named communal autonomy – the majority of organizations embracing the term *anti-globalization* are actually protesting specific forms of globalization, for example, models that exacerbate things like disparities of economic wealth, concentrated political power, or environmental degradation.

As a final element of anti-globalization, terrorist networks such as al Qaeda purport to be fighting the hegemonic political and economic power and hedonistic excesses of the United States (and its allies). The 9/11 attack against the World Trade Center in New York targeted the global economy. Yet, even as al Qaeda fights globalization, it is itself a profoundly globalized institution, dependent upon the electronic media for its internal communication and dissemination of its message and drawing on the rhetoric of a global ummah, or worldwide Muslim community. Thus, even the most radical forms of protest against globalization are also affected by the realities of the phenomenon.

**The Challenge of Global Inequality**

One of the central issues in globalization debates is the relation of globalization to inequality. Economists debate the question of whether and by how much the expansion of international trade and capital movement has increased inequality. Although there is no broad consensus, scholars generally agree that technological changes have had at least as significant an impact on inequality as trade, but both the technology and trade are grouped together as globalization. Many economists agree that the level of global inequality increased across the 1970s and 1980s, but the degree of that rise turns on a number of technical factors, including currency conversion rates. There is little consensus about the most recent period and importantly, the causal relationship(s) between globalization and inequality.15

It is very clear, however, that current global inequality levels – whether they have been moving up or down – stand very high.16 Inequality of income, for instance, is as severe in global society as it is in any particular country in the world. Consider the degree of economic disparity in some of the most economically unequal countries in the world, like South Africa, Guatemala, and Brazil. If we envision the whole world as one society, which is precisely what globalization encourages us to do, we would see that economic inequality among the world population is greater than it is within these countries. These are nations marked by economic disparity and social fractures.

At least one additional relationship is frequently overlooked in these discussions. Even if global inequality has not increased in the past two or three
decades from its already high level, innovations in communications and media technologies have broadened human “frame of reference” beyond national borders, so that we now see global inequality as a more relevant and pressing issue. In earlier eras we did not regularly see the reality of severe global inequality—at least not in the vivid colors in which we can see global poverty on television. More significantly, it is increasingly commonplace for U.S. television programs to be beamed across the world, replete with our product placements and lifestyles of conspicuous comfort. Residents of the developing world see not the so-called typical American family; they see the Hollywood version, which is wealthier and more consumerist than the actual people. Thus, today’s increasingly interconnected, globalized citizens are more likely to take note of inequality, and its implications, at the global level.17

Let me address this in another way. The battle over globalization tends to be fought over whether the global economy is a positive force, a negative force, or a mix of the good and the bad. In general terms, the arguably gradual reduction in absolute deprivation is presented as a positive aspect. On the other side, the continued high numbers in poverty and the entrenched degree of inequality between rich and poor are negative aspects, alongside the environmental impacts of growth. It goes little noticed that globalization of our consciousness might have negative effects, especially on those living in abject poverty in a world of affluence, which is increasingly familiar to them via technological voyeurism, of yachts, HDTVs, iPods, and the like.

A possible objection at this point is that such increased feelings of relative deprivation on the part of the poor are little more than envy. In this view, envy is a moral bad, or at the least, it is not something the rest of us should worry about. But the experience of relative deprivation is not merely a matter of envy. Based on the conviction that it is a moral good to be a member of one’s society, it is appropriate to want to understand one-self, and to be understood, as a full participant in one’s society. Adam Smith famously illustrated this proper moral concern by stating that in his day and age, day-laborers in Britain needed to own a linen shirt in order to appear in public without shame. Amartya Sen has developed this point in his “capability approach” to well-being in order to suggest that appearing in public without shame is an important human functioning. The actual goods needed for a person to appear in public will vary from society to society.18 I have elsewhere developed a Christian ethical account of human dignity and social solidarity that describes the importance of participating in one’s society as fundamental for our well-being.19 For our current discussion,
the point is that globalization expands the scope of our comparisons—the size of the society in which we wish to belong. Or more precisely stated, it adds the layer of global society to the social comparisons that we make to other people.

As for the global affluent, which include all of us gathered here, there may be negative AND positive effects of globalization in our social comparisons. First, to follow the discussion of social comparison, we realize that we are, in global terms, better off than many or most persons around the world. By conventional analysis, this makes us feel fortunate or well off. Of course, with James Duesenberry and others who pioneered the discussions of relative well-being, we tend not to look below us in terms of social comparisons, but rather we look at the Joneses next door or in the next-up income class, because we aspire to move up. We tend to look up, not down. At the same time, and on the negative side, we may well experience empathy with the persons we see living on less than one dollar or two dollars per day. To have knowledge about that suffering thus has a negative effect on our well-being.

It may turn out that seeing ourselves as part of one world has a net positive effect on human well-being, especially for the well-off. However, the complex positive and negative factors, including those of relative perceived well-being, deserve our attention and future study and reflection. This calls us to look more carefully at the arguments on both sides of the economic globalization debate. In addition, relative deprivation should also chasten those of us who speak appreciatively, sometimes longingly, about global citizenship. In view of the level of global inequality in the world, and assuming that even significant reductions in inequality will not approach rough equality in any foreseeable future, those of us who would call for a global society should be careful what we wish for.

Responding to Globalization: Five Questions

This extended reflection on inequality and global social comparison is just one way to think about the myriad ways globalization is changing our economic, political, and cognitive reference points, all at the same time. We need a foothold, someplace to stand from which to make sense and to act amidst these shifting sands. How might we respond, in particular, as we seek to shape our institutions of higher education and the educational experiences we offer to our students? I will close by offering five framing questions that might guide our moral and theological response to globalization.


1. Which globalization will we seek to create?

    Before we arrive at any ethical evaluation, the descriptive reality is that—like it or not—we are becoming a more interconnected world. Globalization has changed and is changing our life. Yet I have sought to suggest that people do have significant choices to make in order to influence which global processes will take precedence. The fight over Internet norms, regulations, and property rights, for example, will determine just how democratic the World Wide Web is, and consequently, how “flat” the world might become. To take another example, the debates over governance of international financial institutions (IFIs) like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization, have made them evolve over the past fifty years. Social activism and academic criticism have helped revise those organizations in generally more democratic directions. In a related vein, efforts to draft, sign, and ratify human rights conventions and international environmental treaties have created international constraints on political and economic behavior that promise to shape a more just world. The leadership efforts of the United Nations Development Programme, with the help of selected national political leaders and a web of celebrity and not-for-profit organizations around the world, such as the ONE Campaign, have had at least measured success in injecting severe poverty into international political discussion. All of these are cases in which the meanings of globalization have been shifted by citizens and leaders who have mobilized through local, national, and global efforts.

    Clearly our institutions of higher education can play a key role in shaping our students’ understanding of globalization. A too-simple question is: Should our own institutions be global in how we shape our educational enterprise? We have all answered yes to this question. A more fitting question, I suggest, is to ask: In what specific ways have we shaped a global curriculum for our students, and in so doing, which dimensions of globalization are we emphasizing?

2. How can we develop the moral and theological resources to “think globally”?

    I have stressed that we should see globalization as a change in our consciousness as much as it is a change in our political or economic institutions. Yet, it is by no means clear that we or our students are prepared to think of ourselves as international or global citizens, as citizens of the world, or as cosmopolitans. In fact, for those of us who do not happen to work at the United Nations or the Nobel Peace Prize committee, these phrases sound increasingly foreign and out
of touch with everyday experience. Two forms of identity serve as chief stumbling blocks to thinking globally: nationality and religious identity. But to state it that way makes it seem as though these forms of identity must be discarded in order to have a global consciousness. This is not the case. It seems easy to call ourselves American, or Christian (or Jewish, Hindu, etc.) or both, even as it remains an abstraction to say we are global citizens. It is unclear why, in principle, it is so much more difficult to envision my status as one human being among six billion humans than to count myself as one American among three hundred million Americans. BOTH collective units are tremendously abstracted from the dozens or even hundreds of persons with whom I regularly interact.

From our earliest days, however, we are embedded in a set of nationalistic or patriotic narratives that form us as loyal citizens: the pledge of allegiance, flags, currency. I do not mean to say that national identity cannot be beneficial and healthy. On the contrary, I mean to lift up its importance. I also defend the significance of religious identity and affiliation as viable, vital parts of the quest for full personhood. Surely it is possible to think of ourselves as Americans, as members of a religious community, and as global citizens, all at the same time. The global kind of identity does not have the rituals and forms of education and initiation that the former two kinds have.21

On this point institutions of higher education can and should play a vital role. For the purposes of this paper, I take it as a given that liberal arts institutions have an obligation to help prepare students for lives of significance and meaningful contribution to their society. The understanding of their society, or their communities, must be stretched from the local to the fully global. As just one, fitting example, Maryville College has already made this stretch in their mission statement: “Maryville College prepares students for lives of citizenship and leadership as we challenge each one to search for truth, grow in wisdom, work for justice and dedicate a life of creativity and service to the peoples of the world.”22 In our common educational work we can make the abstraction of the global level a little less severe.

3. How can we win for losing?

For proponents of the liberal arts, it may seem relatively straightforward to think about shaping our curriculum to shape our students to shape a more humane world. But I want to look at the challenges of globalization for higher education in a slightly different way—by returning us, in fact, to the conundrum that the organizers of Live Earth faced. How do we employ the global
resources within reach of our institutions in morally responsible ways? Or stated differently: The educations that we offer our students bear significant cost to the world around us. Our students travel from far away to be on our campuses; the more elite our institution, the greater distances they travel. In turn, we send our students abroad, at least once and sometimes more, if we possibly can. We don’t put it this way in our recruiting and admission brochures, but in order to provide a world-class, international education at our institutions, we do harm to the environment in order that educational goods might result. (We also acknowledge and would need to balance the fact that this educational enterprise can also provide positive effects for the local economy.) And despite our best but incomplete efforts to make education affordable for qualified persons from all income strata, the students who enter our gates will be young people already disproportionately privileged in the global economy. How could it not be so for our institutions located in a country with a median per capita income of about $30,000 in a world with a median income of less than $1,000 per year? In global terms, there is no doubt: Our educational enterprise increases inequality by increasing the human capital of people high on the global income distribution.

So, we are exacerbating some global challenges even as we seek to equip our students to address them. There should be no overall shame in this, but we should acknowledge it. We should then tie this reality of privilege with the classic liberal-arts mission of responsibility to a “society” has expanded to include the global community.

4. How can we develop the moral agency of the poor, the well-connected, and everyone in between?

In the paper I have already suggested one way in which globalization might undermine or at least obstruct the agency of persons who are poor by global standards: The increased awareness about people living in opulence (including the exaggerated lifestyles promoted by advertising and television programs) can negatively affect the poor person’s sense of capacity to affect change. Let me suggest a second: the “winner-take-all” phenomenon, as described by economists Philip Cook and Robert Frank. The winner-take-all process results because of technological changes that make it possible for successful suppliers of some good – whether it be the performance of athletic or Hollywood superstars or medical or legal experts – to capture a greater and greater market share. When applied to the global level, this suggests that the expansion of markets into international arenas increases the chance that well-funded and technologi-
ally advanced goods and services will push out local producers. For example, Benjamin Barber among others has argued that the expansion of Hollywood films into foreign markets has had this type of negative effect on the agency of local filmmakers around the world to produce marketable films. The high levels of global inequality, arguably, have a negative effect on the agency of the poor and the affluent alike: The further apart the experiences and life conditions are among various persons, the less likely they are to be able to engage one another. In this line of thinking, as we increasingly engrain into our consciousness a global society that is currently vastly unequal in economic terms, we globally privileged persons, like the global poor, perceive ourselves to be less empowered to make change. How many of us truly believe that we can make a difference in combating global poverty? How many of us, rather, are also so comfortable in our own wealth that, like the rich young ruler of Jesus’ parable, go away sad rather than selling our possessions in order to assist the poor? It is not just a play on words to say that to believe we can alleviate global poverty requires radical faith.

What might our liberal arts institutions undertake, then, to increase genuine moral agency amidst the current global challenges, including inequality? First, we should design curricula that equip students to confront international and cultural differences that keep persons and groups apart and suspicious of one another. This can include experiential learning, in curricular and co-curricular settings, on campus, in the community, and abroad—experiences that place our students face to face with persons very different from themselves. (For example, I will never forget the education I had during college visiting and learning from Guatemalan citizen-leaders, from abject poverty, who had organized themselves against their government to demand information about their “disappeared” relatives.) We can also educate students specifically about how to move groups and individuals, including themselves, to make change. Such understanding happens across the curriculum, whether it is through analysis of individual versus collective choice in political science or economics, or transforming leadership in psychology, education, or philosophy, or social movements in sociology or religious studies. This classroom knowledge can prepare our students to put such knowledge into practice, through co-curricular experiences our institutions offer and through applications after graduation.

5. How do we carry on the moral conversation?

The 2007 Maryville Symposium bears the moniker “Finding a moral com-
pass in the global world.” But we find signs and symbols pointing in multiple
moral directions. Our disparate faith traditions have never existed in such variety
and diversity in one society at one time. The “other” is our next door neighbor.
Many of us feel the tensions of multiple religious and moral traditions within
ourselves. The moral divisions cut between us and through our very selves.
Yet for many people, moral pluralism seems to suggest moral relativism. (I
did not realize when I included the term pluralism in one of my book titles
that I found myself taking sides in the culture wars. I quickly learned that “re-
spectful pluralism” sounded like “chaotic relativism” to some citizens.26) But
it is certainly possible to acknowledge and even respect diverse theological and
moral perspectives while still holding a high regard for the truth and the quest
for it. For worldview A to be true does not imply that worldview B is untrue.
Admitting that we who hold worldview A or worldview B might be wrong, we
have even more reason to want to learn from each other about truth. This is a
far cry from a relativistic position in which truth does not matter. We can also
benefit from the insight that many interactions among fellow citizens, whether
in the local or global sense, do not require us to be arbiters of ultimate truth.
For us to be good neighbors (near or far) with one another depends neither
on our state of salvation or on what we think about the state of our neighbor’s
salvation. It might depend more on whether we take out our trash and if we
raise our children to uphold the law and respect our neighbors.

On these matters of creating a moral conversation, our own liberal arts in-
stitutions play a fundamental role. Above all, we can model what it means to
create a culture of free and open inquiry, inquiry about the nature of life’s deep-
est philosophical questions and the most practical. We do not all agree on our
moral and theological convictions, even those of us in institutions that espouse
a value-based mission. Finding a moral compass requires careful analysis and en-
gaged conversation among diverse parties about complex global problems. Our
challenge is to educate students in such a way as to engage these conversations
without succumbing to relativism, cynicism, or despair about agency. Our aim is
to shape the kind of global world in which we would like to live.


5 Some portions of this section have been adapted from an earlier essay, Douglas A. Hicks, “Globalization,” from The Encyclopedia of Leadership, ed. James MacGregor Burns, Georgia Sorenson, and George R. Goethals (Great Barrington, MA: Berkshire Publishing Group/Sage Reference, 2004).


9 A second significant discussion of culture and globalization centers around Benjamin’s Barber’s thesis that two forces—“McWorld” and “Jihad”—are undermining democracy around the world. McWorld, as Barber describes it, is the process of creating a global “monoculture” based upon consumer values and practices. McWorldization is driven by U.S. commercialism, including the tremendous global influence of multinational corporations like Coca-Cola and Nike, the Hollywood film industry, and media-entertainment conglomerates like Disney and AOL-Time Warner. McWorld threatens the richness and diversity of less powerful cultures around the world. Barber defines Jihad as those movements away from multicultural, multietnic democracies towards ethnic or religious enclaves of self-determination. Such efforts are aided by the global communications and media technologies of McWorld. Barber thus asserts that globalization, paradoxically, is aiding both Western economic dominance and balkanizing movements around the world, both to the detriment of democratic participation. See Benjamin R. Barber, Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World (New York: Ballantine, 1995).


16 Some of this discussion is adapted from my essay, “Global Inequality,” in Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics 24 (Waco, TX: Center of Christian Ethics, Baylor University: summer 2007): 18-25.


25 Mark 10: 17-31 and parallels.

Response to Hicks
Sherry Davis Kasper

Professor Hicks has written a challenging paper that one could respond to in many ways. Today I will reply in two ways: first, as a historian of economic ideas; second, as an educator in a church-related liberal arts college.

It is unsurprising that Douglas Hicks would mention Adam Smith, the father of modern economics, in a paper exploring the ethical and theological challenges of globalization. Pertinent to our discussion today, he is the person who, in *The Wealth of Nations*, provided the first, systematic justification for the free market model on which the case for globalization is based. In fact, the single mention of the invisible hand in *The Wealth of Nations* occurs in the context of Smith’s discussion about the problems associated with restraining global trade. In addition, Smith’s inquiry into what created the wealth of a nation was motivated by his concern about the same central issue that Hicks has challenged us to think about today, that is, inequality.

Economists like to tell the following story. Smith’s analysis suggested to him that by allowing individuals to follow their own self-interest to improve their position, they would “widen the extent of the market,” in turn stimulating the division of labor and increasing productivity. As a result, the amount of wealth, what he termed “necessaries and conveniences” available to all individuals, including the poor, would increase, that is, all will be clad in a proper linen shirt. In turn, the invisible hand would ameliorate the inequality problem as competitive forces insured that “universal opulence” would trickle down to all members of society.

What many economists do not acknowledge in this story of globalization is that for Smith the invisible hand was in fact a theological concept. Smith was not an economist, as we know them today, but a moral philosopher, someone who studied natural theology, ethics, jurisprudence and political economy. Thus, he considered theological and ethical issues seriously. He believed that the invisible hand was part of a natural design created by God and given to all humans in common that, if allowed to function properly, would insure that all in society benefited with more happiness. What Adam Smith was trying to do in *Wealth of Nations* was to uncover that natural design underlying economic behavior to determine the institutions that would allow that design to work in a way that more people will be able to consume the necessaries and conveniences
of life and reduce inequality. In an earlier book, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, he undertook a similar task, that is, to uncover the natural design that underlies moral behavior.

Smith was a child of the Enlightenment and believed in the perfectibility of humans. The natural design for this process originated in a variety of what Smith called the passions that guide behavior. For example, as he described in *Wealth*, Smith believes that humans are motivated by the passion of self-interest or self-love. But they are also motivated by physical passions, such as hunger, sexual desire and pain. There are social passions that come from human’s capacity to sympathize with the feelings of others. Some passions are positive, such as generosity, kindness, compassion, mutual friendship and benevolence, while others are antisocial, such as hate and resentment. These are a lot of conflicting passions for one human being to juggle.

Smith described another piece of the natural design that aids humans in doing this juggling, particularly the part where they have to sympathize with the feelings of others. This imagining is done by what Smith called an “impartial spectator” that was implanted in the breast of all humans by God. Smith also called it our moral sense, what we might call our conscience. The great gift that the impartial spectator gives humans is the ability to imagine the situation of others and use self-command to control self-love and develop compassion for others. While Smith never stated that we will reach perfection – in fact many times in *Moral Sentiments* he described situations where humans do not make the mark – Smith was an optimist who believed that the impartial spectator provided us with the ability to approach perfection. As he described: “The man who acts according to the rules of perfect prudence, strict justice, and of proper benevolence, may be said to be perfectly virtuous.” Furthermore, virtuous humans act with justice, following the rules of law that restrain us from hurting others, and with benevolence which “prompts us to promote the happiness of others” starting with our families, then others who have rendered service to us and finally the poor through acts of kindness.

How does this discussion of the ideas of Adam Smith relate to Douglas Hicks’ paper? First, I think it provides one answer to his recast first question: “In what specific ways have we shaped a global curriculum for our students, and in so doing, which dimensions are we emphasizing?” In the case of economics, clearly one of the early proponents of globalization emphasized the ethical and theological dimensions of free international trade. And while a survey of current undergraduate curricula would reveal that economists take seriously
Smith’s recommendation to think globally, it would also expose the emphasis of the majority of economists on the goal of efficiency and the development of critical thinking skills that rely on the ostensibly amoral method of quantitative analysis. This emphasis in economic curricula has surely played an important role in narrowing the meaning of globalization to primarily “economic processes,” as Hicks noted in his comments.

We offer Smith’s idea of the impartial spectator for a second reason. In my estimation, this idea seems to encompass what Hicks is challenging us to think about in his second question: “How can we develop moral and theological resources to think globally?” In essence, if we can develop the ability of our students and ourselves to imagine the situation of others and use self-command to control self-love, that is cultivate our impartial spectators, then we can take a step forward in incorporating theological and moral dimensions into our discussions of globalization.

How do we accomplish this task? I would recommend as a first step to develop curricula that take into account what we have learned about the stages of intellectual and ethical development of undergraduates in the groundbreaking work of William G. Perry and Craig E. Nelson to consist of four modes of thinking and three transitions between them.2 Undergraduates come to us thinking as dualists. Knowledge consists of a body of immutable truths; learning consists of the student assimilation of those truths from the “expert” teacher. Thus, when our students come to college, globalization is good, or bad, because my high school teacher, my minister, my parents, Madonna or Snoop Dogg told me so.

During the transition to the second mode of thinking, multiplicity, students begin to learn that knowledge is not certain. But they also believe that knowledge is based purely on opinion, because they are unaware of disciplinary standards available for choosing among opinions. For many current students, the media and the Internet also reinforce opinion-based knowledge. As a college student, the model of a policy debate I witnessed was William F. Buckley and John Kenneth Galbraith discussing the strengths and weaknesses of globalization with civility and the use of nuanced evidence. Current students have grown up with a model of debate that pits Robert Novak and Tucker Carlson against James Carville and Paul Begala on CNN’s Crossfire, yelling and interrupting each other and inserting sound bites of polarizing evidence. Likewise, the democracy of the Internet insures the availability of mounds of opinion-based knowledge, both pro and con on globalization, which guarantees our
students can find an opinion to support any thesis they propose.

In the third mode of thinking, called contextual relativism, students learn specific standards for choosing among opinions and theories in situations of uncertainty. For example, in economics, the theory of comparative advantage provides a context for students to think critically about the winners and losers from globalization. On the production side, winners include the financers and producers of exported goods and services; losers include the financers and producers of goods and services that have to compete with new imports. On the consumption side, everyone benefits from lower prices and increased choice. At the same time, as Hicks has noted, just as the world’s faith traditions point us “in multiple moral directions,” so does the theory of comparative advantage.

At this point of intellectual development the “chaotic relativism” of which Hicks warns can occur. How do we chose who wins and who loses? What institutions can we develop to minimize the impact on the losers during process of globalization? Can we compensate the losers? Should we compensation the losers? If we stop critical analysis at the disciplinary standard of merely enumerating winners and losers, we could end up in a situation of accomplished, yet empty, academic gamesmanship, if we are still “unable to think critically outside the academic context or in different academic disciplines.”

In the move to the final mode of thinking, called contextually appropriate decisions, we can find one answer to Hicks’ final question: “How do we carry on the moral conversation?” At this stage of intellectual development, students accept that knowledge is uncertain. They learn to apply critical thinking skills developed in relation to their disciplines outside the classroom. They also recognize that the discipline-specific criteria do not always provide a flawless means to makes choices in the face of uncertainty. Finally, they learn to make choices that join their faith-based identities and personal ethics with disciplinary standards. In essence, they are now ready to find their moral compass that drives the “impartial spectator” of Adam Smith.

In conclusion, I agree with Hicks’ final observation that “finding a moral compass requires careful analysis and engaged conversation among diverse parties about complex global party.” But to prevent our students from “succumbing to relativism, cynicism, or despair about agency,” we must develop our curricula and experiences with great intention. We must acknowledge that students come to us as dualistic thinkers. Along the way we must provide them with the intellectual scaffolding of disciplinary and ethical standards to engage the uncertainty of knowledge. Finally, we must create opportunities for them
to practice using these intellectual tools to think about the big questions that globalization challenges us to address. As they practice, so will we have an opportunity to rethink what it means for us to have a moral compass in the global world.


3 Thoma, 132.
Response to Hicks
George A. Spiva

It would seem only logical to ask an economist to respond to a paper dealing with globalization but, in fact, it poses an almost impossible task because the excellent paper I am asked to respond to has in its title the words “ethical” and “theological.” Even this might seem strange because the founder of modern economics, Adam Smith, was a moral philosopher and well before his now famous book, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, he had written a then-definitive work called *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Ethics and theology would seem to have been part and parcel of our social science and, for many years, this indeed was the case. Witness the famous book by R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* which is one of the seminal works in the history of economic thought. Sadly, by the middle of the 19th century economics started moving away from its ethical and theological roots and it is interesting that one of the first efforts of this process was the development of the same abstract model that gave rise to what we now call globalization. I refer, of course to David Ricardo and his theory of comparative advantage. Some years ago a famous philosopher asked our Nobel Laureate Paul Samuelson to name an economic concept that was both valid and non-trivial, and Samuelson immediately replied, the theory of comparative advantage. We all encountered this concept when we took the basic introductory course in economics but, sadly, few have had the time or the inclination to study the importance of the concept and its relevance to the questions posed by Professor Hicks in his outstanding paper.

To over simplify for illustrative purposes, the law of comparative advantage says that if I am better than you are at both mowing lawns and typing pages but I am four times as good as you are at mowing lawns and only twice as good as you are at typing pages we can both benefit by having me specialize in mowing lawns while you specialize in typing pages, and we trade with one another. The total production combination of lawns mowed and pages typed will be larger than if we both persisted in trying to do both mowing and typing. It is the relative advantage or the relative disadvantage that forms the basis for gains from trade and the concept does, I believe, meet the criteria of Professor Samuel’s questioner that it is valid and non-trivial.

Ricardo’s main objective was to formulate a basis for encouraging freer
trade and more trade between and among nations and in this respect he was completely successful, but there was also one of those famous unexpected consequences of his two-country, two-product model, namely, his model was an abstraction from the real world. It is not possible to assign a specific date to the time when economics started down the road of abstraction but Ricardo’s model that came to us during the first half of the nineteenth century is good enough for me.

The movement toward abstraction accelerated steadily during the rest of the nineteenth century but this process took off in a profound way after the end of World War II and the emergence of the computer. Economists have always dealt with numbers. For most people numbers are without any moral, ethical or theological content. They are neutral, or sterile, and as the social science of economics developed in the last half of the twentieth century, economists tried ever more feverishly to abstract from reality and become more like the physical sciences of, say, physics or astronomy. Mathematical models became all the rage and the more abstract they became and the more complex and complicated they became the more powerful they became in shaping the nature of our social science. If you look, for example, at any issue of our most prestigious journals during the past thirty years you will find them dominated by page after page of hideously complex mathematical formulae totally devoid of any moral, ethical or theological content and, more often than not, totally unrelated to the real world.

The intense emphasis on globalization has forced economists to start coming out of their sterile, abstract mathematical world and look at what is and has been going on for the past twenty years or more with world trade and its many consequences, not the least of which is the problem of global warming. I don’t want to be too harsh on my profession. When the environment emerged as a national problem in the early 1960s economists stepped right into that area and, almost overnight, environmental economics became a new and increasingly important part of any economics department. Like the geographers we have long been aware that in the production of the goods and services that populations crave everywhere on spaceship earth it was inevitable that we would also produce a lot of unwanted residuals, crud, and one of the immutable laws of spaceship earth is that everything must go somewhere and the crud went, of course, into the environment. Some of the crud was liquid, some was solid, and some was gaseous and all too often all of these components of the crud contained toxins. Thus, the hard reality of how to deal with this
increasing mountain of crud bore down on economics and we have been trying to come to grips with the problems ever since.

In the process of trying to provide goods and services around the globe the globalization process became a more and more powerful player here on spaceship earth, and among the unexpected consequences of globalization was a new look at Ricardo’s famous theory of comparative advantage. Comparative advantage was what is called in game theory a “win-win” outcome, i.e. everyone who participates gains. But, increasingly over the past several decades people have been asking embarrassing questions about the gains from trade. Are those gains more or less equal for the participants and/or are those gains more or less fair and equitable? Do all of the participants actually gain or are there some losers? Are those who started thirty years ago well behind the richer countries catching up or falling farther behind? Does this matter?

These are hard questions for economists who have been trying for so long to get away from what ought to be and only focusing on what is and can be quantified. We are working hard to develop the analytical tools that will help us find answers to the questions of the globalization process that are tied up inextricably with moral, ethical and theological baggage we have been trying to discard for many years. I think that if Maryville College had proposed a conference about globalization built around this same paper thirty years ago it would have been hard to find an economist who would participate. I am embarrassed even now that I cannot offer more than I have.

For example, Hicks poses five questions at the end of his paper and the first one asks about which globalization will we seek to create and toward the end of that segment he notes that all institutions of higher learning are placing new emphasis on understanding globalization. He asks, “In what specific ways have we shaped a global curriculum for our students, and in so doing, which dimensions of globalization are we emphasizing?” One part of an answer to his question would have to note that there is no real consensus among economists as to how to answer that question. We are still moving off in all directions trying to find out what will work and how effectively will it work. At what level in the primary and secondary school systems should we introduce students to globalization? I don’t know and even if I could determine that, for example, the appropriate time is in the sophomore year in high school how am I going to do this? In the early 1970’s Tennessee decided that every high school graduate would be required to have one semester of economics and they gave high schools four years to get ready to do this. The high schools started offering
economics with the sad reality that there was almost no high school teachers really qualified to teach economics; this unhappy situation is true even today. How can we develop the moral and theological resources to “think globally”? Again, I have to say that I just don’t know the answer, other than to observe that it is easy to talk globally but more difficult to act globally.

How can we win for losing? I found this to be the most provocative question that Professor Hicks raised. There is increasing evidence that income inequality is mostly a function of educational inequality, and this is true not only nationally but globally. As one development economist noted, it is well nigh impossible to build a plant to manufacture computer chips (or whatever) in a country where the labor force is illiterate. Thus, we have to develop teaching techniques that will result not only in a better educated individual but a more morally responsible individual as well. To anyone involved in higher education this is a daunting task.

How can we develop the moral agency of the poor, the well-connected, and everyone in between? When I first arrived in south central Java I was completely unprepared for the levels of poverty throughout the area and I quickly (and naively) concluded that we would very soon have a revolution unless rapid progress was made to develop the area. At that time there was a young cultural anthropologist working in east Java and when he came to our part of the island we put him up in our house as there was no such thing as a hotel in the large village where we lived. Clifford Geertz stayed with my family several times and the first time he visited I put forth my theory of early revolution. I was astounded when Geertz disagreed. He explained that anthropologists had learned that if you were living in poverty and everyone around you was also living in the same level of poverty you didn’t revolt. You were not happy about your condition but if all around you were in the same economic boat you didn’t revolt. However, if you are poor and you are surrounded by opulence that will make you mad. On a larger scale huge income differentials will eventually breed social tensions that any society can do without. We don’t want to make the rich less well off but, instead, we want to make the less well off better off, but to do that in a global sense is going to require a reordering of our priorities and a mustering of our moral strength that has hitherto been largely absent.

How do we carry on the moral conversation? When the Berlin Wall fell the world saw the visible evidence of the superiority of capitalism over socialism. Here were two countries with the same language, the same history, the same culture, and so forth, but with vastly different levels of real per capita incomes.
West German capitalism triumphed over East German socialism in a truly overwhelming and decisive manner. An unemphasized consequence of this triumph was that it reinforced our ethnocentrism in a powerful way. We said to the rest of the world, “You see? If you want to succeed in getting rich you have to go forth and do like us, become like us, behave like us.” We got carried away with our own success as we made it one of our premier exports to the rest of the world. One result was the Washington Consensus that, in turn became the mantra for the International Monetary Fund: privatize, deregulate, balance your budget, stabilize your currency, stimulate exports. We were increasingly unwilling to give much assistance to countries that did not go forth and start becoming like us. We have not made a lot of friends in the process. We need to become more modest, more flexible, and more patient but, like the song says, “Oh Lord it’s hard to be humble when you’re perfect in every way.”
The Vocation of a Principled Global Business Leader
Forming a Moral Compass in a Competitive Economy

Michael J. Naughton

It is an honor to participate in this year’s Maryville Symposium on “Finding a Moral Compass in a Globalized World.” I feel a kindred spirit to the purpose of this symposium in examining this topic in light of Maryville’s mission of liberal arts and church-relatedness. In this paper I will attempt to stay true to this purpose by examining the theme of this symposium as it relates to business in light of the Catholic social tradition, which will incorporate a vision of the liberal arts and the Christian tradition.

Finding a moral compass in a global world, especially in the business world, has never been more difficult. We see this difficulty expressed in the numerous stories of corrupt leadership found in Enron, Parmalat, Tyco, Worldcom, as well as in the increasing complexity of running a business, the intense competitive pressures from globalization, an array of government regulations, a secular culture that marginalizes and privatizes the role of faith, the specialization of universities that fails to form highly principled business leaders, and a church that too often fails to speak to businesspeople.

In this paper, I would like to focus on one particular dimension of this difficulty of developing a moral compass, which I believe begins to get to the root of the problem. The root is in all of us, particularly in our divided life. We are often faced with what the Second Vatican Council document *Gaudium et spes* calls one of the more serious errors of our age, “the split between the faith which many profess and their daily lives.” This document sees this division as so serious that our eternal salvation is at stake: “[L]et there be no false opposition between professional and social activities on the one hand, and religious life on the other. The Christian who neglects his temporal duties ... jeopardizes his eternal salvation.”

While the document speaks of this division in terms of the modern age, the divide between our professional and religious life is a symptom of a much larger problem of our human condition, that is, original sin. In paragraph 13 of *Gaudium et spes*, human sin is explained in terms of division: “man is split within himself.” St. Paul and St. Augustine were profoundly conscious of this division. In Romans, Paul writes: “What I do I do not understand. For I do
not do what I want, but I do what I hate….The willing is ready at hand, but doing the good is not. For I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want” (Romans 7:15-19). Augustine calls this internal conflict and division the “monstrous fact,” and in the *Confessions* he locates this split not in our nature but in our will. He explains in firsthand terms his own suffering from two wills, neither of which were complete, “and what [was] present in the one [was] lacking to the other.” In their intense interior conversations, Paul and Augustine reveal our human condition in a way of division, of a struggle between grace and sin. This struggle is found in the very word *division* which comes from the Greek *diaballein* where we get the word *diabolic* (to scatter, break apart, rupture).

The authors of *Gaudium et spes* seem to think that something about our age has made this division worse, that this split or division is a “more serious error of our age” than in other ages. What is it about this age that fosters rather than resists this split? An initial response to this question is revealed in how students react to Augustine’s *Confessions*. They see him as burdened with, as one student put it, “thinking too much and like having a self-esteem problem.” Students often describe themselves as ethical and moral people, and they wonder why Augustine is so hard on himself. If he would just relax a bit, take religion a bit less seriously and have a little fun, wouldn’t he be just like us? In other words, many students, although certainly not all, do not see themselves as divided, but rather they describe themselves as balancing their lives according to their own lights. They are, as one study on the youth put it, “moralistic therapeutic deists,” i.e., good people who feel positive about themselves and who believe in God but have little need for God except in difficult situations.

Our culture, especially Western postmodern culture, has developed a language of categories to describe our lives that repress our awareness of this division, rather than bring it to light as Paul and Augustine had done. We live in an age where categories are no longer distinctions but separations or walls: leisure/work, public/private, secular/sacred, faith/reason, body/soul, church/state, spirituality/religion. Whereas Paul and Augustine and the other great saints faced their own division and humbly recognize their inability to overcome it through their own efforts, those of us in the modern world avoid confronting this division by creating compartments within our lives that do not need to interpenetrate each other.

My argument is that without the resources of a rich and religious understanding of leisure, any degree of integrity in the sense of overcoming our
division in business and professional life is difficult if not impossible. I will be principally drawing upon the Catholic social tradition’s understanding of work and leisure as a relationship of complementarity. The complementarity of these two fundamental dimensions of our lives, of work and leisure/rest, of giving and receiving, of action and contemplation, is not principally about a balance of the two, but a profound integration that moves us toward integrity. Leisure and work are not simply two isolated periods of time in human life, but rather, as Karl Rahner has written, they are “moments in a person’s self-realization which exist only in their relation with one another and are the primary constituents of human existence itself.”

More specifically, what I am arguing for in this paper is that a moral compass in a global world, especially in business, is best grounded in a religiously and spiritually inspired understanding and practice of leisure such as the Sabbath, worship, prayer/contemplation, mediation/reflection, liberal arts education, and so forth. It is this kind of leisure, and not mere amusements that has the capacity to overcome the division between leisure and work. This relationship between work and leisure, this unity of life, has a particular order to it, which can be described in the following thesis: If we don’t get leisure right, we won’t get work right. No matter how hard we try, through technical progress, economic and financial formulas, strategic foresight, or detailed career planning, we will never get work right, unless we get leisure right. It is in leisure, properly understood, that we find the deepest understanding of the person as receptive, particularly receptive of grace that informs our integration of work and leisure.

This emphasis on leisure is not an attempt to escape the importance of work. We will not get either work or leisure right unless we see them in their relation, not one of mere balance, but of profound integration. The crucial institutions in the formation of this leisure are family, education and religion, which have too often failed in their own mission to foster a unity of life. Before getting to this theological understanding of work and leisure, however, I examine a common cultural understanding of work as career and leisure as function in which to highlight the challenges we have in front of us. In the final section of this paper, I will turn briefly to the Christian university’s challenges and responsibilities as a cultural institution whose very mission is the promotion and development of authentic leisure through the liberal arts, and the preparation and introduction of students to the professions understood as a vocation.
I. Career: Instrumentalizing Leisure to Maximize Achievement

**Work and Career.** With the increasing amount of education and number of skills people need to participate in today’s knowledge economy, organizations are engaging people with more intensive work. Careerists report a flow or zone where they believe that their tasks match and even stretch their abilities, providing them with a sense of personal growth. They have a great deal of control and autonomy over their work and they sense a high degree of productiveness and utility where they see their talents and skills as indispensable to the company because of their contributions. Businesspeople who see their work as “careers” are not so much money-mad (although some certainly are) as they are goal-oriented. In a therapeutic sense, their achievements are closely patterned to their conception of self-improvement — the greater the achievement, the greater the person.

In many respects, the careerist reflects the very etymology of its name: *car*. As William F. May has explained, both career and car refer to movement, and increasingly a private way of movement, in order to achieve particular goals. The car, one’s “auto-mobile” or self-driven vehicle, lets the person travel alone. Even though the car drives one out into society, it does so with a “glass-enwrapped privacy” that shields one from traveling with others. In similar terms, the careerist calculates his travels not in public goods but in private interests. Like the privacy of a car, the careerist is interested in what goals are necessary to get from here to there – education, contacts, money, skill, position, etc. While the activities of careerists are within the law, they have little connection to the public good. As May points out, “questions of public obligation and responsibility seem marginal and episodic at best, distracting and suicidal at worst. The careerist travels by public thoroughfares and largely obeys the rules of the road, but toward his or her own private destination.”

What results from this focus on work as achievement is the inability of careerists to enter into moral debates over their work, especially a moral debate that takes seriously the religious and spiritual character of what a business is. As Josef Pieper explains, “neither difficulty nor effort causes virtue, but the good alone.” Without a substantive notion of the good, the moral compass of the careerist is largely conventional and bland: obeying the law and working within corporate goals, but always deciphering these larger policies in terms of their own private ends.

**Leisure and Education.** The reasons for such a strong careerist presence in the workplace today are multiple and complex, but one cause for its strength
can be found in the declining cultural formation of education, particularly university education, as a form of leisure. School, which often takes up the first fourth of our lives, is one of the largest portions of our nonwork lives. Yet, increasingly this nonwork sphere is becoming understood solely as instrumental to the work arena (anything that is described as “non” is usually subservient to its descriptor). University education is described in functional terms as a career that gives a person the techniques and skills to do well in the corporate and professional world.

Education, however, was not always seen in such a highly instrumental way. Pieper observes that “leisure in Greek means skole, and in Latin scola, the English school.” Education in the Christian classical liberal arts tradition was principally seen as that engagement of the mind in which one could better see reality as it is. By receiving the insights of art, science, math, history, philosophy, literature, theology, one begins to see the whole of creation, and not merely an assemblage of unrelated specialized disciplines. A liberal or humanistic education teaches us to see the whole, which is ultimately a form of contemplation done with others within a community.

This conflict between a functional, instrumental, and useful view of education and the more Christian, humanistic, and classical view was highlighted in John Henry Newman’s *The Idea of the University*. Newman recounts the conflict between these two notions of education during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, responding to John Locke’s demand for more so-called useful or career-oriented education. For Newman, however, an education that only focuses on the useful runs into a significant question: Useful for what? It is precisely the “what” that raises the question of the “good.” Can usefulness and utility provide their own criteria? If education is seen as the means to increase economic goods of profits, efficiency, productivity, the nagging questions are: Profits for what? Efficiency for what? Here the assumption is that more profits and efficiency is good simply because it provides more of them.

Education, for Newman, has to engage the good on its own terms. This is why one should first see education as an encounter with the good (and the true and the beautiful), which makes it an authentic act of leisure. Yet, Newman explains that there is an abundant quality to the good, which is always overflowing and impacting what is around it.

Good is not only good, but reproductive of good; this is one of its attributes; nothing is excellent, beautiful, perfect, desirable for its own
sake, but it overflows, and spreads the likeness of itself all around it. Good is prolific; it is not only good to the eye, but to the taste; it not only attracts us, but it communicates itself; it excites first our admiration and love, then our desire and our gratitude, and that, in proportion to its intenseness and fullness in particular instances. A great good will impart great good. If then the intellect is so excellent a portion of us, and its cultivation so excellent, it is not only beautiful, perfect, admirable, and noble in itself, but in a true and high sense it must be useful to the possessor and to all around him; not useful in any low, mechanical, mercantile sense, but as diffusing good, or as a blessing, or a gift, or power, or a treasure, first to the owner, then through him to the world.13

For Newman, then, the good is never contained, which is why he argued for a liberal education, though not to the exclusion of professional education.14 Because the good is always overflowing, liberal education can inform and influence professional education. This is why for Newman, “though the useful is not always good, the good is always useful.”15 Liberal education for Newman is an act of leisure, which has the capacity to inform professional and, in particular, business education in such a way that its usefulness can be directed to the good. Liberal education, as leisure, has the resources to help the businessperson to integrate his work and the deepest truths of his humanity. It is a liberal education that gives the business professional time to develop “the faculty of grasping the world as a whole and realizing his full potentialities as an entity meant to reach Wholeness.”16

What Newman, Pieper and others help us to see is that once a sense of wholeness, of seeing things whole, a unity of knowledge within a liberal humanistic education is removed, the education of businesspeople increasingly becomes instrumentalized and “careerized,” and the capacity to not only examine, but even to ask, what makes the useful good is lost. A university, in particular a Christian university, if it is true to the Latin root of the term university (universitas), seeks to engage its members in a deepening experience of the unity of knowledge, where each discipline participates in its own unique but interconnected way. Once this unity is severed, knowledge as wisdom is displaced for an increasing instrumental rationality focused on achievements and progress.

Integration and Achievement. What is most tragic about this loss of leisure in education is that there is little left in the educational enterprise to see far beyond instrumental achievements or personal fame. What we are left with is a self-defined only by its achievements, or lack thereof. We are always tempted to equate our achievements in work with our identity of who we are. The first ques-
tion we, as Americans, often ask people in conversations is, “What do you do?” Without even knowing it, we fall into a careerism which values people more for what they do than for who they are. There is no doubt that people’s achievements are connected to their character, as I will indicate below, but we need to resist becoming the noun of what we do for work. While a businessperson is a businessperson, she is not only a businessperson.

This problem of careerism is often seen more clearly in retirement. Many entrepreneurs and business people have a hard time retiring from their businesses because the habits they formed have been too often restricted to the narrow goals of organizational, productive and financial goals of the business and their own careerist aspirations. For example, a couple of years after Lee Iacocca retired from the Chrysler Corporation, his picture was on the cover of *Fortune* magazine with the headline, “How I flunked retirement.” Lee Iacocca, this icon of American industry, this economic giant, this man who knew exactly who he was as chairman of Chrysler, was uneasy, unsure, and somewhat lost in retirement. While he developed habits of work, he seemingly neglected other virtues important to his personhood. As John Ruskin puts it, “The highest reward [or punishment] for one’s work is not what he gets from it, but what he becomes by it.” Iacocca’s work generated great achievement, impressive titles and significant wealth, but something was neglected in contributing to his whole person. Of course, one of the impressive things about Iacocca is that he had the courage and honesty to reflect in public about his failure in retirement.

The tragedy of the careerist is this: What happens when there is no source of formation, no sphere not instrumentalized to the achievement of the career, no place and time of rest? If Iacocca is any indication, the subject loses touch with the resources that give him the capacity to develop more wholly. This is why one of the most important insights in the Catholic social tradition as it relates to the businessperson is what John Paul II calls the subjective dimension of work. When we act, we affect and change objects outside or beyond ourselves. This is most evident in our work, which John Paul II calls the objective dimension of work. We are by nature a *homo faber*, a “builder of the world and maker of things.” Yet, however impressive we are as builders in communications, computerization, construction, travel, work is not simply an activity that terminates in an object. As workers, we change not only the world, but we also change ourselves, the subjective dimension of work. As a self-reflexive activity, the work we do, which includes not only the physical actions, but also the in-
intentions, motives and ends for which we work, reflects right back into ourselves — it changes me, the subject, whether I am an entrepreneur, lawyer, plumber, teacher, janitor, or nurse.

Alasdair MacIntyre sheds light on this dynamic between the subjective and objective dimensions of work by explaining that the end of farming, fishing, architecture, construction, and so forth, “when they are in good order, is never only to catch fish, or to produce beef or milk, or to build houses,” nor is it simply to make money. Work is to be ordered in such a way “that not only is there a good product, but the craftsperson is perfected through and in her or his activity…. It is from this that the sense of a craft’s dignity derives.” Of course, the fisherman who fails to catch fish is no longer a fisherman; he is broke. But his work is never fully or essentially explained by the fish caught or the money made. In other words, to explain the experience of the fisherman by his product of fish or by his remuneration is to remain on the surface of what is actually happening. As John Paul II puts it, “The sources of the dignity of work are to be sought primarily in the subjective dimension, not in the objective one.” While the objective achievements are important, they must be evaluated in terms of their impact on the person and those around her.

Work as a career and leisure as function distorts one’s moral compass by instrumentalizing leisure to the private ends of the careerist. If businesspeople are to determine the moral and spiritual direction of their businesses, then they to need create larger spheres of work and leisure. The problem with understanding one’s work only as a career is that its reality is so small that we refuse to receive and accept the greatness that God has for us in our work. One of Augustine’s confessions was the smallness of the world he created: “The house of my soul is too small for you to come to it. May it be enlarged by you.” We too often create such small places of work that we cannot encounter anything except our own narrow private interests. To overcome this smallness of soul, we need a largeness of work as vocation and leisure as contemplation.

II. A Christian Integration of Work and Leisure

A Vocation to Give. Within the history of the Christian tradition, the notion of vocation has been expressed in a wide variety of ways. There is still a debate today over how the word should be employed. The contemporary philosopher Lee Hardy, however, explains that there has been a growing ecumenical convergence between Protestant and Catholic theology on understanding
vocation, particularly with the development of John Paul II’s social teaching.24

There are a variety of ways in which John Paul II uses the term vocation: a universal call to holiness, a state of life (priestly, religious and lay), marriage, and work. In order to understand work and in particular business as a vocation, we need to see our vocation first in terms of our universal call to be human, and in terms of our state of life. This broader sense of vocation captures the moral and spiritual foundations of our vocation to give, which is necessary to understand our vocation in the way in which we do our work and business.

The word vocation comes from the Latin *vocare* which means “to call,” and particularly for John Paul II, this call is to give of oneself. Our first call to give is not to our work, but to be fully human, to be who we were created to be.25 Throughout his papacy, John Paul II would often quote *Gaudium et spes*: Because the person is made in God’s image one “cannot fully find himself except through a sincere gift of himself.” We are made in such a way that our happiness as human beings is found in giving ourselves to others and the other. This essential dimension of gift is revealed in the book of Genesis. John Paul II explains that “[w]hen God says ‘It is not good that man should be alone’ (Gen 2:18), he affirms that ‘alone,’ man does not completely realize this essence. He realizes it only by existing ‘with someone’ — and even more deeply and completely — by existing ‘for someone.’”26 Created in God’s image, we are made for communion by giving ourselves to others, which is the basis to our development. The very essence of our humanity is found at this profound level of giving ourselves.

In other words, we are at our best not when we are taking, or calculating our interests, or maximizing our utilities, or shouting claims of freedom, but when we give of ourselves. This vocation to be human is a call that is heard by the sheer fact that we are created, which makes it a universal call for all humanity. God calls all people out of nothing and chaos and into being, into a relationship with Him and all others who have been created. This call, this voice of creation, reveals to us that a core dimension of our identity as individuals is found in our relationships and in our gift of ourselves to others. This is not a reality we can deny, unless we want to deny ourselves. This dynamic of self-gift is a natural law of sorts, for if we break it, we break ourselves. Or, in more Christian eschatological terms, “We actually become, eternally, what we have given ourselves to.”27 This is why the vocation to be human is specified in *Lumen gentium* (1964) as a “universal call to holiness,” that are lives are ultimately marked by our self-gift to God and to others.28
The second dimension of our call is to a state of life, which John Paul II, following the Church’s tradition, describes in terms of the religious, priestly, and lay states. This dimension has a long and complicated history within the Church, which again cannot be examined here. What I can say about these states is that they express a differentiation of how this vocation of gift, this universal call to love and holiness, is lived out. Unfortunately, in the past, the temptation in the Catholic tradition was to relegate the lay state to simply obeying commandments, divorcing this state of life from the radical call to holiness and love found in the beatitudes. Throughout his papacy, John Paul II sought to dispel this form of legalism and minimalism for the laity in the Catholic Church. In *Christifideles laici* (Lay Christian Faithful, 1988), he explains that “[t]he vocation to holiness must be recognized and lived by the lay faithful, not as an undeniable and demanding obligation, but as a shining example of the infinite love of the Father that has regenerated them in His own life of holiness.” Or as Hans Urs von Balthasar puts it, “Love does not inquire how far it must go, but how far it may go.” In the past, the lay state was often understood in static terms, as though understanding the commandments was a dried-up, legal, single interpretation. While one may come to obedience of the commandments in duty, if one does begin to move to love, such obedience leads to rigidity, minimalism, and legalism. Simply obeying the commandments easily turn into duties, which turn into a love grown cold. This static view of the lay state prevented a rich notion of gift to animate the lives of laity, especially their marriages and their work. While I do not have time to explore John Paul II’s contribution to marriage and sexuality, his development of the theology of the body is all about the self-gift necessary to understand the profound vocation of marriage.

John Paul II’s use of vocation overcomes a long-time tendency in the Catholic Church to restrict a calling to only the priestly and religious states of life. His use of the term also corrects a tendency in the Church to describe work as only a means to serve the vocation of marriage and the family, losing its wider social contribution to the world. He is concerned about a danger within the Church of failing to speak meaningfully to a sphere of life that can take up to a third to a half of our waking hours. To relegate work to only an individual realm of achievement understood as a career is to evacuate work of its moral and spiritual power, a power that can humanize and even sanctify people.

John Paul II described this incarnational view of faith and work as the “gospel of work,” which situates work in terms of salvation history, of creation,
sin, and redemption/sanctification. The first dimension of this gospel of work is creation. In his encyclical letter on work, *Laborem exercens*, he writes that, from the very beginning of creation, the person “is called to work.” This call is particularly expressed in “the biblical calling to ‘subdue the earth,’” which reflects a profound insight about human work. Precisely because we are made in God’s image, our work is called to participate in “the very action of the Creator of the universe.” God’s creation is not only a one-time event, but an unfolding process in which we have been asked to participate in God’s command to us to have dominion through the work we do. By putting to use the wealth of spiritual and material resources given to us by our Creator toward not simply our self-interested ends, but toward the good of others, we can contribute to the progress of society and our own development by allowing all people to participate in this dominion.

The second dimension of a gospel of work is the fallen character of work. As a worker himself (a quarry worker, a factory worker, an actor, a teacher, a pastor), John Paul is aware of the pain, toil, monotony, and suffering of work. Work is a fallen reality and its command for dominion leads easily to exploitation. He speaks about those without work, those without living wages, those who cannot enjoy the fruits of dominion, and those who work in subhuman conditions. These are injustices precisely because they create obstacles that prevent people from living out their vocation. Their disorder is revealed by an original created order. These unjust disorders create an overwhelming burden for people, especially those who are unskilled and poor.

The third dimension is that work, especially the suffering that comes from work and the alleviation of that suffering, can be a participation in Christ’s redeeming/sanctifying mission. Because of sin, we suffer and cause suffering at work. Our identity is particularly linked to our response to this suffering; for suffering will make us either bitter or better, but it will never leave us the same. As with all suffering, our toil at work can be an opportunity for deep sanctification if our suffering participates in the cross of Christ’s love for us. This participation in Christ’s redemption, expressed through the cross, deepens our sensitivity to those who suffer around us. When we share in the sufferings of others, we imitate Christ’s emptying of himself for the sake of friendship. We cannot, then, have an authentic vocation to our work unless we understand the sufferings of those in the workplace: those who suffer from disrespect, sub-living wages, dehumanizing job processes, layoffs, as well as from their own personal problems of depression, despair, and other ailments. As Christ seeks
our good by suffering on the cross, we must seek the good of others by taking
on their sufferings. This is an essential element of our vocation in our work.
Our vocation to work must be shaped by deep charity and expansive justice that
aim to alleviate as much suffering as possible in the workplace by developing a
“disciplined sensitivity” to the sufferings of others.40 It is in being connected to
the sufferings of others that our deepest sanctification can occur at work.

What this theological vision of work, this gospel of work, this vocation to
work, is orienting us toward is a way of giving ourselves at work according to our
created and redeemed reality. We do not work only for ourselves, but also for
others, such as our family, community, nation, humanity, and God. This is why
John Paul II writes that work “constitutes one of the fundamental dimensions
of [our] earthly existence and of [our] vocation,” because our work can be a
participation in the ongoing creation and redemption of the world, a work that
allows us to exercise our gifts in service to this end.

It is precisely within this theological vision of gift that our fundamental
moral principles of work are human dignity and the common good. We should
see people not as human capital, but with human dignity. People are not instru-
ments for our advancement, but because they are created in the image of God,
destined for the Kingdom, we are to treat them with dignity. We should also
see our own goods as not merely private but as common goods. In Western
culture, we tend to see property as a so-called private choice, where the use of
the property is determine by personal preferences within the limits of the law.
Yet as Augustine pointed out, the word private comes from privation, a certain
loss of meaning or substance. To understand our property, our companies, our
choices, our religion only in private terms is to refuse to recognize its inher-
ent spiritual giftedness as well as its social usefulness. These principles, along
with other principles expressed in the Catholic social tradition such as participa-
tion, subsidiarity, universal destination for material goods, priority of labor over
capital, solidarity with the poor, protection of the environment, help to guide in
more specific ways our vocation within organizational life.

Yet, as profound and as meaningful as our vocation to give at work is, we still
have a problem. Or at least, I have a problem, especially in terms of developing
a so-called “moral compass” at work. When I give of myself at work or at home
for that matter, I often experience certain dysfunctional characteristics. I become
resentful in my giving. I find myself whining, “why am I doing all the work,
why am I doing all the sacrificing in this relationship, why aren’t they giving as
much as I am giving, why is this an 80-20 relationship,” and so forth. I often
feel unappreciated wondering why my colleagues do not recognize my contributions. I feel a heavy duty that has lost a generous spirit that tends to lead to a victimization syndrome. This victimization then leads to resentment, which not only neutralizes the power of giving, but actually works against me, producing burnout and exhaustion. My work is no longer a place of development and sanctification, but of dis-formation. The initial moral good that comes from my giving eventually gives way to a cynicism that changes the giving into a taking.

What we find is that we cannot give what we have not received. As the Latin proverb puts its, *nemo dat quod non habet*: “Nobody gives what he does not have.” While we have found that there is a law of gift, there is also a law of receptivity. In other words, in order for us to give rightly, we need to be able to receive rightly. Or, to restate the thesis stated at the beginning of this paper, in order to get work right, we need to get leisure right, but leisure not as function or amusement, but as contemplation, as receptivity. We not only need to know how to give at work, to understand our vocation to work, but we need to know how to receive the world and God. This, in many respects, is a tougher challenge in not only developing a moral compass, but in sustaining as well as purifying it.

**Leisure as Contemplation: Habits of Receptivity.** Leisure as contemplation is a different kind of activity than work. Its structure is not an achievement on our part, but a “receivement” where we lay ourselves bare to accept what God wants of us. This receptivity creates a contemplative outlook that does “not presume to take possession of reality but instead accepts it as a gift, discovering in all things the reflection of the Creator and seeing in every person his living image.” It is a receptivity that is ever new, unpredictable, never settled, and has the capacity to surprise us, to cause us wonder as well as fear that we will have to change our ways in thought and action. This is why the person “comes in the profoundest sense to himself not through what he does but through what he accepts” not through what he achieves, but what he receives. The reason why this receptivity is so profound, so surprising, so wonderful, so fearful in our lives is because what is received is not a belief or a moral code but a Person, Jesus Christ, whose death and resurrection invites us into a relationship that overcomes our sinful and self-absorbed character.

This primacy of receptivity or acceptance does not resign us to passivity, leaving us in some idle state. This graced receptivity orders us to pattern our lives in accordance with this graced relationship. Stanley Hauerwas explains that “at the very center of the Christian’s belief about what God has done for him is the affirmation of the change that makes in the believer; a change that
not only reorients his understanding of his existence, but a change that makes for radical reorientation of his character and conduct.”44 This graced receptivity creates in us a centeredness that “alone makes it possible to do the things of this world in a spirit of responsibility, yet at the same time in an uncramped, cheerful, free way, and to put them at the service of redemptive love.”45

This act or habit of receivement is difficult for those of us brought up on a heavy dose of careerism, athleticism, and other forms of achievements. Ultimately, it is an act of humility in the recognition that I have to take my “turn to be worked upon.” There is something that I do not have, and, no matter how hard I work to achieve through skill development and career planning, I will never get work right, unless I can receive.

It is precisely in our refusal to receive that we find ourselves in so much trouble. When we take by force those things that should only be received, we violate the divine image inherent within us. This refusal to receive is found in our origins, in the story of the fall of Adam and Eve, when God commands them not to eat “of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.” The moral law is given by God, which we can only receive. The moral compass must have at its core a magnate that receives a force outside of itself. We cannot take it, manipulate it, or create it; we can only accept it.46 If we take and achieve when we should instead be accepting and receiving, we distort our place within God’s order, and our actions will increasingly be characterized by alienation, distrust, and ultimately despair.

There are few better than Nietzsche (Ayn Rand might be another) to explain the person who cannot receive. His “noble man” or “superman” is one who regards “himself as determining values… he creates values.”47 This notion of the person as only creative, active, and constructive distorts the place of the person within the cosmos, as well as overrates the role of work within his life. This is why leisure as contemplation, as receptivity, as grace, must have a certain primacy for our work to be ordered to its proper end.48 It is in leisure that we begin to understand that the human situation “calls not for a resolve but for a rescue,” a rescue that can only be received.

To be more concrete on what receivement looks like, we can describe leisure in terms of habits of receptivity. The first is the habit of solitude, of silence, not only external noiselessness, but a ceasing of our emotional internal tapes that have been playing for years, where we can hear again the wisdom that “deafens every fool.” A common experience for most people is that we become scattered as we move into the world of activity, and we lose a certain center, which causes
within us a loss of sight of who we are. Our activity from our work, our families, our community, and so forth, no matter how good they are, can cause a diffusion of the self. The scattering generates a whole series of emotional tapes that often center on our achievements or lack thereof: of the illusions of grandeur of who I think I am; the feelings of the unappreciated genius; the debate scenarios with one’s nemesis; the award speeches for recognition; the pretend heroism. Our emotional tapes, as Thomas Keating calls them, mask the conditions of our reality and create a false image of ourselves.\(^49\) It is often our tapes, our endless monologues within our minds that prevent us from a deep rest, because the tape perpetuates the restlessness of the restless heart.

Unfortunately, our leisure as functionality or as amusement perpetuates this fragmentation by deterring us from reality. This is why Josef Pieper’s warns that “unless we substitute true leisure for our hectic amusements, we will destroy our culture and ourselves.”\(^50\) Yet, no matter how hard we try to absorb ourselves in leisure as amusements and function, there are certain forms of leisure that force us to face more honestly our place in creation: death of loved ones, sickness, significant failure and disappointment, broken marriages, addiction, and so forth. These are often forced moments of leisure, but leisure nonetheless. These rather dramatic moments in our lives silence our internal tapes, at least for a while, but too often these moments pass and we forget their significance. This is why the habit of silence is the power of the soul to receive reality as it is, not only on occasion, but to live it in every aspect of one’s life. When we stop our tapes on a daily basis, we create the conditions that allow the freedom of God’s Word to speak its full force to us. It is here that we see the deepest form of silence, and it’s most profound fruit is prayer, a silence that stills the mind and heart and opens the person to God.

The second habit is celebration, and in particular Sabbath. The Sabbath is not merely a day at the end of the week, the weekend, nor is it the “mop up” day in which to complete unfinished projects from week, but it is “a holy day,” God’s day, where we receive through Word, sacrament, leisure, rest, silence, etc. the meaning of our existence, including our work activity. Abraham Heschel explains that “the solution of mankind’s most vexing problem will not be renouncing technical civilization, but in attaining some degree of independence of it.”\(^51\) We are commanded to rest because our capacity to develop as subjects cannot be found only in work. Ultimately, this is why careerism fails, because it marginalizes and instrumentalizes all forms of leisure it comes in contact with: education becomes training, Sabbath becomes a catch-up day,
holy days become vacation days.\textsuperscript{52}

Although it has suffered much damage in recent years the Sabbath is still one of the most powerful signs in our market economy that production and consumption do not own us. It can provide one of the few times and spaces in one’s week which the person is not defined principally as a worker or a consumer, but as human, as created and redeemed. Actually, to be only a worker or consumer is an eventual process of dehumanization, because by themselves working and consuming preoccupy us with limited ends. The Sabbath is necessary for our own humanization, if it is characterized by a celebratory dimension of a festival in which we receive and affirm our end as fundamentally good.

The Sabbath is not, however, an escape from work. In a paradoxical manner, it is only in our detachment from work that we see our deepest meaning of work. Benedict XVI explains this connection by stating “that the biblical teaching on work finds its coronation in the commandment to rest.”\textsuperscript{53} To rest in God is not to escape one’s work, but rather an invitation to live out in our work “in a new way — as a consequence of a light which allows one to appreciate that this existence has divine dimensions which previously had been hidden.”\textsuperscript{54} Worship, particularly in terms of its sacramental meaning, is not an escape from the world, “rather it is the arrival at a vantage point from which we can see more deeply into the reality of the world.”\textsuperscript{55} This sacramental/incarnational view of worship reveals that spirit pervades materiality, grace perfects nature, and worship makes one’s work holy. This is why in the Catholic tradition the Eucharist is the most profound expression of Sabbath. It is where we see most deeply and most profoundly “the work of human hands;” the bread and wine are transformed into the real presence that has the power to redeem the world.\textsuperscript{56}

The third habit is the habit of service, of going to the margins. Unlike the other two habits, this habit of service seems more like work than like leisure, yet to be with those who on the surface cannot do anything for us, can actually be a most profound experience of receptivity. Jean Vanier explains that “[i]f we remain at the level of ‘doing’ something for people, we can stay behind our barriers of superiority.” We share most deeply with people when we are with them, especially those who are most vulnerable and marginalized.\textsuperscript{57} To be with those who on all appearances cannot do anything for us are precisely those who can do more for us than we can for them. As Benedict XVI explains, “those who are in a position to help others will realize that in doing so they themselves receive help; being able to help others in no merit or achievement of their own. This duty is grace.”\textsuperscript{58}
While there are more habits to be examined, the point is hopefully clear that without these forms or habits of receptivity, we cannot see clearly our vocation in work because we cannot receive the vision and character the Lord wants to give us. Without habits of receptivity, we increasingly become self-satisfied with what we already know and our hearing becomes further blunted by our emotional internal tapes.

**Integration: Integrity.** When we can see our work as a vocation and leisure as contemplation, we have the ingredients for real integrity, where the roots of its meaning are exposed. In Latin, integrity comes from *integritas*, where we get the word “integer,” a whole number. Integrity is about being whole, the ability to order the parts of our lives that overcome our division and leads us to become whole human beings. It is not only about balancing work and leisure. While balance can be helpful toward integration by preventing our spending too much time in either work or leisure, by itself balance can actually perpetuate and even strengthen the divisions and gaps in our lives. Balance can leave unchallenged the fragmentation that occurs from living different parts of our lives for different ends. It can also foster a privatized faith that fails to provide a thoroughly transcendent and comprehensive vision of the world, and instead, balance delivers a therapeutic counsel that offers a cheap version of integrity.

This Christian vision of integrity challenges businesspeople to become not just doers or contemplatives, but contemplative practitioners, people who can first experience their being as receivers of creation, redemption, grace, (could we say justification) and who then see their work as a form of giving (could we say sanctification). This integration of work as a vocation and leisure as contemplation has an interesting connection with Jim Collins’ work on leadership, which I find one of the more consistent visions of leadership theory with what I have stated in this essay. In the *Harvard Business Review*, Collins writes about five levels of leadership and at the fifth level, where he places a small number of great leaders of American business, he explains two important characteristics. The first is resolve. These leaders work hard, they do not give up, they are tough, industrious, creative, diligent, thorough, and they are ready to make great sacrifices. This quality is actually shared with those on the fourth level. What makes fifth-level leaders different is their “humility.”

Humility for these leaders did not come from their work, but for many of them it came from their leisure. Collins explains that these fifth level leaders had significant non-work experiences that informed their notion of leadership and of work in general. For some, it was the forced leisure of a life-threaten-
ing sickness. After his near-death experience with cancer, Darwin Smith, CEO of Kimberly-Clark, developed into a level-five leader. For others it was religion. Colman Mockler, CEO of Gillette, whose conversion to Christianity while getting his MBA at Harvard significantly altered the way he managed and led. What made these two men great leaders were not only techniques and formulas from work, but a vision of leadership that came from their leisure, from events that while initially had nothing to do with their work, nonetheless transformed their work. What Collins helps us to see on a more practical level is the relationship between work, in particular leadership, and leisure. Great leaders, level-five leaders, must be able to receive (humility), otherwise they shut off an important source for great work, which is not only based on their achievement but also their receivement. Leadership cannot be isolated from the realm of leisure, otherwise, leadership loses perspective toward its end.60

**Conclusion: What does it take to foster a vocation within business?**

If Collins is correct that great leaders in business are significantly formed within the realm of culture, then what does this tell us about the role of leisure in the formation of business leaders? The three great institutional sources of culture and of leisure are family, religion, and education. They play a crucially important role in the formation of business leaders as well as all workers. Without the formation of business leaders by family, religion, and education, particularly in terms of work as a vocation and leisure as contemplation, we are left with only the law and a thin moral reasoning of enlightened self-interest to guide businesspeople in an intensive competitive global economy. Without a morally and spiritually informed culture, it is unrealistic to think that law and self-interest can resist the corrosive competitive pressures intensified by globalization. Without robust and healthy cultural institutions of family, religion and education, our ability to develop a moral compass in business is compromised precisely because the cultural institutions that give support to leisure serve as the seedbed in which the moral formation of future business leaders take place.

While there is much to be said about family and churches in the formation of business leaders, I would like to conclude this paper with a discussion on the role of the university and in particular the Christian university in the formation of business leaders for tomorrow. What I want to propose in these concluding remarks is what kind of Christian business education is necessary to provide a moral compass in our globalized world. I propose four distinct but overlapping integrating dimensions that serve as a distinctive Christian vision of business education. This integrative understanding of life will entail the integral con-
nection of faith and reason, virtue and *techne*, vocation and work, and business and society. If Christian universities do not recapture its particular religious and moral mission in education, they will become a trade school without any moral or spiritual authority.

**Business Education as Liberal Arts: Integration of Faith and Reason.** One of the radical claims of a Christian university education is that it will provide the student with “*a higher synthesis of knowledge.*”61 A principal characteristic of this higher synthesis is an engagement and integration of faith and reason. The unique character of a Christian university is to nurture reason’s inquiry toward ultimacy and Christian faith’s desire of a “comprehensive experience in understanding,”62 This relationship between faith and reason is characterized by a complementarity where faith enhances reason, it does not replace it, where grace perfects nature, it does not destroy it, and where reason enriches faith, preventing it from fideism and superstition and deepens the implications of faith in the world. Yet, the realization of this complementarity between faith and reason and faith and business will always entail a complex tension between rethinking and rediscovering its relationships. There will be collisions, tensions, and confusions between faith and business, but at a Christian university, there is a confidence that their engagement will, in the end, produce a higher synthesis of knowledge and wisdom that is at the heart of a mission-driven, Christian business education.

Business education as an extension of the liberal arts is first and foremost a serious engagement with reason. It seeks a reasonable way to do a thing, and creates in the student the habit of discerning why the thing is done. Reason within business education at a Christian university will be concerned with the instrumental rationality of how to get things done. It also should have built within its curriculum an encounter with a moral rationality that engages the business student in the deeper questions of business: the nature of the human person, property, and work or profession; the difference between wants and needs; the role of business within society; the basis of contracts; the purpose of the corporation. In other words, a business school should not be simply a training ground on how something is done, but also an education on why things are done.

When reason is not hijacked by its instrumental and empirical dimensions and is allowed to express itself fully, it naturally leads to questions of ultimacy and faith. One of the interesting phenomena within business education and business itself in the 1980s and 1990s was that as business ethics began to expand, this
opened up for people to take more seriously the role spirituality and deeper questions of ultimacy played within business. Such questions of faith, spirituality and theology began to be seen as relevant and complementary to the practical dimensions of business.

**Business Education as Practical Wisdom: Integrating Virtue and Technique.** Reason helps business education to see itself as a formation in practical wisdom, which is at the heart of seeing business as a profession. Warren Bennis and James O’Toole, in a highly critical article on business education in the *Harvard Business Review* (“How Business Schools Lost Their Way”), explained that business schools have adopted a model of academic excellence that reflects a scientific model “predicated on the faulty assumption that business is an academic discipline like chemistry or geology when, in fact, business is a profession and business schools are professional schools.” This model of business has increased the specialization within the disciplines of business, fostering more detailed explanations of the various functions of business, but it has intensified the silo effect of the academy. This scientific model within business trains students to think compartmentally and does not prepare them to see the whole, especially as it relates to the social and moral character of human relationships, and ignores what is at the heart of professional understanding of business. That is practical wisdom, which entails technical competence, a rich moral end and practical experience. When business education adopts a scientific over a professional model, it reduces itself to technical training and fails to engage the student in a deeper understanding of the practice of business.

Practical wisdom, within the larger Christian moral tradition, is the premier cardinal virtue for professionals. It is the integration of moral ends with the proper means of the business. It enables the student to apply the broad and general truths of reason, the world, and humanity to the concrete details of one’s work within business. None other than a prudent person can be just, because to will the end of justice demands that one is able to recognize and will the proper means to attain such an end. The entrepreneur, for example, who wants to pay his employees a just wage, must also find sustainable means to make it happen.

**Business Education Exploring Vocation: Integration of Faith and Work.** I have argued in this paper that one of the more serious errors of the modern era is the divided life. One contributory dimension to this compartmentalization is a departmental structure within universities and the isolation of disciplines from each other, equipping students for what Gustavo Gutierrez criti-
cizes as “a peaceful coexistence of privatized faith within a secularized world.”

As John Paul II explained “[t]he segmentation of knowledge with its splintered approach to truth and consequent fragmentation of meaning, keeps people today from coming to an interior unity.” To overcome this privatized coexistence and foster an interior unity, Christian universities must educate their students in a vocation and not merely a career. They must draw upon resources that are robust enough to engage the student in the universal call to holiness, a discernment of their state of life, and their vocation to business. While courses in ethics and programs in service-learning are helpful, they are often not strong enough to challenge this human and, in particular, modern problem of compartmentalization, and some even foster it; nor are such courses and programs theologically rich enough to engage the student in a conversation about his or her vocation.

**Business Education Serving to the World: Integrating Business and the Needs of the Poor.** Business’ principal service to the world is creating and distributing wealth through producing needed products and services, creating good jobs, paying just wages, contributing reasonable taxes, making a fair profit, and so forth. A corporation is not as responsible for the common good as the state is. Business’ principal task is not solving social ills per se. A business contributes to the common good as a business, which means that profits, efficiency, innovation, quality and productivity need to be disciplined and constantly improving. These are significant services to society. One merely needs to look at places where businesses are not flourishing to see its contribution to the common good.

Yet, as business performs these services, “serious contemporary problems in areas such as the dignity of human life, the promotion of justice for all, the quality of personal and family life, the protection of nature, the search for peace and political stability, a more just sharing in the world’s resources” arise in the very actions of business. Business is an inherently social enterprise constantly impacting families, communities, nations, and the global community. Business education should form students to see the “expanding chain of solidarity” in which business operates, but not at the expense of its service as a business.

Not to take this “expanding chain of solidarity” into consideration can have devastating consequences, especially for the poor. Clement of Alexandria in a famous homily asked “*Quis dives salvetur*?” Who among the rich can be saved? Clement’s question is a primer for the Christian understanding of wealth. It reminds with prophetic force that the Gospel does not treat wealth in its own
right, but rather whether it serves persons or leads to human ruin.”67 Clement’s question should haunt the halls of every Christian university, especially its business schools. With businesspeople as the principal wealth creators and distributors in our society, a Christian business education worthy of its name must take seriously the enduring duty of the Christian faith and ask: How can its business education develop a “disciplined sensitivity” to the needs of our world, especially those who are marginalized from wealth and its benefits? Does such an education form students in a business practice where those who suffer are given special consideration? Does such an education focus only on a disciplinary practice that simply maximizes wealth producing practices?

The Christian university, like the business leader, faces serious pressures to divide itself and live in parallel universes. Yet, as I have argued in this paper, integrity is the ability to integrate those things that make it wholly consistent with itself. For the Christian university, this is where students receive not two types of education, but one that enables the student to live with great integrity. As a cultural institution, its education must reflect an understanding of leisure that fosters the habits of receptivity that enables faculty, staff, and students to see the whole. These four means of integration begin to achieve the integrity of a Christian business education, creating the conditions for students to address in a sustained and profound way the integrity of faith, virtue, vocation, and service as a businessperson. If Christian universities can educate highly principled global business leaders who can integrate the complexities of running a business with the radical call to love in the gospel, a stronger moral compass will operate in today’s businesses where conditions will be created to foster the develop of people.
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Response to Naughton

John Gallagher

On Tuesday, October 16, 2007 an article “It Doesn’t Have to Be All Business” appeared in the business section of the *New York Times*. The author is Sharon McDonnell. Here are the first few lines.

As work is increasingly making inroads into leisure time, many business travelers are finding ways to turn that equation around – combining their travel for work with time for cultural and historic sightseeing. “Cultural tourism can be an extension of business, its not just fluff,” said Patricia Martin, a marketing consultant and author of *Ren Gen: Renaissance Generation* (Platinum Press, 2007). “Today, a person’s knowledge is the new currency, and travel and cultural experiences are two of the most enlightening things they can do, enabling them to bring new information and insights into the workplace.”

Her book describes the rise of what she calls the “cultural consumer,” who joins book clubs, attends concerts and shows a renewed enthusiasm for learning, largely fueled by the Internet and a convergence of business with the arts, education, and entertainment.1

While this could almost sound fabricated, it is the dilemma Dr. Naughton puts before us in his challenging paper. With the New York Times attesting to such commonly held sentiments about work and leisure, and the “instrumentalizing” of all things to work, I believe that he has framed the discussion correctly. In answer to the question about finding a moral compass in a global world, he presents us the case of a business leader, arguably a fitting choice since business and markets are among the principle shapers of our current global world and about which considerable skepticism abounds in regards to morality.

Let me try to summarize Dr. Naughton’s argument. We are divided creatures (by nature or will) in a divided world, and so our lives are compartmentalized. Finding a moral compass requires that we recognize and confront this divide. Confronting this divide includes the intellectual recognition that it exists and the forms and shapes in which it exists. One of the dominant forms in which it exists and in which we experience it is in our work and in our leisure. In this instance, confronting the divide requires not just the intellectual recognition that it exists but also a different understanding – a new cognition, as it were – new answers to the questions, “what is work, and what is leisure?”2 This is Naughton’s matrix.3
The confrontation also includes a sort of cognitive reordering by insisting that leisure is primary. The prescription to get leisure right is a way of acknowledging and confronting the division. In fact, it seems to me the heart of the confrontation. And finally, finding a moral compass includes acting on this new knowledge, this new understanding, this reordering. The actions are the habits of leisure as so indicated; solitude, celebration, and service. These have profound implications for our culture and the sources of culture and for liberal arts education.

Taken as a whole these are the ingredients for integrity and an argument that such integrity is the key to a moral compass. However, this is integrity of a particular character. One, it is fully formed by the Catholic intellectual tradition and Catholic social teaching and two, it is in contrast to the conceptions of integrity as a character trait that we commonly find in the management literature. Rather than trust or dependability, here, integrity is a life long project, a way of being.

I would like in this response to accomplish three things. One, I want to provide some additional reflection on the Catholic intellectual tradition and Catholic social teaching. Two, I want to try to place these prescriptions for business leaders in the management literature. And three, I want to suggest two questions for further discussion.

Catholic social teaching flows out of a Catholic understanding of the nature of reality. Naughton asserts much from this tradition through extensive citing of papal encyclicals and the work of numerous scholars who are engaged in and with this tradition. It is not my intention to comment point by point on these since he is more expert about the particulars in the encyclicals and the church’s teaching on the subject of work and labor. Rather I would like to try to place the tradition upon which he draws in a larger context, in the hope that we might all draw upon it more fully.

When we speak of a conversation framed by the twin pillars of faith and the liberal arts, I suggest we begin at the very core, the very center of this faith. At this core is not creed, nor dogma, nor doctrine, nor hierarchy, but a being who contains all that there is, and outside of whom there is nothing. A being who is in search of us, has revealed himself to us, has become one of us, who will be with us always, and who is constantly reconciling us to himself. But despite all this – his continuing engagement, involvement, participation, and indeed, his very presence among us – he remains a mystery. For the spending of our best efforts, understanding, insights and collective wisdom, and our shared experiences, we are left seriously underinformed.
The faith is our collective encounter with this being. Billions of us across time and space have experiences of this encounter. Indeed, all of reality is just such an encounter, whether that is through a microscope, a novel, an algorithm, a trip abroad, a service engagement, our families, education or work. But each individual encounter is a new insight, a new piece of data. Through all of time and even now, we share these experiences with each other, and we tell each other our stories. And we reflect, ponder, discuss, debate, argue, and teach. This is our intellectual tradition. It is not without error. But the error is ours. We reach wrong conclusions, wrong interpretations. We can even fabricate stories of our encounters; indeed we can fabricate the experience itself.

The Catholic intellectual tradition is exactly this sort of collective reflection on and probing of our encounter with this being. As Naughton has pointed out in his paper, the collective reflection is far more than any single encyclical; it is the continuing and ongoing reflection on this encounter, through time and by individuals and communities. When we speak of Christianity as a narrative, or a culture, as Christopher Dawson suggested, or as lived experience, this is what we mean.

Catholic social teaching flows from this tradition, a vast, rich, intellectual effort to understand this collective encounter. It too is a continuing reflection, but in some ways might be better characterized as the faith’s collision with modernity. How to make sense of the vast social changes wrought by the industrial revolution and the changes in patterns of work and production and consumption? How to address the challenges of globalization?

Two further points are needed at this juncture. First, note that this social teaching, this reflection, is primarily a pursuit of justice, and it can never refuse to turn its reflective eye on itself. Second, all of its ponderings eventually begin and end in its fundamental understanding of human dignity. As Benedict has said, we all have, and share, an experience of creation. What he means is that everything that is, flows from this being who contains all, who authors all, and so contains us. Apart from him, we do not exist. Upon this belief rests our own dignity and worth, and the only basis for mutual respect. There can be no other, for any bases we develop are ultimately not possessed by everyone and thus, in the end, are divisive. Naughton brings collective insight from this tradition to his argument. But, to my second point: given that he has set his argument in the context of a global business leader, does he in any way present challenges to mainstream management thinking?

The scholarly literature on leadership is vast, and the popular literature even
more so. In it leadership is the holy grail of management. In both cases, the 
an academic and the practitioner literature are, in my view, mostly devoted to 
understanding, explaining, describing the exercise of power. Here we will find 
discussion about leadership trait theory, leader-member exchange theory, path-goal theory, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and contingency theory. It is about doing. Integrity has a place in this literature. But most commonly, it takes its place, perhaps the highest place, among a list of character traits the possession of which is required for any leadership success. In contrast to Naughton I might place Jim Collins’ work here as well.

There are some management scholars, and of growing number, who recognize and wrestle with the moral dimension of leadership. These might include Chester Barnard, and his emphasis on moral purpose, or Peter Drucker, or Henry Mintzberg, who is also a proponent of the necessity for moral reflection as the basis for leadership formation. The late Sumantra Ghoshal has done some provocative work on the moral contract between business and society. I would include here those scholars who are working in the spirituality in the workplace arena, or what some refer to as the “Faith at Work” movement, such as Robert Greenleaf, Joseph Badaracco, Margaret Benefiel and David Whytes. These are less about doing and more about being, and in that sense Naughton’s argument belongs here.

Finally, I have two questions about areas in which I would like to know more. We need to know more about “receivement.” It sounds suspiciously to me like grace. I mean that in the best sense, but Mary Catherine Hilkert reminds us of the importance of naming grace, that is, pointing to the power and presence of God when we see it. We also need to know more about the implications for the formation of current business leaders. There are legions out there without the benefit of formation in the cultural and education environment you propose. If I may return to the Times article with which I began: how do we keep from being “just fluff?”
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Response to Naughton
Scott Henson

Dr. Naughton reminds us that in our rapidly globalizing world, morality involves both individual behaviors and personal choices as well as socially-meaningful decisions. Finding a moral compass is a deeply personal dilemma, but it is also a task rooted in community. Drawing from Catholic social thought and tradition, Naughton situates personal moral choices in the realm of communal experience and reflection. His insight informed by a life of study and personal commitment to a rich moral tradition accentuates the considerable scholarship presented in his paper. Naughton provides a well-constructed model based in Catholic teaching yet accessible to a broader audience through appeals to reason and shared social norms. Based on a solid foundation of Catholic scholarship, deep reflection, and community experience, Naughton is positioned to speak to a much larger context. The opportunity to apply principled arguments combined with rigorous thought to a broad social context is an exciting prospect for his work. The challenge for Naughton is to translate moral precepts founded in the individual and based in a particular community to moral insight at a collective global level.

Naughton’s ideas are focused on vocation and principled leadership. Globalization particularly in the commercial and economic realms is characterized by complexity and competition. Naughton begins his discourse by recognizing the challenges that confront business leaders in today’s turbulent and accelerated business environment. Failures in business leadership and lack of effective oversight make business prone to abuses and in need of ethical and moral grounding. The growing divide between the pressures of a highly competitive work environment and human aesthetic and moral values is a central theme. Naughton deftly negotiates the boundaries between work and the rest of life in terms of spiritual values. Naughton attacks the notion that human life should be divided between the sacred and secular, private and professional, or work and leisure. Naughton’s focus on the unity of life and wholeness of human nature is not a new concept, but his historical and philosophical recitation is concise and instructive. Alasdair MacIntyre, a frequent reference in Naughton’s work, is a good example of scholarship in this tradition.1 MacIntyre traces the idea of virtue manifested in human unity all the way back to Aristotelian philosophy. Interweaving Church teaching and biblical illustrations with philoso-
phy, common sense and logic, Naughton makes a compelling argument for the healthiness of a non-compartmentalized life. The need for holistic understanding is presented most prominently in Naughton’s discussion of work and leisure.

Naughton develops many avenues of investigation into the areas of vocation, work, and leisure. A focus on the more nuanced and unique perspectives may be most useful in response to Naughton’s expansive treatment of the topic. Addressing the classical argument concerning the “good”, Naughton points to the essential quality of self-replication. The “good” in Naughton’s opinion is not limited to a single act or consequence. Manifestations of good reproduce themselves in their affect. “Good” is reproductive in the sense that its impact is transferable and contagious. The concept of globalization in all its complexity and enormity can easily overwhelm any sense of individual agency. Thinking of personal morality as the starting point for a greater replicating good is an encouraging concept.

Naughton also re-evaluates workplace behavior and tasks. Challenging the notion that work is primarily intended to produce a good or service valued by its commercial price, Naughton describes work as a self-reflexive process or subjective dimension of work that is valued more by the impact it makes on the worker than on customers and colleagues. A job has intrinsic value to change and shape the character of the person engaged in the work. Indicators of success determined by the market such as wealth, prestige, and promotion are only one aspect of the value of work. Naughton argues that goal-oriented career motivations may not be the most satisfying approach to work and do not foster a sense of balance between work and leisure.

Another interesting aspect in Naughton’s discussion of principled work is the development of grace as a foundational concept. Usually reserved for deeply personal issues of faith, grace as described by Naughton in terms of “receivement” is an insightful perspective on work and leisure. The humility to accept help and wisdom from others is key to producing consistent value for others. As Naughton points out, we will not get work right until we get leisure right. This simple yet profound wisdom reminds us that we cannot adequately meet the needs and demands of others unless our own tanks are being filled. “Receivement” is the act that completes the cycle of work and leisure making the process perpetually possible.

Naughton provides several other complementary insights into societal issues that are grounded in the basic idea of unity of human experience such as profound integration of work and leisure, sustainability through workable strate-
gies, environmental conservation as dominion stewardship not exploitation, and unity of knowledge in academia. It is Naughton’s skill at combining so many integral concepts and ideas into the basic premise of principled vocation that makes his work so valuable at many levels.

Naughton’s challenge in describing a moral compass in a global world is to move from the personal and specific to the universal and general. Naughton’s research stands to inform a broad application of morality to human work and global business. This broader application asks at least two things from Naughton’s continued research. How can the knowledge and experience of one tradition, Catholic social thought, be translated into a common social discourse? How can principles of personal morality be applied to global institutions and social structures?

The Catholic Church is a repository of much Western thought and tradition. The collective research, reflection, experience, and leadership of 2000 years in history is an invaluable resource that Naughton draws from as a deep well. The advantage for Naughton is that he is in many ways the product of this rich tradition, an insider that speaks the language and knows the culture. The diversity of Catholic thought is beyond the experience of any one person, even a good Catholic boy from Chicago, but the familiarity and sincerity in Naughton’s expressions of Catholic social teaching is so much deeper than the average reader as to make much of the insight seemingly inaccessible. Naughton does an admirable job of presenting his arguments in clear terms and related to the broad outlines of Western history (a skill even more apparent in his public presentation at the Symposium). However, there is painstaking work yet to be done to translate his intimate knowledge and understanding into a common discourse within the secular arena and even the broader Christian community. Catholic teaching has a universal quality that is distinct from many other religious traditions, and Naughton has a good foundation to build upon.

When the Pope issues statements and encyclicals, they represent a tremendous amount of forethought and debate. The weight of centuries of Catholic social teaching and practice shape the words of the man. The reality of this backdrop can be lost to those uninitiated to Church tradition. Naughton’s frequent reference to Papal pronouncements is very instructive, but the implicit wisdom they carry is not readily apparent. The formidably task of rehearsing the history and debate behind the words is eminently worthwhile. Readers would also benefit from more explanation of Catholic vocabulary and symbols. Concepts such as subsidiarity\(^2\), solidarity with the poor, and many other gen-
eral ideas but with specific meanings within the Catholic tradition need to be fully explained. This is especially true in the context of Papal statements where precision of meaning is so intentional and important. For example, Naughton with co-editor S.A. Cortright present subsidiarity as a Catholic teaching applied to business principles in their edited collection, *Rethinking the Purpose of Business*. This idea is now widely accepted in areas from the U.S. Constitution to corporate governance. Writer of the included article “Business Corporations and the Principle of Subsidiarity”, Dennis McCann, suggests in this volume that subsidiarity refers to leaving responsibility with the lesser or subordinate bodies who are best capable of performing a task rather than transferring this responsibility to higher or governing bodies. The implications of this broadly applied principle and its Catholic foundations are valuable insights for a discussion of moral traditions applicable to the global environment. A significant number of such detailed descriptions of specific terms would be too laborious for the purposes of this particular paper, yet Naughton’s continued work in this area is quite useful.

There are also areas of Catholic tradition that appear contradictory when viewed from the outside. For example, the priestly and laity dimensions of Catholic institutionalism seem to contradict Naughton’s statements about the unity of sacred and secular in the human experience. A concise explanation of Sacramental ecclesiology and Church hierarchy might be instructive. For its wealth of universal thought and application, the Catholic tradition maintains a certain parochialism that is problematic in globalization discourse. This is particularly sensitive in areas of moral universalism with a theological basis, yet it is the relevance of deep and particularistic thoughts and practice that makes them powerful and attractive. As Naughton noted in his presentation, it is the depth of our particular experiences and beliefs that enrich our connection to universal truths.

The move from a particular tradition to global application informs the need to think beyond personal morality by considering global institutions and systems. Morality has both a personal commitment and is embedded in social structure. Naughton illustrates this idea in his discussions of Catholic community and personal morality. Naughton addresses his paper to the global business leader. Leaders have personal responsibility for moral behavior, but leaders also operate within structures. The global business leader must understand and negotiate global financial institutions and economic systems. These systems operate by certain rules and presuppositions. These presuppositions raise the
question: Do systems perpetuate moral and immoral predicaments or conditions of human behavior? The answer, most notably emphasized in the Marxist and Postmodern critiques, is yes.

Karl Marx would not be surprised by the problems faced in a global capitalistic economy. Marx meticulously identified inadequacies and inequities within a capital system in creating his critique that inspired massive political movements and informs continuing academic debate. While Naughton focuses on personal morality as a central issue for principled global business, Marx insisted that the economic system is the root of business problems. Marx believed that capitalism alienates workers from their labor and exploits them in the drive to maximize profit by minimizing wages. It is the economic structure that divides the human being by separating people from the true nature and value of work and replacing it with an abstract exchange value. This is not too dissimilar to Naughton’s reference to “economism” in which human labor is valued solely on its economic purpose. Marx’s solution is not to change an individual’s moral compass, but to change the moral grounding of the entire system that he believes is fundamentally exploitative. I do not suggest that Marxism provides a moral compass for a global world, but he does highlight the undeniable structural aspects of equity and morality.

Critical theories from feminism to postmodernism challenge oppression, exploitation, and inequality at the structural level. The ability to find a moral compass in a global world depends to a great extent on reforming social institutions and systems. This is especially true in the economic area. Business leaders must examine the rules and norms of the global business environment if the quality of work experience is going to improve for the billions of workers engaged in business activity predicated on capitalism. Issues such as sweatshops, worker safety, environmental degradation, income inequality, cycles of poverty, and so forth are moral issues with systemic factors.

Naughton’s work reflects a social consciousness that engages global inequalities and reform. He suggests in his presentation four movements toward more principled work found within Catholic social thought: from human capital to human dignity, from private goods to common goods, from utility maximization to distributors of justice, and from technical analysis to seeing things in whole. These concepts have elements of personal reflection, community values, and global ethics. Naughton expands on these principles by including culture in his analysis particularly the overlap of politics and economics in the cultural context. These are interesting and useful aspects of his paper and presentation.
that merit continued work. It is commendable that Naughton provides such a thorough application of Catholic thought to global leadership at the personal level and still manages to raise related issues at the societal level. There is obviously much more opportunity for Naughton to apply his models of work and leisure to global structures and systems. Scholarship dedicated to the union of faith and learning in the academic environment will be enriched with each develop Dr. Naughton makes.


4 *The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume VIII*, “laity” describes the different roles of laity and clergy with an understanding of hierarchy based in sacramental and clerical functions of the Church.


Conclusion: Is a Kind of “Liberal Arts Theology” Needed?

Ronald A. Wells

The themes that emerged over the Symposium weekend revolved around a question: what would it mean for us look at globalization with moral eyes? And, further, what would it take for us to develop those moral eyes?

Douglas Hicks leads off the discussion by outlining what globalization is, and is not. But what ever one might say or believe about definitions of globalization, one of the greatest moral dilemmas is inequality. People are not benefiting equally by the new economic dimensions of a single world. In one way the earth may becoming “flat,” but in other ways, the barriers between peoples grow higher every day. Hicks challenges liberal arts institutions to acknowledge that fact in its educational theory and practice.

Sherry Kasper, a historian of economic thought, reminds us that Adam Smith, the father of economics and the original thinker on global trade, was not an economist in today’s sense, but a moral philosopher. Further, she surprises us by suggesting that Smith’s work was only partly a work in economics, but more importantly that it was a work in theology. This is a wonderful orientation point: theology is defined as “faith seeking understanding,” and such a viewpoint is vital to the calling of a church-related liberal arts college in answering the challenges offered by Douglas Hicks.

In contrast, the response by Tony Spiva is also instructive. He also uses the theory of comparative advantage, and acknowledges the problems of a global world’s inability to distribute its successes well. We needed Professor Spiva – a professor at a major university – among us liberal arts people for the sake of intellectual honesty. We think that the liberal arts enterprise is in itself a moral undertaking that is meant to educate young people but also be a force for the common good in society. Spiva surprised us at the Symposium by conceding that mainstream economics at the university level has few moral resources to offer. This admission bothered him – heard more in his public presentation than seen in the comments printed here – that his discipline was so intellectually bankrupt in terms of moral discourse. For him, “theology” of any kind was a long way off.

Michael Naughton’s paper makes the “theology” quotient even more explicit. He places his argument squarely within the long tradition of Catholic
social teaching. He explicates both that tradition and the bible in developing how we all might develop the calling of a moral business person to work for the common good in today’s global word. In this regard, he joins with Douglas Hicks in thinking deeply into what the liberal arts in a church-related setting might contribute.

The respondents, Scott Henson and John Gallagher, probe aspects of Naughton’s work to our benefit. Henson reminds us of Naughton’s good point that finding a moral compass for ourselves and our students is more than just an individual matter (though it surely is that) but also a communal matter in which we are responsible to others. Henson also comments on Naughton’s idea of “receivement,” and that the old adage “it is more blessed to give than to receive,” is only partly true; in fact, we will never be able to give until we learn how to receive. Gallagher takes it further and suggests that our liberal arts education cannot fully succeed in its moral calling until we are able to talk about “grace” in an open, though intellectually responsible, manner. Gallagher does so by placing Naughton’s “receivement” in an overall context of leadership theory.

This brings us back to what Douglas Hick’s said at the beginning, that we need to be intentional in our liberal arts colleges, especially the church-related ones, about being conscious of the moral dimensions of what such communities of learning do. As Sherry Kasper reminded us, this is a kind of “theology.” Now, having said that word again, one is aware that colleagues in other disciplines might well react with dismay, or at least caution, when they hear that our liberal arts colleges must become more aware of doing a kind of theology. We assure them that we do not mean the academic theology that one find’s taught solely in religion departments, theological schools, and printed in learned journals. No, by theology we mean an awareness of, and a wish to be intentional in pursuing, the role of faith – balanced by reason – in forming the questions to be asked and the sorts of answers we seek to the main questions of our time.
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