



## **Freedom, Subsidiarity, and the Spirit of Gift**

The TWELFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE on

CATHOLIC SOCIAL THOUGHT and BUSINESS EDUCATION

The EIGHTH COLLOQUIUM on CHRISTIAN HUMANISM in BUSINESS and SOCIETY

At the University of Public Service – Ludovika

Budapest, Hungary

June 23-24, 2022

---

### **Concurrent Session Abstracts**

#### **“Transforming a business model to address poverty and injustice: a case study in humanitarian response and international cooperation”**

**Dr. Alberto Andretta, Catholic Relief Services**

Rooted in Catholic Social Teaching, Catholic Relief Services is committed to the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity supporting locally-led integral human development, in partnership with local institutions and leaders. The promotion of individual and institutional agency is a “synodal process” that crafts new ways of understanding and addressing social and economic transformations, structural injustice and poverty, and that proposes new forms of fraternal and social friendship.

Our experience has taught us that CRS’ local partner organizations embrace opportunities to lead and own processes of change. Accordingly, their openness and eagerness nurture CRS’ commitment to accompany our local partners in their journey to self-reliance leading to an internal organizational transformation of our business model.

The facilitation of local capacity strengthening and leadership is a natural evolution of our dynamic adherence to the values of subsidiarity and solidarity. We continually interrogate how we live and apply our faith in a variety of changing circumstances, both as individual staff and in relation to our internal systems, organization of labor, external positioning with peer agencies and donors, policy and influence work. The traditional business model of humanitarian response and development

assistance are being revisited to evolve and update our capacity to provide ad hoc assistance and accompaniment to local organizations in exerting their own institutional agency and leadership. The evolution of a global organization – in all its internal workflows and systems – can be enhanced by the application of a “synodal process” that allows for a genuine internal engagement. A “comparative advantage” that a faith-based organization holds is to leverage the relative higher level of commitment to the values informing the institution that propels a sort of restlessness continually seeking new and better ways to advance its mission. Ideally, this organizational development process becomes a “sacrament” or as a lay sign “both of a very closely knit union with God and of the unity of the whole human race, it desires now to unfold more fully to the faithful of the Church and to the whole world its own inner nature and universal mission” (Lumen gentium, 1). This paper/workshop will offer some illustration, evidence, and metrics of key changes to date and a discussion of the of the challenges and opportunities ahead.

### **“Nicolet Bankshares: A Personal Reflection on Applied Social Thought”**

**Mr. Robert Atwell, Nicolet Bankshares, Inc.**

Nicolet Bankshares Inc was launched in November of 2000 with the intention of reinvigorating a strong community banking culture in Northern Wisconsin. While the bank has no explicit religious identity; the underlying principles that have guided the organization are grounded in a Christian understanding of the nature and purpose of human social enterprise. We have adapted the language of personalism, subsidiarity and solidarity into less academic and more broadly accessible terminology. The value proposition of a for-profit enterprise that exists to serve individuals and organizations within a region that retains a strong Christian heritage has resulted in very rapid growth. Outstanding financial returns are explicitly derived from a persistent commitment to our purpose. Purpose is people; the financial impact is what happens when organizations are relentlessly committed to customer outcomes and to creating an ethos of shared success across owners, employees, customers and communities. The company today stands at \$8B in assets and with a market capitalization exceeding \$1B and is recognized as one of the highest performing financial institutions in the Great lakes area of the US. At every annual meeting we have explicitly said some version of the following:” if you think the purpose of our organization is to make you money you might want to own a different stock. Return to shareholders is the RESULT of our work in service to the people in our area, but it is not the PURPOSE of our actions”. The resulting return to our shareholders over 22 years has been 696% while the broad

public market index has been up 235% and the US banking index has been up 53% in that same time period.

The purpose of this document is to capture the role Christian social thought has played in the formation and growth of Nicolet. I ask the reader to indulge my use of the first person in the description of this experience. I do not own or control Nicolet. I co-founded and own about 1% of its economic value. Control is over-rated and elusive. All ownership is transitory. I am not a self-made man. I am a son of God and of my father and mother. I am a son of the upper Midwestern United States; a place I love more with every passing year. I feel incredibly grateful for the people I grew up among and with whom I work. Above all I am grateful for the gift of my faith and for those who taught me that unity of life and the integration of faith and reason are pathways toward a more fruitful life. I do not propose this particular experience as a general roadmap. While the rich intellectual traditions of Christian social thought have informed this work, the Nicolet journey has been both deeply personal and intensely social. My partner, cofounder and successor as CEO is Mike Daniels. With 900 people working at Nicolet across 50 locations and 3 states, we have to continually teach what we are doing, why we are doing it and for whom we are doing it. Mike's simple way of saying this is that we have to "matter to our customers, matter in our communities and matter to each other". We are the lead local bank in most of the northern small city markets where we are present. Our goal goes beyond being an effective financial resource. We aim to embody and strengthen the latent power of mutual service, trust and cooperation resident in the culture of these communities.

### **"Subsidiarity and Spirit of Gift in Social Welfare of Societies building on Freedom and Participation"**

**Prof. Dr. Klaus Baumann, Albert-Ludwig University Freiburg**

The Spirit of Gift is considered as an anthropological potentiality as well as a religiously strengthened ingredient of the human need *and* human right to help others, including the Gospel's priority of love of neighbor (agape). In combination with the basic human need *and* human right to associate with others, the spirit of gift has prompted associations of social welfare as vital parts of civil societies which are expressions of the citizens' freedom and participation in social life and public order of free societies *for the common good*.

In the history of Christianity, these needs and rights have been realized by the faithful in various environments and with different theological underpinnings; they have prompted other groups to do

likewise and to strengthen and promote informal and formal structures of care on various systemic levels, starting from families and peers. In the early 20th century, free social welfare organizations actually made the German Weimar Republic introduce the principle of subsidiarity „*ante litteras*“ in its social legislation, even before this principle was formulated in Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (1931).

How do democratic states today respond to these realities in their theories of (usually secular) state and in their legislative ordering of social welfare, including the health sector? What is the role of subsidiarity in public (or state) social welfare with regard to the freedom and participation of the population and civil society - in contrast to totalitarian regimes? The spirit of gift is at the same time a spirit of freedom, of autonomy and of communion which are presuppositions of gift in the sense of gratuitousness (Pope Benedict XVI) and of subsidiarity. This is true and needed on individual, organizational and state systemic levels in order to work for and realize more of the common good.

**“The *fides* of creative freedom, gratuity, fraternity, and circular subsidiarity: the modernity of Franciscan socio-economic thought”**

**Prof. Oreste Bazzichi, Pontifical Theological Faculty S. Bonaventura-Seraphicum and Dr. Fabio Reali, L'Altro Publishing House**

In the evolution of the foundations of the *οἰκονομία*, it becomes evident that it was, the *ora, lege et labora*, and the Franciscan socio-economic school, the matrix from which originated the first economic lexicon.

The origin of *οἰκονομία*, argued by a substantial and shared part of modern economic historiography, is in the «*caritas Fratemitatis*», a new mediator, as confirmed by David Landes, who states that “Adam Smith's world was taking shape five hundred years before he was born”.

The logical-ontological path of the Franciscan School, in antithesis to the Aristotelian-Thomistic School, has opposed the primacy of creative freedom, and therefore of the principle of alterity or diversity and voluntarism as an interpretative paradigm of reality and the «relational network» of being as a gift of God, brothers among ourselves, connected with Christ, in the «spirit» of St. Francis.

The Franciscan ethical and spiritual perspective is to join the logic of gift with the logic of *self-interest*, by creating that harmony (*Canticle of Brother Sun*), between use-value and exchange value within the value-legacy/*fides*, which embraces both. Without *fides*, there is no *communitas* and therefore no fraternity that generates *bonum commune*. *Fides* is the element that nourishes the *ecclesia* and *civitas fidelium* with transcendent essence in a circular perspective.

The market (*communitas*), understood as beauty, is presented as a place of relations based on the *fides*-Christian and the «fame» of the merchant, «*ministri reipublicae*», essential for the *res publica* and sets as *telos* the *bonum commune*.

The «*caritas Fraternitatis*» becomes «practical reason», capable of humanizing (*Our Lady Poverty*) and civilizing (*Our Lady Love*) economic science according to the natural order (self-interest) and according to the supernatural order (love for God). The experience of the Monti di Pietà is an example of this harmony (*et-et*) and beauty; an experience of practical life, between «*scibilium*» et «*agibilium*». The principle of subsidiarity is based on the creative freedom and dignity of man, as well as on the value of relational goods as gift/gratuity according to the geometric figure of the circle (the doctrine of *exitus* and *reditus* of St. Bonaventure) and through the application of a methodological principle, *Ockham's razor*, which states that “all factors being equal, the simplest explanation tends to be the exact one”, and that everything superfluous must be «cut out».

### **“Subsidiarity and the Bitcoin Industry”**

#### **Dr. Pedro Erik Carneiro, Brazilian Ministry of Finance**

The article evaluates the Bitcoin Industry according to the principle of subsidiarity. Can we rely on an algorithm instead of monetary authorities to ensure financial stability? Does this algorithm need no social or legal scrutiny? Can global currency management operate for profit instead of serving the common good? In finance, the most vital characteristic of an asset can be its weakest aspect, depending on its objective and the circumstance. Bitcoin is the first successful cryptocurrency because of its algorithm and distributed-ledger technology. Its market share and market capitalization are the biggest among cryptocurrencies. But what is Bitcoin? Is it a currency, a payment system, a property, a speculative asset, a commodity, a tax haven, an asset suitable for money laundering, all these together controlled by a few “miners” or simply a computer file? Its price is still influenced by the decisions of monetary authorities. According to the principle of subsidiarity, all forms of collectivism are contrary to the formation of a harmonious society, the private initiatives should not be taken away by a higher power. On the other hand, individuals or groups of people cannot be equated with sovereign states or global institutions. Anonymity and cross-border nature are the main advantages of Bitcoin. Such anonymity seems to equate individuals or groups of people with the status of monetary authorities without any scrutiny. And the cross-border nature avoids control of state monetary authorities. The principle of subsidiarity is founded on Christian anthropology, in which man is the image of God, is a sinner who needs to be

redeemed, is endowed with free will, and is a social being. The so-called “Bitcoin evangelists”, on the other hand, seem to be ideologues of the efficient market hypothesis, which despises any ethical or social control. Or they support an erroneous idea of subsidiarity that argues that subsidiarity is a matter of devolution of power or smallness of scale, in favor of individual freedom and a utilitarian common good that are at odds with Christianity.

### **“The Evolution of a University Through ‘Community-Building Subsidiarity’”**

**Prof. Scott M. Davidson, Dr. Kevin M. Godfrey, and Dr. Mary Ellen Wells, Alvernia**

#### **University**

This paper situates four specific developmental experiences of "community-building" within the principle of subsidiarity. These experiences were essential for successfully incorporating a business model approach to stabilize and redefine the operations of Alvernia University, a Franciscan university in Reading, Pennsylvania. They served as the bases for continued decisions regarding mission, organizational structures, and growth. The authors demonstrate that these experiences reveal concepts that exemplify the principle of subsidiarity and its usefulness. These concepts can also serve as practical guides for other institutions.

The first community-building experience was associated with the university's First-Year Program, which focused on creating an internal community of new students centered around seminal experiences of the Franciscan movement and the university's well-established core values. The second was revising an existing center at the university to broaden the community it serves by connecting the university and the regional community in increasing partnership. The third was a restructuring of the academic programs within the university to revitalize communities of faculty, staff, and students. The fourth was the community-building associated with Alvernia University's new Strategic Plan, which engaged input from an inclusive group of community members, including students, faculty, staff, and administration.

In furtherance of all four initiatives, Alvernia University embraced the principle of subsidiarity as the first step in the process of authentic internal and external community-building. We sought to understand, employ, and include the principle of subsidiarity as essential in our transformation to become a social entrepreneur that helps to increase the economic development in our region. This paper summarizes the four initiatives and discusses parallels that demonstrate three common ingredients of community-building efforts that incorporate subsidiarity as a foundation: listening, transforming, and empowering. In the new model of higher education that Alvernia University is

creating, we demonstrate that a business-based model rooted in catholic social teaching—with an emphasis on the principle of subsidiarity—is achievable, can improve self-governance, and ultimately can ensure the organization will thrive.

## **“Freedom, Solidarity and Subsidiarity through Work in Ancient Rome: The Tomb of Baker Eurysaces”**

**Dr. Nadja El Beheiri, Catholic University Pázmány Péter**

Solidarity and subsidiarity are most central principles for the social teaching of the Catholic Church, without doubt. Every intent to identify them within the framework of the ancient world must be conscious of its limitations.

Christian (social) thinking entailed a revolution that stems out of the basic anthropological idea: every human being was created at the image of God. A fundamental proposition of Cristian belief is that every man and woman, regardless of his or her social condition, is equal in dignity. It is precisely the concept of dignity that has a fundamentally different meaning in Christian belief than it used to be in the Roman world.

For Cicero the term justice was linked, on one hand, to the common good, and on the other hand, to the *dignitas* of the person. By *dignitas* we understand a quality achieved by individuals acting guided by virtues.<sup>1</sup> Although this difference is an essential one, Roman tradition paved the way for Christian principles in several aspects. We might say that Roman thought set the coordinates within Christian ideas so that those could gain a foothold. This is somehow also true for one of the darkest stains in the history of humanity: slavery. Freedom is an essential aspect of dignity, and it is beyond doubt that Romans were far away from abolishing slavery. As Thomas Wiedemann, the German-British scholar expressed most accurately, Romans “were not thinking about slavery so much as using the concept ‘slavery’ to think with”.<sup>2</sup> Based on Greek philosophy and owing to a pragmatic realistic approach, Roman thinkers, however, recognized in theory that, according to natural law, all men are created equal. The jurist Ulpian expressed it very clearly when he stated: (...) “*quod ad ius naturale attinet, omnes homines aequales sunt*”.<sup>3</sup> This consciousness lead to a quite extensive system of manumission, and provided former slaves the possibility to integrate into society. It seems that this was the case of the baker Eurysaces as well. By acquiring freedom, the former slave was granted the opportunity to establish many-fold relationship within society; he could become part of civil society.

Within this framework, we might also discover antecedents of the principles of solidarity and subsidiarity. The quality of being free members of society enabled former slaves to participate in striving for the good of *res publica*. Having in mind the concepts elaborated by the social teaching of the Church, we depart from a notion of ancient solidarity in which each member of the community acknowledges its own responsibility to contribute to the common good.<sup>4</sup> The consciousness to contribute to the life of the community through responsible acts is one of the major differences between the work of an unfree and a free person. A slave might also materially contribute to the good of the society he lives in, but never will he do so while feeling that he is part of the society he works for. Subsidiarity, as a related concept, consists in assisting others to fulfil their own duties according to their own possibility and place in society. This place in society is what Cicero expresses in his definition by the term *dignitas*.

In this paper we suggest through one of the most outstanding private monuments of the Roman republic that work was considered as value that also contributed to forge the *dignitas* of a person.

## **“Teaching Freedom, Subsidiarity, and the Logic of Gift through the Lens of the Integrative Justice Model”**

**Dr. Tina Facca-Miess, John Carroll University and Dr. Nicholas Santos, Creighton University**

The Integrative Justice Model (IJM) is a normative ethical framework which provides guidance for fair and ethical marketplace exchanges, particularly when engagement with impoverished or marginalized populations is involved. The IJM postulates five key tenets:

1. Authentic engagement with non-exploitative intent
2. Value co-creation with consumers
3. Investment in future consumption without endangering the environment
4. Representation of stakeholder interests
5. Long-term profit management rather than short-term profit maximization

These five tenets resonate with the three principles of subsidiarity, freedom and logic of gift. Authentic engagement, value co-creation, and interest representation are connected with the principle of subsidiarity. Likewise, investment in future consumption is connected with empowering impoverished customers so as to increase the freedoms they enjoy allowing them to better participate in the market economy. Finally, long-term profit management is indicative of giftedness. The expected outcomes for business organizations that follow the IJM principles are long-term

relationships, customer empowerment, sustainable business initiatives and the creation of a fairer marketplace.

In this paper, we begin by elaborating on the IJM and its connection to freedom, subsidiarity, and the logic of gift. We then give examples of how the IJM has been used in the classroom. These examples include an undergraduate course entitled “Microenterprise Development in Impoverished Markets,” and a capstone course on “Sustainable Marketing.” Other examples include graduate level applications in MBA courses including Sustainable Marketing Management and Sustainable Product Development. We also discuss how the IJM has been taught online in marginalized contexts such as in Jesuit Worldwide Learning’s Entrepreneurship course, and in Rwanda and Pakistan with graduate level refugee researchers. We will discuss recent applications of the IJM to create operational models that assist social businesses, NGOs and non-profits in identifying the significant predictors of transformative outcomes for beneficiaries, specifically the extent to which to organization transforms quality of life for its beneficiaries. Finally, we discuss avenues for growth and further research.

## **“We wanted freedom, we got Black Friday: Freedom or Capitalism”**

**Dr. Fernando Galindo, Universidad Anahuac Mexico**

Freedom versus totalitarianism was the defining struggle of the last century; not capitalism versus communism. Milton Friedman was one of the preeminent proponents of the second view.

In his famous essay “Capitalism and Freedom” (1962 - 2020) Friedman sees capitalism as essential to liberalism and considers liberalism as the only possible way to organize a free society. But neither is the identity of capitalism and liberalism as clear as he suggested, nor is his version of liberalism a good way to establish, nurture and promote a free society.

Friedman correctly identifies the limitation of power —the system of checks and balances— as the key principle of liberalism, but he applies this principle only to the government and not to the capitalistic business corporation, arguing that competition by itself will limit the power of any corporation and its power to do wrong. In his view regulation in the economy is therefore prejudicial to freedom and the economy, and the role of government in the economy must be minimum: Government should provide a legal framework and serve as an umpire in disputes among corporations.

Contrary to Friedman's suggestion, the concentration of power is inherent to capitalism. The first modern capitalist corporations, the *East India Company* (1600) and the *Dutch East India Company*

(1602) were monopolies created by the British Crown and the Republic of the Netherlands respectively. The monopolistic impulse and a tendency to exploit people and natural resources were a constant in the first corporations, exemplified in the enormous “business” of the slave trade, and were not restricted or eliminated by purely capitalist forces.

The guiding principle of Friedman’s capitalism is the unfettered accumulation i.e. the concentration of capital through the aggressive pursuit of profit—not investment, but solely profit—opportunities. Capital is a source of power. Friedman’s purported distinction between “economic” and “political” power is false: economic power is a prominent form of political power.

Friedman’s liberalism defined as *laissez-faire* can aspire at its best to a society of sellers and buyers; at its worst to a society of *phishers* and *phools* as Akerloff and Shiller (2015) argued. Phishers are those actively seeking profit opportunities at the expense of others; “phools” are those “phished” and manipulated by phishers, and who give money away for things they could not possibly want.

Competitive pressures within a free market will continuously feed this dynamic, generating a society of obese, undernourished, over-spender consumers trapped in unsurmountable debts (See Case & Deaton 2020) Friedman’s capital philosophical failure consists in an excessive focus on external dimensions or the external conditions for freedom, to the detriment of the essential internal aspects of freedom.

Friedman understands freedom in its simplest form as the absence of external constraints to do as one pleases: The liberty to choose without remorse, negative consequences, blame, shame, guilt, or commitment to whatever someone fancies at any given moment. That is why he asserts that “power to coerce is the fundamental threat to freedom” ((1962 - 2020, 3). And he also (wrongly) believes that this power is mostly exercised by what he calls “big government”.

But the fundamental threat to individual and political freedom is ignorance and vice. Freedom is never a given or solely a right to be protected by the State; personal and political freedom is always a conquest and an achievement.

We are born to be free, but we must earn our freedom, as the image of the Platonic cave taught us, through education; spiritual, ethical, intellectual, and political education.

Marred by ignorance and vice, capitalism brings about a society of phools and phishers; never a society of free citizens. No coercion by the government is needed to restrict freedom, manipulation by capitalist businesses suffices. Instead of freedom we got Black Friday and the undesirable prospect of *amusing ourselves to death* (Neil Postman) navigating yet another platform of endless series streaming.

Friedman's capitalism is another version of materialism, the practical one, as *Laborem excercens* prophesied, it also goes against freedom and the dignity of the human being.

To reflect on the limitations in Friedman's thought and to offer an alternative view of freedom and power constraint, one centered on knowledge and virtue for the individual, and corporate governance for businesses is the purpose of my presentation.

## **“Reason and Faith - Restorative Processes and Catholic Social Thought in Response to Corporate Harm”**

**Rev. Daniel Griffith, Julie Craven, and Brandon Mickelsen, University of St. Thomas**

Restorative processes used effectively today in response to harm are rooted in the indigenous practices of First Nation peoples of North America and New Zealand. In the 1970s, restorative justice (RJ), which encompasses restorative practices and processes, became a worldwide movement because of its effectiveness and adaptability in response to harm across multiple disciplines and professions. Restorative justice asks who was harmed, what was the nature of the harm, and how can the harm be repaired and justice restored? The effectiveness of RJ lies in its connection to the social nature of the human person, the human desire for healing and flourishing, and the demand of justice to give those who have been harmed their due.

Catholic social thought (CST) encompasses both the social doctrine of the Catholic Church and the scholarly reflection and application of the principles of Catholic social teaching to complex issues that attend society. Catholic social thought seeks the attainment of justice and the promotion of the common good by applying fundamental principles to subjective situations. Like RJ, CST is rooted in the social nature of the human person and is oriented to healing through the restoration of justice. Principles of CST, e.g., the dignity of the human person, solidarity, subsidiarity, and the preferential option for the poor, align effectively to the work of restorative justice in helping heal harm and foster accountability. Not surprisingly, then, the authors have found that a dynamism occurs when restorative processes are paired with principles and values of CST in Catholic and non-Catholic settings.

According to Catholic social teaching, corporations, and businesses, through their leaders, have a responsibility beyond just delivering profits and shareholder value, which extends to the common good of society. What happens when corporate harm occurs, resulting in the transgression of duties and injury to persons and the common good? The authors will demonstrate that the wisdom of

restorative processes and the principles of Catholic social teaching arise as a gift of reason and faith, respectively, and thus can be effectively paired in responding to corporate harm.

Specifically, this paper will show how the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis effectively used restorative processes after the archdiocesan corporation was criminally charged for its failure to protect children. The paper will also show how the pairing of RJ and CST could be effectively used in responding to corporate harm - harm done to the community through pollution - and harm experienced by healthcare workers because of the global pandemic.

### **“The theological roots of the principle of subsidiarity: how freedom and gift are connected, and solidarity requested”**

**Prof. Gregorio Guitián, University of Navarra**

In this presentation we intend to delve deeper into the origins and theological roots of the principle of subsidiarity. Our aim is to show both the interconnection between freedom and gift, and the unity between subsidiarity and solidarity. Firstly, we explore the origins of the formulation of the principle of subsidiarity in Catholic Social Teaching (CST). Because this principle was adopted by the then European Community, there have been a number of studies interested in the origins of subsidiarity. Yet, we contend that these studies are “superficial” to some extent, with it meaning that they have focused on the historical, philosophical or even organizational aspects of the principle, but have neglected the theological context in which subsidiarity was born. In this regard, Thomas Aquinas’ thought is particularly relevant and illuminating.

It is often said—almost always bringing up the same references and quotations (Millon-Delsol, 2002; Minerath, 2008)—that Aquinas replaces the Aristotelian citizen with the person. As the image of God, the person occupies a special place in society. The texts by St. Thomas that are usually cited to explain how he laid the foundations of subsidiarity are found in the context of the treatment of divine providence, but few scholars have noted this point. St. Thomas conceived the government of human things (of the family, the city, the kingdom, etc.) in comparison and resemblance to the way God governs the universe. It is in this perspective that the logic implicit in subsidiarity can be better understood. In our view, this context is crucial for an accurate understanding of Aquinas’ thought and, at the same time, for a better appreciation of the contribution that late CST—particularly the Encyclical “*Caritas in veritate*”—has made to the understanding of subsidiarity (Guitián, 2010).

In Thomas Aquinas’ conception of divine government there is a harmonious articulation of the following elements: on the one hand, the design of the divine government of creation foresees the

intervention of mediations (Gutián, 2004) and, on the other hand, it is crucial that man, who like the angelic creature is called to participate in this government, puts his or her capacities at work in the exercise of his or her freedom.

In St. Thomas' mind, divine government implies both the reception of aid that contributes to one's own perfection and a free correspondence in the exercise of one's own potential in order to help others. Indeed, it is not accidental that the person realizes his or her own effect, that he or she puts into action his or her potential. The logic of subsidiarity implies at the same time the reception, the correspondence to that help and, going further, the communication of one's own good to others: like the teacher who teaches his students, who, by rendering their own talent and thanks to the help received, can teach others in turn. The logic of subsidiarity presupposes the logic of gift and is a reflection of the way in which God governs the world.

Reception, free correspondence, gift. This is the chain. Then we can understand why subsidiarity and solidarity should always go together. Although they can be distinguished, they cannot be separated.

At the roots of the principle of subsidiarity there is affirmation: it positively seeks to ensure that each intermediate element has the necessary help to perfect itself and, in turn, can contribute to the perfection of others. The logic of providence that is at the basis of the Aquinas' explanations that are usually brought up when speaking of subsidiarity, excludes both the annulment of the human being—the neutralization of his or her capacities—and his or her isolation from others. And, on the other hand, it is oriented to the common good.

### **“Impact investment as a sustainable gift”**

#### **Dr. Tibor Héjj, Proactive Management Consulting**

Investment and more general business is about “*to take*”, whereas gift is about “*to give*” – so why and how can they be integrated? The answer is that capital owners have a free choice whether instead of the “traditional” goal of maximizing shareholder value, they aim to create both financial and social value, or even only serve the solution of a social need. Among the many forms of socially beneficial investments serving the common good, we focus on the kind of investment and leadership, which is based on human dignity – the very first and most fundamental pillar of Catholic Social Teaching (CST). Spirituality is the basis of such an approach – CST provides a complete system in which CST and moral leadership as management theory get aligned. The related terms are “person(alism)”, “subsidiarity”, “common good,” and last but not least “happiness”. Only recently show up

“spirituality” and “love” in management science and practice. As a result, a newly discovered relationship has emerged among “gift”, “subsidiarity”, and “caring”, both in and at work. Establishing and running a company for others, requiring and assuring the stakeholders’ responsibility and taking care of the employees as “persons”, rather than “human resources”, or even just “FTE” -s in an excel-sheet. This includes assuring all the eight aspects of “wellness” at the company/workplace. In such cases, the way of management is also different: Leaders in such a philosophy do not act according to the traditional command-and-control system but as servant-leaders. Like everything else, this also needs monitoring and measuring – I show a self-developed management tool to do so.

Proof of concept: such companies exist in many countries – even here, in Hungary. As a case example, I show my non-profit company, “Sunflower” (with 20+ years of proven track record and 120+ employees) with the mission to provide jobs, rather than donations for the disadvantaged, specifically for the disabled. The company is a combination of the principles discussed up to now: impact investment + gift + dignity + subsidiarity + caring. This is how impact investment rooted business can become a sustainable gift for those in need. Still, their responsibility is not taken away – subsidiarity is implemented in the daily operation (“we work with you on your inclusion by enabling you to get reintegrated into the society with freedom and autonomy by offering a job, suitable to your capabilities, which includes free transportation of the workers by the company’s 9-seat van fleet of 7 cars). Even the governance is based on subsidiarity e.g. through the handicapped workers’ representation in the Supervisory Board.

This is the holistic implementation of Pope Francis’ request: “Business abilities, which are a gift from God, should always be clearly directed to the development of others and to eliminating poverty, especially through the creation of diversified work opportunities.” (“Fratelli tutti” by Pope Francis).

## **“Empower to Promote – Impact of CST in Eastern Europe”**

### **Dr. Peter Klasvagt, Kommende Dortmund**

The Social Institute Kommende Dortmund promotes the formation and empowerment of future priests in Eastern Europe on the basis of Catholic Social Teaching, in order to have an impact on society, especially among the young generation.

The Social Academy is, on a small scale, a European laboratory in which future church leaders can bring in the different cultural imprints and historical experiences of their local churches and home

countries and experience in respectful cooperation that plurality on the basis of common values is not frightening and threatening, but enriching and liberating. The experience of constructive debate enables the participants of the Social Academy to pass on their personally gained convictions to the younger generation in their respective fields of activity and thus to contribute to the "Church in Europe" being a pace-setter of cross-border understanding and reconciliation.

In cooperation with the association socioMovens - Giving Europe a Soul e.V., founded by the Social Institute Kommende Dortmund and alumni of the Social Academy, since 2013 have been carried out more than 45 social-ethical youth weeks at 13 locations in eight countries with about 900 participants. The local project coordinators and their supporters (teachers, social workers, volunteers) share the concern of the Kommende Dortmund to firmly implement a social ethical youth engagement. The about 50 local project coordinators contribute their skills as church leaders by, for example, ensuring communication with local church and civic authorities.

### **“The Empowerment Process in Social Enterprise: The Ridaje Case”**

**Giulia Latella, MCE Research Center and Luca Mongelli, IESE Business School**

Hybrids are organizations that combine apparently irreconcilable elements (Battilana et al. 2017; Battilana and Lee 2014; WK Smith and Besharov 2017), regardless of whether these elements are forms (Battilana and Lee 2014; Santos et al. 2015), identities (Besharov 2014; Glynn 2000; Pratt and Foreman 2000; Pratt and Rafaeli 1997) or organizational logics (Battilana and Dorado 2010; Besharov and Smith 2014; Ramus et al. 2017). However, Hybrids peculiar and innovative ability to address societal issues arises precisely from this unprecedented combination (Battilana et al. 2017; Battilana and Lee 2014), as it is in the case of "Social Business Hybrids" (SBHs), which pursue a social mission through innovative business models (Battilana et al. 2015; Battilana and Dorado 2010; Fosfuri et al. 2015; Santos et al. 2015).

Social impact can refer to a variety of purposes, all connected to the social sphere. Different types of SBH can pursue this heterogeneity of purposes: the Work Integration Social Enterprise - which mainly involved marginalized and disempowered people (such as migrants, prisoners, homeless, etc.), as key actors of economic production process; the Integrated SBH - whose aim is to allow access to goods and services to people that are excluded for personal or structural reasons; the Differentiated SBH - which supports people with disabilities, or even children and elderly, who live marginalized to society and cannot perform any production activities.

Literature on these topics (Battilana et al. 2015; Battilana and Dorado 2010; Santos et al. 2015) has recently highlighted some opposite and complementary limits. On the one hand, there is a typical tendency of SBHs to adopt a more market-oriented logic, the so-called mission drift. As a result, attention towards the social purpose reduces (Ramus and Vaccaro 2017; WK Smith and Besharov 2017), with both ethical consequences - the change of focus implicitly recalibrates the aim pursued (Chell et al. 2016; Kannothe et al. 2018; Mitzinneck and Besharov 2019); as well as organizational consequences (Battilana et al. 2015; Battilana and Dorado 2010) - the change of focus leads to internal tensions (W. Smith et al. 2013). On the other hand, the organization can turn towards its social mission to the detriment of the economic logic: it is the situation of the mission look-in (Copestake 2007; Staessens et al. 2019). In this second case, consequences are particularly noteworthy, since not only the economic productivity is reduced, but also the social impact is negatively affected due to excessive strategic rigidity (Battilana et al. 2015).

Current literature has focused on strategic and organizational issues while leaving the anthropological level less explored: situations of disempowerment (social, cultural, physical, etc.), as well as the corresponding mechanisms of empowerment, are therefore not yet sufficiently studied.

Some studies have opened new reflections, as it is the case of the study promoted by Haugh and Talwar (2016), which re-proposes the Ecomancipatory Entrepreneurship model, developed by Rindova et al (2006). This study focuses on women's empowerment within a rural community in India through a WISE that leads to overcoming environmental constraints and obtaining personal freedoms. A further example is that of the research on Made in Carcere conducted by Mongelli et al (2018), where a WISE operating in Lecce women's prison operates for the empowerment and integral development of the person starting from a situation of radical marginalization (Mongelli et al. 2019).

Although these two studies have opened a new line of research, they are not sufficient for a systematic analysis of the various models of empowerment that SBHs can implement. Therefore, our research focuses on the dimensions of human development that are successfully affected by SBHs activity, as well as the processes that are necessary to define this "impact".

We conducted a preliminary analysis of the dynamics and phases of the empowerment process applied by "Ridaje" to the homeless. We used an explorative qualitative research design with the case study methodology (K. Eisenhardt 1989; K. M. Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007). The exploratory project is suitable for this study as the topic of empowerment promoted by SBHs is still fragmented

and not yet fully understood in the literature (Haugh and Talwar 2016; Mongelli et al. 2018).

Therefore, we have chosen a qualitative "theory elaboration" approach (Lee et al. 1999).

Ridaje is an innovative start-up with a social vocation, officially born in July 2019, whose mission is the rehabilitation of homeless people living in the city of Rome, providing them with the opportunity to be trained and work as urban gardeners. Thanks to work of these people, Ridaje takes care of the renewal and conservation of the city's public green, often in conditions of neglect. Addressing individuals who have at heart the city of Rome (neighborhood committees, territorial associations, businesses), Ridaje carries out a sort of adoption of degraded places on their behalf. The activity is funded directly by the organization promoting the intervention or through a structured form of crowd-funding already provided by Ridaje web portal.

Preliminary findings suggest that, as in the case of Made in Carcere, homeless too experience the disappearance of the domestic dimension, the deprivation of the home, which means to be in a condition of definitive and totalizing confusion of life. Private dimension is not separated from the public one. The paradox is thus recomposed: the impossibility of a sphere of intimacy from the social one leads to the alienation and the loss of identification of the "I", which is deprived of its necessary protection.

## **"Living & Teaching Subsidiarity in American Catholic Elementary & High Schools"**

**Dr. Alex E. Lessard, Adeodatus**

In *Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together*, Pope Benedict XVI writes that: "When those responsible for the public good attune themselves to the natural human desire for self-governance based on subsidiarity, they leave space for individual responsibility and initiative, but most importantly, they leave space for love... which always remains 'the most excellent way.'" His predecessor, Pope Saint John Paul II, insisted that the Church's social teaching needs to be "a consistent yardstick and a certain force of inspiration" that we must accept as a "shared criterion for personal and community decisions and actions." In other words, the Church needs to teach the fullness of the developed social doctrines of the Church, to make them as much a part of our moral framework as the Ten Commandments or the Golden and Silver Rules.

It will take a long-term, thoughtful, concerted effort to make Catholic social teaching a more integral part of our educational systems, from the home to elementary to secondary, collegiate, and technical/manual arts education. "Living & Teaching Subsidiarity in American Catholic Elementary & High Schools" will reflect on some of the ways that schools can begin to embody and teach the

principle of subsidiarity as they coordinate their activities toward a common love of and participation in truth, goodness, and beauty by students who are created in the image and likeness of God and redeemed by our Lord Jesus Christ.

I will focus on the importance of subsidiarity in ordering the primary institution of the family with secondary educational institutions; in both maieutic and mimetic methods of teaching; in arranging the day-to-day operations of secondary institutions so that students come to see its importance through that lived institutional culture; and finally on creative ways to teach subsidiarity within the curriculum – especially in literature, history, economics, and civics courses.

### **“Martial Virtues as the Guarantor of Subsidiarity and Freedom in a Society”**

**Mr. John Lucke, University of St. Thomas**

If war is the continuation of politics by other means, then the political and societal world is contended through and navigated successfully by martial virtues. Total war is an awful phenomenon and de-escalation from this outcome ought to be sought after because subsidiarity is best practiced during times of peace and stability; however, a populace rooted in martial virtue is the best bulwark against the highly undesirable pathway to total war. Alternative modalities without a proper conception of the costs of freedom, ignorant of the price of warfare, cannot lead to the peaceful practice of subsidiarity within a society. Subsidiarity and societal freedom of gift can only exist through the promotion of martial virtues.

Subsidiarity in Western society is a socio-economic method cultivated in European roots, expressed through a balance of power between elites and the working man. But that balance can only be so because of the great power and martial success of individuals who guaranteed the proper space for freedom, sovereignty, commerce, and gift to prosper at the lowest level possible. And what is martial virtue? It is a reorientation of modern societal values, placing simplicity, justice, discipline, and above all, consciousness and courage, at the top of the moral hierarchy.

Promotion of martial virtues at the societal level allows the individual to recognize the great wealth within himself and the incredible costs that go into the freedom of a society. This recognition provides the requisite free choice fundamental to the gift of self. These classically martial virtues operated best when in the service of Christian ends. Without these virtues in place, true self-gift seldom occurs on a societal level. The truly free man is the one capable of defending himself and his sources of independence. Likewise, cultivating martial virtue in a populace guarantees more self-knowledge thus self-gift with subsidiarity flowing from the lowest level of society upwards.

Establishing martial virtues in a society does not equate to indiscriminate foreign ventures or total expansionist policies, in fact quite the opposite. Doing so would discourage subsidiarity within the society by consolidating the levers of war and prioritizing harmful objectives. In order to practice freedom, gift, and subsidiarity at the societal level, a promotion of martial virtues must occur.

### **“Gift, Donation, and Tax”**

**Prof. Dr. Siarhei Lukin, University of Law and Social Informational Technologies**

The problem of the redistribution of income and property both within individual communities and in society as a whole is one of the most difficult both in economic and moral aspects.

According to both Christian and Old Testament ideas, the relationship between God and the people created by Him in one aspect is an exchange of gifts, a great triad of gifts. The first gift is the values received by man from the Lord, his abilities, talents, life itself, the image and likeness of God, and the many-sided spiritual gifts. Christians consider the greatest gift of the incarnation of God of the Word, His life among the people, the torment of the cross and death for their salvation. The second gift is a reciprocal gift of man to God, expressed in the fulfillment of God's commandments, dedication to God of his time, his whole life and products of his labor. The Old Testament Jews and Christians realized that the man himself needed this second gift. Thanks to this, he develops the ability and the need to give, the ability, in turn, to receive the third, according to Christian notions, the greatest gift - eternal life in the Kingdom of God.

The sacrifice of man to God must be made with a special inner attitude, with love, and therefore voluntarily and with joy. Such a donation is a full-fledged gift. The absence of such a mental attitude reduces the donation to a tax, a heavy duty. The internal state of a person can reduce a donation to a tax, but it can also raise a tax to a donation. This inner state in the Christian understanding is fundamentally more important than the distinction between fiscal payment and voluntary donations.

The general meaning of the New Testament doctrine of voluntary donations is that they should be made with inner motivation. The ability to sacrifice is an important criterion for Christian perfection. The value of voluntary donations is determined not by absolute, but by their relative size. The rich and the poor have equal opportunities in this regard, despite the difference in their property status.

## **“Social Doctrine of the Church and Relational Ontology: the Trinitarian Roots of Subsidiarity”**

**Rev. Giulio Maspero, Santa Croce and Dr. Ilaria Vigorelli, Pontifical University of the Holy Cross**

The social doctrine of the Church is a properly theological discipline but intrinsically linked to philosophy and the human sciences because of the ontological foundation and sociological phenomenology to which it refers (Höffner, 16-18). This transdisciplinary dimension emerges especially when dealing with the interconnection of different principles, in particular the relationship between solidarity and subsidiarity with the common good and the dignity of the person (Hittinger, 2002 and McKinley Brennan, 2014). The Magisterium, in formulating the principle of subsidiarity itself, has drawn on Thomas Aquinas' re-reading of Aristotle (Aroney, 2014). In the light of modern criticism and the post-modern context, it can be shown how the relationship between solidarity and subsidiarity refers to the tension between the one and the multiple that the ontology developed by the Fathers of the Church in the light of Trinitarian revelation made it possible to resolve. This requires, however, a re-semanticisation of the relationship, understood not as a mere appendix to the identity of the human being and society, but rather as a constitutive and immanent element of it. It is therefore a question of reinterpreting subsidiarity in its relationship with solidarity in the light of an ontological-relational conception of the common good (Donati, 2008), which prevents any reductionism in the sense of collectivism or individualism. In particular, the distinction between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* by Ferdinand Tönnies will be re-read from the perspective of Trinitarian ontology and anthropology, to recognise the correlativity of solidarity and subsidiarity in the light of the processes of generation and communion immanent to society itself, the foundation of internal and vital relations in analogy with the Trinitarian foundation. In fact, if the principle of unity that founds *Gemeinschaft* is internal to it, and not external as in the case of *Gesellschaft*, the relations and processes that constitute it must be immanent and emergent, in the sense that the distinctions based on them are sources of a novelty of being. Trinitarian ontology thus shows that the more the internal dimension of society is differentiated and at the same time united, the more human and prosperous society will be.

## **“The Relational Subject and Related Principles for a Good Society”**

**Domènec Melé, University of Navarra, Catholic University of America**

The quest for a good society is not new at all. Living in society is part of the human condition, since humans are *zoon-politikon* (social animals) as Aristotle pointed out. Thus, it is not surprising that many philosophers have paid attention to considering what society is and what a good society consists of. Their respective views on this latter question are far from coincidental. Some of them even renounce this question, limiting themselves to speculating about the origin of society and simply propose formulas to achieve an acceptable coexistence. The answer that they give to these questions depends to a great extent on the anthropological vision adopted.

Some view of the human individual are reductionist. In one extreme we find out a radical individualism: the society is made up by individuals with preferences to be maximize through the society. A good society is merely that which allow its member a coexistence, for instance, through a social contract. In the other extreme, a collectivist perspective, according to which the individual is an abstraction and human reality is the ensemble (aggregate) of social relations.

Contrastingly, in the personalist approach combined to critical relational sociology, the human being qualifies and distinguishes himself with respect to all other living beings by being a person who possesses her own subjectivity (one's internal character) and is a relational subject (relationally constituted).

The human being has his/her own teleology leading to human fulfilment and social environment can contribute of making difficult this end. A good society is that which contributes to the fullness of life of the people who constitute it. This require freedom and social conditions which favor or even foster fullness of life of those included in a society. Within economic activity we can find out social relations at micro level (a small working team), at meso level (a business organization), and at macro level (political community with an economic system).

From these premises, we arrive to the common good as principle of moral legitimacy. Related to this we discuss the tension between political freedom and the common good arguing on the necessity of the Principles of Subsidiarity, Solidarity y Participation for a good society. We applying these principles to business organizations.

## **“The principle of open subsidiarity: How to overcome the tension between the market and the State?”**

**Prof. Cristian Mendoza, Pontificia Università della Santa Croce**

The principle of subsidiarity recalls that “a community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions, but rather should support it in case of need and help to coordinate its activity with the activities of the rest of society, always with a view to the common good” (CA 48).

Many authors consider that the main structures of higher order are political or economic, observing a certain tension between the role of these spheres in social development. It seems to be a discussion regarding the power to be assigned to each of these higher order structures: it is a horizontal tension at the highest level of the social order. Those who consider that the economic structures (the market) have excessive power recall that it is not enough to guarantee equal rules for all, since—in their opinion—the exercise of the economic system generates injustices. On the contrary, those who judge that the State has excessive power in the social order will recall that history teaches that political interference in the social order has created totalitarianism and great material and anthropological poverty.

Our thesis is that the principle of subsidiarity refers instead to the vertical relationship between these higher order structures and lower order social groups. Focusing attention on the principle of subsidiarity makes it possible to improve the vertical dynamics of society, where the needs and decisions—intelligent and free—of citizens concerning their life in society are known and respected. On the one hand, the market can increasingly take into account the real benefits of those who participate in commercial exchange; on the other hand, the political authorities can attend more realistically to the needs of the population, without imposing measures that are politically correct or too easy to apply. As Banerjee and Duflo warn, the path to development lies in knowing the needs of the population and not so much in implementing political or economic measures designed by those in power in society.

## **“Leadership Wisdom and Organizational Effectiveness: An Empirical Validation of Subsidiarity’s Positive Effect on Solidarity”**

**Dr. Kenneth S. Mias, Dominican College**

This paper proposes a research model that uses a leadership wisdom construct, and an organizational effectiveness construct defined within the Competing Values Framework to answer the following research question: Can leadership wisdom predict the various criteria of organizational effectiveness in a for-profit business environment? Research results are based on the statistical analysis of a sample of 205 survey responses from 59 different front-line organizational units within 26 different, for-profit firms in 9 industries.

This research finds that Leadership Wisdom has a statistically significant and predictive impact on an organizational unit’s effectiveness. These findings lend considerable empirical support for the notion that the application of the principle of subsidiarity can have a positive impact on solidarity within for-profit business organizations. It can also be argued that from these findings that Leadership Wisdom is a necessary enabler of the principle of solidarity and its positive effect on solidarity. This study has also brought the research on leadership wisdom, subsidiarity, and solidarity to a more detailed level; lays out a clearer framework and direction for future research; and opens the door to additional research streams.

## **“Autobiographical Thinking as a Pedagogical Tool: Envisioning oneself as a Protagonist of change”**

**Ms. Omowumi Ogunyemi, Pan-Atlantic University**

In an educational institution with people of different cultural backgrounds and religious beliefs, one often finds students who show some reluctance in participating in discussions of moral principles when the principles coincide with teachings of Catholic magisterium. When reference texts, documents and writings that cite the magisterium are used, non-Catholics sometimes take the contents as points to be learnt and written for examination purposes but not for practices in life, whether currently as a students or in the future as practitioners in their professions. Catholics may also not show much interest in reading the encyclicals, especially when they do not see its practical implications.

In addition to the challenges to teaching ethical practices caused by diversity, many people complain about the problems of the society and the government, without thinking of how they can contribute to solving them. The arguments and counter argument used in criticisms of the state of affairs, often

refer to third parties who are expected to “do something”. One sees that the discussants have theoretical understandings of the moral principles, which they believe others should have, but find it difficult to evaluate their experiences and figure out how to personally adopt the moral principles that they consider necessary for human flourishing and which they prescribe for others.

In a bid to engage students in reading articles that explain subsidiarity, and demonstrate its practical implications for life, this paper proposes using autobiographical thinking as a pedagogical tool to explain the good use of freedom and the need to take responsibility for creating change. By building up stories which help students envision their own role and responsibilities for societal change, the tool facilitates an understanding of individual decision making for the practice of subsidiarity. The pedagogical exercise could lead to the experience of oneself as a gift to humanity, attained when an individual works in a way that promotes human dignity for themselves and for others. The tool is still at the conceptual phase and open to suggestions from the conference participants.

### **“Spiritual Capital and Spiritual Freedom: The Lens of Giftedness in Business”**

**Dr. Karel Sovak, University of Mary**

A vocation brings about work that truly utilizes the unique gifts, talents and skills each individual brings as a reflection of God’s character revealed in their lives. As a personal dimension of society, subsidiarity serves as a guide to all for a well-ordered society which is directed toward the common good. The spiritual capital a person brings to the workplace embeds the individual desire to bring supernatural blessings to the freemarket. The spiritual freedom people share is the focus on the interior movements of each soul, dedicated and grateful for what God has given them in terms of intellect, will and heart. Both of these spiritual aspects bring about the lens of giftedness, which allows business to focus on the productivity of strengths, an integration of individual purpose with organizational needs and an integration of organizational purpose to better meet societal needs. As Saint Pope John Paul II noted, “*Gift exists for the sake of communion.*” Upholding Catholic Social Tradition, the tenet of subsidiarity is a way business can put respect for person into action, in the form of communion with others. Emeritus Pope Benedict XVI noted, “*Subsidiarity respects personal dignity by recognizing in the person a subject who is always capable of giving something to others*” (CV 57-58, 2009). The purpose of this paper is to identify the moral principles of decision making within an organization that helps individuals respond to the question, “what do you stand for?” as well as the socio-economic principle for employers to respond to the question, “who do you stand with?” The relationship of these two questions not only provides a deeper understanding of the common good,

but also helps to identify a proper attention to human dignity and human flourishing, as a way to better define the human person. The spiritual capital (higher standards, values and motivation) one brings to the workplace, along with the spiritual freedom (capacity to do good to please God) is the greatest aspect of service a person can bring to society that leads to an increase in social charity. Keeping that freedom at the lowest level (subsidiarity) allows for the essence of giftedness – allowing one to discover themselves in a world God created for them.

## **“Applying the Principles of Subsidiarity to the Management of Workers in Industry and Education”**

**Msgr. Stuart Swetland, Donnelly College**

There is much that can be gained by applying the principles of subsidiarity to a microeconomic analysis. Following the insights of St. John Paul II’s encyclical on human labor, *Laborem Exercens*, one can combine the principle of subsidiarity with a phenomenological analysis of the transitive activity of work to yield several important insights about the centrality of the human person in the business enterprise.

St. John Paul II reflected on the nature of work as a “transitive activity,” that is, an activity that begins within the human person as a choice and then has an effect in the visible world (*LE* 4). As a transitive activity, work has two dimensions or “senses.” The first sense, the one most people focus on, is the “objective dimension”—the thing we make, the task we do, the service we provide. It is this dimension that is the focus of the market because it can be quantified via the pricing mechanisms of our economy (*LE* 5).

But there is another dimension to work. The “subjective dimension” of work is what work does to the worker, how it makes him or her *more* by participation in the process of creating and doing. It is this dimension which is, in fact, the most important. It is also with this dimension that the dynamism of a free economy is born. New ideas, enterprise, invention, and insights are discovered via the subjective dimension of work (often by a community of workers trying to invent a better way of doing things) (*LE* 6).

Businesses that survive and thrive over the “long-haul” know that it is through paying attention to the subjective sense of work—to their workers’ health and well-being, training, and development—that allows them to flourish. This is not surprising because it is *people* who work and serve, and who are ultimately the business.

## **“Subsidiarity and the voluntary principle: historical reflections”**

**Rev. Dr. Richard Turnbull, Centre for Enterprise, Markets and Ethics**

Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847) was a significant figure in the history of social thought. The assessments of his contribution varied both among contemporaries and in more recent studies.

There were some tensions and inconsistencies and evaluation of his success not uniform. On his importance and impact, however, there is no disagreement.

Chalmers' combination of pastoral ministry in both rural and urban settings, together with his career as an academic meant that he was uniquely placed to both reflect upon and put into practice his ideas concerning the voluntary principle in social welfare. Chalmers expounded his thinking in numerous works over several decades.

Central to Chalmers work was the manner in which he brought his evangelical beliefs and wider ideas of political economy together in a distinctive way. Understanding this relationship is central to appreciating Chalmers' place and thought. Chalmers is a key channel for the transmission of Smithian economics into Christian thought.

Chalmers brings the moral dimension into the heart of his theology and ministerial practice. This moral principle, formed and shaped by his evangelical Christian conviction, gives a number of distinctive characteristics to his social thought and policy. Many writers focus on this moral principle as a basis for criticism of Chalmers, as an inappropriate application of piety. However, in doing so, a number of important lessons and principles in Chalmers thought and practice are either missed or dismissed. There is no reason why Christian moral thinking should not be applied to either historical or contemporary debates around social welfare.

Underlying Chalmers' thought is the notion of subsidiarity. This principle has been applied and developed in the thinking of the common Christian tradition. Chalmers laid down a number of important principles and foundations for how this idea has been understood and applied both historical and in contemporary thinking. In doing so we see the significance of the idea of subsidiarity and how these ideas have developed in both Protestant and Catholic usage in particular in their relationship with and application to the economy and civil society.

## **“Grounding the Principle of Subsidiarity: Creation, Wonder, Marriage and the Family”**

**Dr. Jim Wishloff, University of Lethbridge and Mr. Ernest Pierucci, St. Mary's College of California**

In *Centesimus Annus* John Paul II notes that the “correct picture of society” follows from “the Christian vision of the human person” and that “the social nature of man is not completely fulfilled in the State, but is realized in various intermediary groups, beginning with the family and including economic, social, political and cultural groups which stem from human nature itself and have their own autonomy, always with a view to the common good.” He reminds us that by responding to the call of God contained in the being of things we become aware of our transcendent dignity. Absent acknowledgement of and respect for each person’s response to this call, we are absorbed by the body social becoming simply cogs in the social mechanism. We cease to live as subjects. The path John Paul II proposes is a “disinterested, unselfish and aesthetic attitude that is *born of wonder* in the presence of being and of the beauty which enables one to see in visible things the message of the invisible God who created them.”

We propose to trace the fixed and unshakeable principle of subsidiarity back to *the beginning* in the original community of husband and wife, to their mutual primordial wonder at their visible femininity and masculinity. When Adam was unable to find a suitable help mate from all of the animals of creation he was given the gift of a woman, bone of his bone, flesh of his flesh, like him created in the image and likeness of God, together with him the fullness of humanity. Their bodies made visible in the world what otherwise would have remained invisible: the mystery of the spiritual and the divine. Through that foundational wonder at their bodies, man and woman, drawn into the mystery of the inner life of the Trinity, became truly persons, transcendent beings and not objects for absorption or manipulation. They formed the prototype of social order and the well-spring of subsidiarity.

## **“Business as a Force for Good: A Classical-Experience-Based Curriculum Development”**

**Mr. Charles Wookey, Blueprint for Better Business and Prof. Héctor Rocha, IAE Business School**

The idea that the purpose of business is a force for good that goes beyond maximising profit for its shareholders, has grown dramatically in recent years. But this is still far from mainstream research, teaching, and practice. This paper presents a classical-experience-based curriculum development named Business as a Force for Good that aims to make mainstream the teaching of the purpose of

business beyond maximising shareholder value. It is a course that creates a reflective and transformative space for executives to explore what is necessary for businesses to become more purpose-led centred in human flourishing, and how it is always both a personal and organisational challenge. This paper summarises the teaching approach, the class dynamics, the testimonials from the participants of the first experience and the way forward.