

A MARXIST CRITIQUE OF THE PAPAL ENCYCLICALS:
LEO XIII TO JOHN PAUL II

by

James Frick

Thesis presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Ottawa
as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
(Religious Studies)

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. E.J. Lacelle

UMI Number: EC56018

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC56018
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Table of Contents:

INTRODUCTION....1

1. The Economic....1
 - a. How it is Understood....2
 - b. Failure of Papal Method....2
 - c. Critiqued by Marxism....3
2. The Encyclicals Used....5
 - a. Form of Presentation....5
3. Understanding Marxism....7

Chapter One - Leo XIII: Evils of Society; The Socialists - 1878

Part One - Leo's Position

INTRODUCTION....9

DIAGNOSIS....10

1. Secularization in General....10
2. The Socialist Threat....12
 - a. Plight of the Rank and File....12
 - b. The Socialist Option....14
 - c. Leo and the Socialists....16

REMEDY....19

1. Nationalism: Return to the Church....19
2. Socialism: Teaching and Charity....20

ASPECTS OF CAPITALISM....21

1. The State....21
2. Property....22

Part Two - Marxist Critique

LAWS OF CAPITALISM DISREGARDED....24

1. Law of Accumulation/Profit....25
2. Law of Value....26
 - a. Investing to be Competitive....27

- 3. Law of Value and Labor....28
 - a. Value Derived from Labor....28
 - b. The Process of Production Set in Motion....29
 - c. The Ability of Labor to Produce Excess Value....30
 - d. Surplus Value: Value Estranged from Labor....31
 - e. Capitalism Oblivious to Social Health....33

ON THE SOCIALISTS....34

- 1. Same Mistake Made Today....34
- 2. Strife Tied to Economics....35

ON STATE POWER....37

ON RELIGION....38

CONCLUSION....39

Chapter Two - Leo XIII: The Condition of the Workingmen - 1891

Part One - Leo's Revision

INTRODUCTION....42

SOCIALISM....44

- 1. Diagnosis Revised....44
- 2. Property and the Socialists....46

THE CHURCH....50

- 1. Return to Church Teaching....51
- 2. Capitalism to Remain Intact....51
- 3. Role of Church as Educator and Example....53
 - a. Role of Capital....54
 - b. Role of Labor....55

THE STATE....57

- 1. Capitalism Legitimate....59
- 2. State Welfare Sanctioned....59

LABOR ASSOCIATIONS....63

Part Two - Marxist Critique

ON THE SOCIALISTS....66

1. Achievement....66
2. Property....68
3. Law of Social Development....69
 - a. Hunter and Gatherer....70
 - b. Development of Production - Property and Class....72
 - c. Forces of Production in Conflict with Class Relations....75
 - d. Superiority of Feudal Class Relations....76
 - e. Feudalism to Capitalism - Forces of Production again Set Free...79
 - f. Capitalism and the Continued Advance of the Productive Forces...84
 - g. Capitalism's Inherent Contradiction Based on Class Relations....87
 - h. The Capitalist Dilemma - Profit versus Humanity....92
 - i. The Socialists' Intent....93
4. Socialist Objectives....96

ON THE CHURCH....99

1. Inequalities Inevitable....99
2. The Role of Capital....103

ON THE STATE....104

ON LABOR ASSOCIATIONS....108

CONCLUSION....111

Chapter Three - Pius XI: On Reconstructing the Social Order - 1931

Part One - Pius' Position

INTRODUCTION....113

REAFFIRMING LEO....115

1. Return to the Church....115
2. Failure of Socialism and Liberalism....116
3. Compromise - A Middle Road....118

FREE ENTERPRISE CRITIQUED....119

1. Capitalism Presently Void of Justice....119
2. Role of State in Instituting Justice....122

OMINOUS FOREWARNINGS.....	123
1. Imperialism.....	123
2. Threat of Monopolies.....	124
Part Two - Marxist Critique	
THE VALIDITY OF THE MIDDLE ROAD.....	127
1. Defects of Economic Liberalism.....	127
2. Abused Individualism.....	127
3. Systematic Essence of Capitalism.....	129
4. Inevitable Failure of the Middle Road.....	131
EVIDENCE OF IMPERIALISM.....	133
1. Imperialism - Essential for Capitalist Development.....	133
2. Export Economies.....	136
3. Agriculture.....	138
a. Inefficient Land Utilization.....	139
b. Cash Crops.....	144
c. Dependence on Food Imports.....	146
4. Foreign Debt.....	148
5. Cheap Labor.....	151
a. Cheap Labor as a Source of Profit.....	152
b. Western Standard of Living Founded on the Exploitation of Foreign Labor.....	155
EVIDENCE OF THE CAPITALIST STATE.....	159
1. Legislation Responsive to Economics.....	160
2. Business Councils and Committees.....	161
a. Council on Foreign Relations.....	161
b. Committee for Economic Development.....	163
3. Think Tanks.....	164
4. Presidential Commissions.....	165
CAPITALIST STATE AND WAR.....	166
1. Competition Necessitating Conflict.....	167

2. Imperialist Ideology Crumbling....168

CONCLUSION....169

Chapter Four - John XXIII: The Church and Social Progress - 1961

Part One - John's Position

INTRODUCTION....173

1. Why the Encyclical....173

2. The Encyclical's Radicalism....175

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP AND THE COMMON GOOD....179

1. Responsibility towards the Common Good Enlarged....179

2. Increased Interdependence Threatening Perfection....182

THE QUESTION OF WAGES....184

1. Criticism of Contemporary Wages....184

a. Wages of the Third World....184

b. Wages of the Developed World....185

Proper Wage Defined....186

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL PROGRESS, AND PERFECTION....187

1. Equitable distribution of profits....188

a. Equitable Distribution as a Precondition of Perfection....189

2. Democracy in the Workplace....190

3. Economic Representation at the Political Level....193

WORLD DEVELOPMENT....193

1. Defining the Actors' Role....194

a. Wealthy states to be Responsibly Active....194

b. Dispossessed to become Active....197

2. Imperialism Evidenced - Suggested to be an Inherent Flaw of the Capitalist Network....198

a. Starvation versus Profit....199

b. Population versus Adequate Means of Subsistence....201

Part Two - Marxist Critique

JOHN XXIII AND KARL MARX - A COMMON HOPE....203

1. Perfection Defined....203
 - a. Dignity....204
 - b. Responsibility....205
 - c. Freedom....207
2. Marx's Alienation and John's Perfection - Similarity of Goal
Difference of Diagnosis....208
 - a. Similarity of Goal....208
 - b. Difference of Diagnosis....212
3. Flawed Reforms....214

IMPERIALISM-- IGNORANCE OF DIAGNOSIS AND REALITY....216

1. Imperialism Reviewed....216
2. Flawed Diagnosis....217
3. Specifics not Cited....218

LIBERATION THEOLOGY....220

1. Participation of the Masses....220
2. Functionalism and the Ultimate Failure of Traditional Teaching....221
 - a. Liberation Theology....222
 - b. System versus Individual....224
3. Liberation Theology and the Proper Diagnosis....226

CONCLUSION....231

Chapter Five - John Paul II: On Human Labor - 1981

Part One - John Paul's Position

INTRODUCTION....236

1. Changed Conditions....236
2. Back to the Basics - Perfection Dismissed....239

THE PRIORITY OF LABOR....241

1. Labor and the Priority Thereof: Objective versus Subjective....241
 - a. Objective Labor....241
 - b. Subjective Labor....242

c. Capital's Natural Subservience Ignored....	244
d. Making Amends....	246
e. Origin of Conflict - Individual Instigation....	247
2. John Paul and Socialization....	248
a. Private Property....	248
b. Shared Property....	251
c. Government as Indirect Employer....	252
3. Economism and Collectivization: Dangerous Extremes....	255
DEFINING A JUST ECONOMIC ORDER: PROPER REMUNERATION, NOT PERFECTION..	257

Part Two - Marxist Critique

DIAGNOSIS: INDIVIDUAL VERSUS SYSTEM....	260
1. Incomplete Perception....	260
2. The Role of Competition....	262
a. Competition's Effect on Labor....	264
b. Marxism: Man Lifted Up....	265
c. Flawed Prescription....	266
UNVEILING THE TRUE CONTRADICTION AND CONFLICT....	267
1. Conflict as Subjective....	267
CONCLUSION....	270

Thesis Conclusion....

1. Summary....	272
2. Confined and Sedating Universalism....	273
a. Confined Universalism....	274
b. Sedating Universalism....	276
3. Origin of Confined and Sedating Universalism: Dismissing the Message....	277
a. From the Message to the Person....	278

- 4. Method of Correction....279
 - a. Elimination of Confined - Return to the Message....279
 - b. Return to the Message....280
 - c. Elimination of Sedating - Questioning the Socio-Economic Order....281

FOOTNOTES....287

BIBLIOGRAPHY....296

INTRODUCTION

1. The Economic

There is no one facet of the world to which the entire populus relates so intimately as it does to the "economic." In its most abstract, economy refers to the manner in which humanity provides for itself that which is necessary for its existence and the reproduction and continuation of its species over time. In its most concrete, economy refers to whether a person relates to the process of production in such a way that he lives materially secure, relatively comfortable and certain of his existence in the immediate future, or if a person's immediate future is a day to day proposition as life, in particular the means necessary to sustain such life, is far from guaranteed. A further component of economy's concrete sense involves the very process involved in obtaining the means of subsistence, a process that, in the majority of cases, consumes the greater portion of an individual's waking time. Does the individual spend his day, or for that matter, his life relating to the economic process as a farmer, an industrial laborer, a capitalist, a beggar, a government official, a teacher? Moreover, and most importantly, does the position occupied by the individual afford and encourage his total development? Are his talents and faculties for the arts, sciences, and the humanities effectively nurtured so as to allow for his overall well-being and the complete realization of his human potential? Or, on the other hand, are such faculties and potential disregarded if not actually discouraged and

repressed by the work process?

a. How it is Understood

As important is the economic, or better still, the manner in which the economy relates to and determines each person's existence as described above, is the way in which one understands the economy. This is to say, how does one choose to perceive the economy? Does one approach the economy empty, unbiased, tainted only of curiosity and the objective of truth, or is one burdened by preconceptions of social reality that cannot help but influence the method of analysis used for deciphering the economy's purpose, its reason for being? Indeed, if one approaches a social phenomenon adhering to preconception^s, the nature of which, pertain to and, in part, explain the phenomenon in question, it is most certain that one's method of investigation will invariably be restricted, forced to conform, to be in accord with the beliefs and values comprising such preconceptions. If this be the case, the credibility of the conclusions and recommendations inferred from such prejudiced^d investigation can only be considered questionable- questionable in terms of overall objectivity and in the effectiveness of any policy or plan of action that might be construed and enacted on the basis of such conclusions and recommendations.

b. Failure of Papal Method

It is precisely the issue of papal impartiality regarding humanity's most critical temporal concern, the economic, as well

as the resultant deficiencies of Church analysis and instruction rooted in such impartiality, that this paper concerns itself. In this regard, the paper examines a series of papal encyclicals, covering the years 1878 to 1982, written for the express purpose of addressing the capitalist economy in order to devise instruction capable of alleviating the negative social effects such an economy precipitates. *Common* to the method of all four writers considered, Leo XIII, Pius XI, John XXIII, and John Paul II, is their uncompromising functionalism. Simply put, the popes approach the question of economics convinced that contemporary society and its institutional components, including the economy, are legitimate, thoroughly ordained by natural law. In this light, though admitting that the operative economy is far from perfect and in need of periodic adjustments to correct social inconsistencies; nevertheless, the fundamental, structural purpose of the capitalist mode of production is never questioned much less subjected to scientific scrutiny. Obviously, the complete absence of such basic inquiry can only, and indeed, does minimize the validity of any papal dialogue involving the economy, whether it be an interpretation of or corrective measures for.

c. Critiqued by Marxism

In demonstrating the above, in particular, the pronounced and condemning lack of papal objectivity, the various popes' analyses, conclusions, and recommendations, shall be critiqued in the light of an investigative procedure that is the opposite of the popes', that predicates its analysis, conclusions, and re-

commendations, not on unfounded preconceptions, but on years of investigative study of the economy itself. This alternate means of economic exploration being Marxism. Unlike the Church, Marxist theory deems nothing sacred and immune to investigation. The fundamental axiom of Marxist analysis is that in order to eliminate the vices associated with a social component, for instance, the economy, it is crucial, if not mandatory, that one first thoroughly and objectively as possible understand the component in question. For it is only through comprehending the reality of the subject as it exists in and of itself, that one may critically testify to its influence, positive or negative, on surrounding reality, as well as have any possibility of formulating and enacting those alterations capable of and, in fact, necessary for inducing the change desired. According to this approach, Marxist analysis reveals an economic mode of production that is hardly deserving of the uncritical acceptance and reverence granted to and bestowed upon it by the Church. On the contrary, Marxism argues that the purpose of capitalism as defined by its own laws and structure of being, in specific, the relations to the means of production, necessarily opposes the interests and well-being of humanity.

In short, the paper seeks to contrast alternate methods of economic inquiry, papal and Marxist, for the specific purpose of demonstrating the dangerous absence of investigation marking papal procedure, as well as show how such absence renders the conclusions and recommendations of the Catholic Church economically untenable and operatively useless.

2. The Encyclicals Used

The papal documents to be utilized in the study include the following: Leo XIII- Evils of Society/Inscrutable, The Socialists/Quod Apostolici Muneris (1878), The Condition of the Workingmen/Rerum Novarum (1891); Pius XI- On Reconstructing the Social Order/Quadragesimo Anno (1931); John XXIII- Christianity and Social Progress/Mater et Magistra (1961); and John Paul II- On Human Labor/Laborem Exercens (1982). The reason for their inclusion involves the fact that together, the above mentioned encyclicals represent an evolution of papal thought with regard to capitalism. Each of the works brings to the economic dialogue lasting innovation that takes the form of steppingstones upon which future popes build and consistently refer to.

a. Form of Presentation

In presenting the encyclicals, the paper shall, first of all, let the popes speak for themselves. For in order that the reader be able to judge for himself the validity of the papal pronouncements, existing by themselves or in the light of the Marxist criticism to follow, it is essential that the paper first make available unto the reader a clear and precise presentation of the papal perspective, diagnoses as well as suggestions. Secondly, if the reader is to fully appreciate and comprehend the papal arguments, it is important that he become familiar, not just with the arguments themselves, but with the historical situation provoking the arguments' inception. In this regard, the presentation of each encyclical shall be preceded by a brief

introduction designed to inform the reader of the particular historical context from which the encyclical emerged.

On the basis of this form of papal presentation, the paper hopes to make apparent the way in which papal economic thought has evolved over the last 100 years, becoming ever critical through time, as well as show, by virtue of the Marxist critique, how such thought, though becoming more precise, is nevertheless hindered by the presence of a debilitating functionalism. A functionalism that has granted the capitalist system sanctuary from those questions and the investigation necessary for revealing, for divulging the inner essence, the purpose and being of the capitalist mode of production. Indeed, until such an unwarranted functionalism is dismissed, the economic teaching of the Church can only be considered questionable if not worthless, as any teaching must be which exists so oblivious to the reality at hand.

At this point one should note that while the above list is indeed significant in terms of papal economic analysis, it is far from complete. In this regard, John XXIII's Pacem in Terris/Peace on Earth (1963) and Paul VI's Populorum Progressio/Development of the People (1967) are the most notable exceptions. Though dealing with specific economic concerns, particularly Populorum Progressio and its criticism of imperialist techniques, both encyclicals are predominantly political in scope, and thus, fall outside the socio-economic parameters within which the paper's interest lies. For to adequately study these documents would require a full and comprehensive extrapolation

of international politics that is simply beyond the paper's intent and ability. In any case, because imperialism does depict a crucial stage in capitalist development and is referred to in a number of the encyclicals that are considered, one may rest assured that, as a topic of economic consideration, imperialism shall be dealt with in a most thorough and exhaustive manner.

3. Understanding Marxism

When one refers to Marxist theory, more times than not, one is apt to think of its concrete embodiment, the Soviet Union. Whether or not such a connection is warranted can be answered in three ways: 1) yes, communism Soviet style represents the actualization of a theory committed to dictatorship, enslavement, and misery; 2) yes, the Soviet state is in perfect accord with Marxist thought and provides humankind with inspiration and hope for worldwide liberation; 3) no, far from embodying Marxist theory and ideals, the Soviet Union has merely veiled itself with Marxist rhetoric in a failing attempt to conceal the fact that it derives its inspiration and motivation from a most blatant and despotic brand of state capitalism. Make no mistake, it is the third and final response that the paper sides with. In the opinion of this writer, one must disregard Marx's writings entirely if claiming the Soviet Bloc nations to be true to his values and in line with his theory. One need only read his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 to grasp in full what Marx believed to be humanity's

greatest objective- its complete and absolute liberation from material necessity and political bondage.

In any event, this paper seeks not to advocate any aspect of Marxism, whether it be the above mentioned goals or the violence Marx suggests is necessary for obtaining such goals. On the contrary, the paper chooses to implement Marxism as a tool of comparison. This is to say, the paper desires only to compare the most objective aspect of Marx's theory, his analysis and discernment of capitalism's inherent laws and tendencies as divulged in the three volumes of Capital which, incidentally, one must be familiar with before one can utter but a word of judgment concerning the soundness of Marx's method, with that of the popes'. For it is this writer's belief that it is only through recognizing the comprehensive method Marxism employs in its study of the economy, that one can fully appreciate the problem of unfounded biases plaguing most facets of papal method, analysis as well as recommendation.

CHAPTER I- LEO the XIII - 1878

INTRODUCTION

In examining the first encyclicals penned by Leo XIII, Evils of Society/Inscrutabili, April 21, 1878; and The Socialists/Quod Apostolici Muneris, December 28, 1878, both of which can be said to have initiated, and indeed, created the foundation upon which future papal social teaching was to be based, the chapter shall be divided into four parts. First, objectively presented shall be Leo's diagnosis concerning the acute and prolific socio-economic infirmities which plagued the masses throughout the industrializing West at the turn of the century. Second, from the position of his diagnosis, explored shall be Leo's response to such troubles in the form of the prescription he puts forth to be acknowledged and adhered to. Third, using the above as a backdrop, the encyclicals shall be examined for the purpose of revealing Leo's interpretation and understanding of the major components comprising capitalism in terms of it being a political, socio-economic system (e.g. property, wages, labor, state power). Specifically, it is the chapter's objective to derive from the thought of Leo how the above components garner their legitimacy in terms of both their very being and as far as their power and potential effects should be allowed and sustained. Finally, the fourth stage of the investigation and the second part of the chapter shall consist of a review and critique that seeks to evaluate Leo's diagnosis and remedy as well as his general understanding of the capitalist motif by exposing it to the rigors of scientific Marxism. Thus, on the basis of

the intrinsic laws of capitalism as discovered and propounded by Marx, in particular, the law of accumulation, the prime motive of any capitalist enterprise, as well as the law of value, the method by which profit is created, the validity of Leo's explanation and thought in general as well as the potential effectiveness of his various recommendations shall be determined.

DIAGNOSIS

On the basis of the encyclicals themselves, one is made to understand Leo as attributing the socio-economic depravity typifying the time period to both a secularization of society in general, as well as a blatant attack of the social order itself.

1. Secularization in General

As far as the secularization of society is concerned, Leo's world represented a time of national awakening. Most representative of this spirit of nationalism was the newly united German state under Bismark. Important to note in that it reflected a trend throughout Europe, was that not only was Germany united in the basic sense of a territory, it was united in the more substantial sense of a peoplehood. In Italy itself, the problem of nationalism as seen from the Church's eye had already achieved crisis level. For it was during the pontificate of Leo's predecessor, Pius IX, *that* in 1860 over two-thirds of the Church's vast states in central Italy were annexed by king

Victor Emmanuel II. A decade later papal authority was yet to receive its bitterest taste of national spirit as the most sacred of sacred territory, Rome itself, was beset and occupied by the Italian army.¹

Turning to the people, by virtue of the tide of nationalism the people of the continent began to cut themselves adrift from their ancient steppingstone, the Church, in order that they might reorientate and identify themselves with the freshly expressed ethnocentric political focal point, the state. Truly, the pontificate of Leo XIII was, if anything, characterized by a redefinition and consolidation of the once far-reaching papal power and influence that had been so drastically curtailed in the wake of the new nationalism.

With the above representing the political stage upon which Leo's pontificate had its debut, his diagnosis of the economic injustices so prevalent is easily understood. According to Leo, it was precisely the state's deviation from and exclusion of the Church that served to foster and aggravate the economic woes of many. Leo writes:

We unhappily find laws subversive of divine constitution of the Catholic Church promulgated in the greater number of states. Such is the reason for contempt of the episcopal authority and the difficulties thrown in the way of the exercise of the ecclesiastical ministry, the dispersion of the religious orders and the confiscation and public sale of the property which served to support the servants of the Church and feed the poor. From this cause arise the measures leading to the removal of public institutions devoted to charity and beneficence from the salutary direction of the Church...²

2. The Socialist Threat

a. Plight of the Rank and File

More than nationalism, the most marked phenomenon distinguishing the time of Leo's pontificate was the unbridled social upheaval ushered forth by the industrial revolution. Throughout Europe cities were developing around industrial centers which were growing and expanding at unprecedented rates. In this regard, the once predominant agricultural areas, tremendously aided in terms of productivity and efficiency through the utilization of new technology and mechanical innovations, displaced millions of unnecessary farmhands as well as small-scale farmers, the great bulk of which migrated and settled in the cities where industry proved eager to make them of use.³ Characteristic of these cities was an anarchy of planning. Unable to adequately sustain the migrating populace, overcrowded conditions became the norm. It was not unusual for a family of five to share a one room, so to speak, apartment measuring 10' by 12' with ceilings less than 6' high. Here follows an eyewitness account of a typical urban dwelling around the turn of the century:

In one small cellar measuring 1,500 cubic feet... there are ten persons...The beds- and in that term a include any roll of dirty old rags, or an armful of shavings- have an average of 3.3 persons to each, many have five to six persons to each, and some people are absolutely without beds; they sleep in their ordinary clothes, on the bare boards...young men and women, married and unmarried, all together. I need scarcely add that many of these dwellings are dark, damp, dirty, stinking holes, utterly unfit for human habitations...⁴

Inevitably, riding the heels of such cramped conditions were the standard problems of sanitation, health, infant mortality, mortality in general, lack of foodstuffs, shelter, clothing; indeed, a veritable scarcity of all the things needed to subsist.

Of course, the above description of a scanty, impoverished existence is in no way to suggest that the means and the potential to solve such hardship were non-existent, for they were. What was not existent was a social philosophy encompassing and, in fact, guiding the productive forces such that they would be devoted to the priority of satisfying the basic needs of society's members. Instead, the dominant attitude of both state officials and industrialists was one of laissez faire capitalism which, in most basic thought and reality, subscribes to the priority of profit over and against all other considerations and interference, particularly by the government in the form of regulation. Hence, it was desirable to keep wages as depressed as possible (minimal subsistence), as well as to create an unemployed reserve army to act as a buffer against potential worker agitation. Finally, the absolute enhancement of profit was further realized in the horrendous working conditions that typified the day. Working conditions where safety codes, health codes, not to say anything of the worker's dignity, were all dead issues. Why? Because again, any kind of investment in the welfare of the worker is simply not a profitable venture from the perspective of the laissez faire capitalist.

The ideology of laissez faire capitalism made manifest is perhaps best illustrated in the plight of the 19th century European mine worker. Though not as well documented as are the conditions of the industrial workplace, the predicament of the mine worker was generally considered to be worse. The greatest danger, and indeed, most frequent occurrence being the caving in of a shaft or tunnel often resulting in the lives of many miners being snuffed out in a matter of seconds. Moreover, in the majority of cases the impetus for the cave was cited as being a lack of necessary support beams. Why such a lack?, because company planning calculated that in the long run the money saved in the lumber for beams outweighed the costs of retunneling. Interesting to note, as Papal Nuncio to the Belgian court in 1843, it is without doubt that Leo was aware of the miners' plight as Belgium was the site of extensive mining operations.⁵

b. The Socialist Option

With the above sufficing as a brief commentary on the socio-economic injustices suffered by the masses throughout Europe at the time of Leo's pontificate, it is not very difficult for one to imagine the tremendous amount of support the emerging socialists and their worker-orientated ideas generated amongst the people. Ideas, though differing in method, generally insisted on imposing vast and dramatic alterations on the socio-economic realm in order to alleviate the worker's burden. By the time of Leo's pontificate there had already existed a

Communist League which was first established in Brussels but later was superseded by the more advanced and universal International Workingman's Association. Although the International was destined to dissipate into various factions over the years, the ideas it helped spawn survived and were propagated by the various labor parties that had been established and continued to evolve throughout Europe.⁶

As far as the leadership of the workers was concerned, while no one person could ever be seen as, so to speak, in charge, especially when considering the very precarious and factious nature of the various movements; nevertheless, particular individuals all jockeyed for position and leadership among the rank and file. Of the individuals pushing their program of worker emancipation, whether it be the popular German leader Lasalle, or the French anarchist Proudhon, or the continually exiled militant Bakunin, the one figure who in terms of his thoughts and ideas, was generally accepted as the undisputed head of an often fragmented movement was the German born

Karl Marx. Marx, whose prestige and influence amongst the proletariat was engendered through his authorship of the Communist Manifesto (along with Frederick Engels) as well as his writing the constitution of the Workingmen's Association and his greatest yet never actually completed legacy, Capital, represented to the established order a most dangerous and potentially subversive antithesis. An antithesis most evident in the Marxian interpretation of history which asserted the inevitable demise and complete collapse of the reigning capitalist order.

c. Leo and the Socialists

Coupled with the secularism of nationalism, Leo recognized the civil agitation triggered by the various socialist groups- "Socialists, Communists, or Nihilists"- as further contributing to the economic malaise of society in the sense of such groups' objective being the subversion of society as a whole, including the Church. Again, as in the case of nationalism, but in a much more overt and drastic fashion, intrinsic to the socialist tendency was a condemnation of the Catholic Church which was interpreted as a stumbling block to the implementation of socio-economic reforms. Clearly, while not all of the leftist groups were anti-Church, the most influential ones (those subscribing to the teachings of Marx or Bakunin) viewed the Church from the historical perspective of allying itself with whatever socio-economic institutions were dominant at a given time. Thus, in order to facilitate the far reaching changes these socialist groups desired, it was realized and openly professed by such groups that the Church, operating as consort to the existing capitalist regime, must fall with it.

In this light, it is no wonder that the socialist brand of equality, freedom, and worker controlled production, was denounced and reviled in no uncertain terms by Leo.

You understand, Venerable Brethren, that We speak of that sect of men who, under various and almost barbarous names, are called Socialists, Communists, or Nihilists. Spread over all the world, and bound together by the closest of ties in a wicked confederacy, they no longer seek the shelter of secret meetings, but, openly and boldly march forth in the

light of day, striving to bring to a head what they have long been planning- the overthrow of all civil society whatsoever.⁷

Categorizing the socialists as mere thieves with the sole interest of deceiving the poor through a gilded tongue professing social concern, Leo insisted their actual objective was to use the masses, the deprived, as a means for achieving their own selfish ends.

By a scheme of horrible wickedness, and under the guise of caring for the needs and satisfying the desires of all men, they try to secure and hold in common whatever has been acquired by title of lawful inheritance, by labor of brain and hands, or by thrift in one's mode of life.⁸

Moreover, even if the socialists truly desired the betterment of humanity's lot, Leo asserted that any solution that is to succeed can only do so if the components of such solution are defined within parameters acceptable to the Church. Parameters, important to note, which have their basis, their very foundation in the Word of God as revealed to his Church, and from his Church to all humankind.

But We affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the Church. It is the Church that proclaims from the Gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be brought to an end or at least made far less bitter. The Church uses her efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by her precepts the life and conduct of men.⁹

Needless to say, far from adhering to any papal prerequisite in their program for change, the socialists were interpreted by Leo as out and out disrupters of a type of natural, or better

still, divine order. Hence, using no uncertain terms, Leo concluded that the only possible result of the socialist effort would be a secular world engaged in the titanic error of interpreting itself as the creator of its own destiny, and thus, inevitably casting itself into a turbulent sea of economic and socio-political chaos. Why?, because such a world would purposely bypass the true course of its progress- a progress that can only exist and be understood as "untampered" reality determined by God and guarded by his spokesman, *the* Church.

Surêly these are they who, as the Sacred Scriptures testify, "defile the flesh, despise dominion, and blaspheme majesty" (Jude Ep. 8). They leave nothing untouched or whole which by both human and divine laws has been wisely decreed for the health and beauty of life.¹⁰

Again Leo writes:

Assuredly the Church wisely inculcates the apostolic precept on the mass of men: "There is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist purchase for themselves damnation." And again Seh admonishes those "subject by necessity" to be so "not only for wrath but for conscience' sake," and to render "to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour" (Rom. XIII).¹¹

To summarize Leo's diagnosis of the socio-economic ills plaguing an industrializing Europe, Leo claims such ills have their locus in a godless humanity- a godless humanity precipi-

tated in a twofold sense. First noted was the general trend of nationalism in fashion throughout Europe, and the inevitable secularism such nationalism ushered forth. Second, the socialists were seen as levelling a very specific and overt offensive against the Church which they (the socialists) viewed as fortifying the existing socio-economic institutions. Institutions that, from the socialists perspective, must be revamped if not totally done away with in order to facilitate the changes they sought.

REMEDY

1. Nationalism: Return to the Church

From the diagnosis, the balm for soothing and eventually healing the prevailing economic depravity becomes most apparent. Simply, Leo calls for an unconditional return to the Will of God as reflected in the precepts set by the Church. As far as state nationalism was concerned, such a return meant upholding papal influence and Catholic teaching as well as re-establishing and, in fact, preserving Catholic properties previously annexed-properties which played a crucial role in assisting the poor and helpless. Leo argues:

Again and again We beseech them, for their own safety's sake as well as that of their people, to welcome and give ear to the Church which has had such wonderful influence on the public prosperity of kingdoms, and to recognize that the foundation of spiritual and temporal rule are so closely united that what is taken from the spiritual power weakens the loyalty of subjects and the majesty of kings...let them restore

that Church to the conditions and liberty in which She may exert her healing force for the benefit of all society.¹²

2. Socialism: Teaching and Charity

Turning to socialism, Leo considered it a great evil purposely designed to lead man astray in both thought and deed from the Word of God. In thought, in the sense that socialism preached God to be an illusion and interpreted the Church itself, by virtue of its conservative demeanor, to be a factor contributing to the people's suffering. In deed, in the sense that the socialists, in order to enact their various reforms, called for the eventually subversion of the existing socio-economic components of society. According to Leo, such motives threaten the natural order of things as ordained by God. In this regard, Leo, revealing his functionalist leanings, adamantly believed the social, political, and economic trappings of society, existed precisely because they were a mandate from God. Hence, to tamper with the social structure is to tamper with the divine order of things, the very Will of God. He writes:

...strive with all your force of soul to implant the Catholic teaching deep in the minds of all. Strive that all may have the habit of clinging to God with filial love, and that, revering His divinity from their tenderest years, they may respect the majesty of princes and of laws; that they may restrain their passions and stand fast by the order which God has established in civil and domestic society.¹³

Along with the above, Leo's prescription goes on to include an appeal of charity issued at the individual level. Though briefly, Leo nevertheless clearly reminds the "rich" of their duties and obligations towards the impoverished.

She is constantly impressing on the rich that most grave precept to give to the poor what remains; and she holds over their heads the divine sentence that unless they succour the needy they will be repaid by eternal torment.¹⁴

ASPECTS OF CAPITALISM

On the basis of his two initial encyclicals, all evidence demonstrates Leo as unconditionally condoning the system of laissez faire capitalism as it existed and thrived during his pontificate. While, as said earlier, he does petition the wealthy to aid the poor in their plight, Leo nevertheless feels quite content to leave the very foundation, the very structure of the system intact. This attitude is particularly reflected in his discussion of the legitimacy of both state power and property.

1. The State

As far as state power is concerned, Leo justifies and sanctions it in the name of divine order and will.

Thus, as even in the kingdom of heaven He hath willed that the choirs of angels be distinct and some subject to others, and in the Church likewise has instituted various orders and a diversity of offices, so that all are not apostles or doctors or pastors (I Cor. XII), so also has He appointed that there should be various orders

in civil society, differing in dignity, rights, and power, whereby the State, like the Church, should be one body, consisting of many members, some nobler than others, but all necessary to each other and solicitous for the common good.¹⁵

Obviously, by granting the state a unique mandate from God, Leo inevitably commits himself to a situation in which a most reactionary government must be tolerated and endured. According to Leo, the crucial need for such tolerance lies in the overriding importance of and desire for social stability. He writes:

And if at any time it happens that the power of the state is rashly and tyrannically wielded by princes, the teaching of the Catholic Church does not allow an insurrection on private authority against them, lest public order be only the more disturbed, and lest society take greater hurt therefrom.¹⁶

For Leo therefore, it is not a matter of the qualitative disposition of society determining whether or not society should be civilly maintained or violently dismissed, as it is a matter of society's order and scheme reflecting a heavenly will. A will one should never act contrary to or apart from even in times of great suffering. If anything, the will of God may only be petitioned through prayers. He writes:

And when affairs come to such a pass that there is no other hope of safety, she teaches that relief may be hastened by the merits of Christian patience and by earnest prayers to God.¹⁷

2. Property

Looking at the concept of property, Leo's condoning of

state authority likewise applied to property. Plainly stated, from Leo's point of view it is only reasonable that the inequality of men's minds and bodies necessitates a similar inequality of possessions. Moreover, such inequality, like the right of the state, derives its very being from a natural order, from the will of God.

For while the socialists would destroy the right of property, alleging it to be a human invention, altogether opposed to the inborn equality of man, and claiming a community of goods, arguing that poverty should not be peaceably endured, and that the property and privileges of the rich may be rightfully invaded—the Church, with much greater wisdom and good sense, recognizes... the right of property and of ownership, which spring forth from nature itself, must not be touched and stands inviolate.¹⁸

When applying this method of thought to capitalism per se, one can only deduce Leo as giving complete acquiescence to a system whose very pivot rests on the means of production being privately owned and controlled by a select few. Moreover, and perhaps most important as far as the social question is concerned, a firm *commitment* to the capitalist system necessarily entails a *commitment* to the essential laws of capitalism, accumulation and value, as well as to the social conditions such laws inevitably create and foster. In other words, if the Church sanctions a system of private ownership such as capitalism, must it not sanction as well the depraved conditions engendered by the system? Indeed, it seems it must. This problem shall be further investigated in the critique section to follow.

PART II - MARXIST CRITIQUE

In the process of critiquing Leo's diagnosis and prescription, undoubtedly of great benefit is the hindsight garnered unto us over the last hundred years. A hindsight that has truly demonstrated and revealed to us the underpinnings, the crucial economic laws explored by Marx that serve as the very essence of capitalism.

LAWS OF CAPITALISM DISREGARDED

To begin, Leo perceived the socio-economic ills of society as not intrinsically, and hence, not necessarily associated with the capitalist process. On the contrary, he believed the capitalist system founded on the private ownership of the means of production to be a legitimate and tolerable fixture operating in the realm of humanity. Of course, this is not to suggest he denied the existence of the ills that persisted hand in hand with the relatively new and rapidly evolving economic system. Indeed, they did exist, as such ills were the very subject the two encyclicals addressed. However, as his diagnosis made perfectly clear, rather than attributing the socio-economic depravity of an industrializing society to the economic system itself, Leo insisted such depravity had its locus firmly entrenched in the secularism of the time. Leo's functionalist belief in social wholeness caused him to assert that social health was merely a matter of people returning to the Church and its guidance.

Moreover, labor hard that the children of the Catholic Church neither join nor favour in any way whatsoever this abominable sect (the socialists); let them show,

on the contrary, by noble deeds and right dealing in all things, how well and happily human society would hold together were each member to shine as an example of right doing and virtue.¹⁹

1. Law of Accumulation/Profit

By such pronouncements, it is unquestionable that Leo neither made himself familiar with the already existing scientific studies concerning the intrinsic laws of capitalism (i.e. Marx's Capital) or he simply rejected such studies, nor did he have the benefit of seeing, as we have, such laws evolve and make themselves manifest in contemporary history. Of such laws, undoubtedly the most basic and immutable one being that of profit motive, or in more specific terms, the accumulation of capital. Simply, in order to survive, it is imperative that competitive business and industry facilitate a profit, value over and above the initial investment. Such value is particularly essential in terms of expanding production, conducting technological research, and searching for new and cheaper sources of raw materials, all in the name of producing a product competitive in price, and thus, capable of ensuring continued accumulation. For if one engages strictly in a process of simple reproduction, such that a specific amount of capital originally utilized to initiate the preceding period of turnover (the total process of investment, production, marketing, and securing the original investment plus profit) is likewise used to facilitate all following turnover periods, resulting in the creation of a constant and equivalent amount of value

and profit for each turnover, it is but a matter of time until a competitor industry in order to purchase, for instance, machinery capable of producing more products in a shorter period of time, and hence, cheaper products in terms of value, invests a part of its profits along with its standard investment into the process of production. And of course, the result of the cheaper product's appearance on the market *is* that it may be sold for less than the average market price (for such a product), and thus, accrue unto itself a relatively significant portion of the market's demand.

2. Law of Value

At this point, what must be discussed is the reason why the individual product of an industry which produces more in a given period of time relative to a competitor is, in fact, less in value. To begin, as is the law of accumulation, an equally immutable law of the capitalist mode of production posits that the natural value of all commodities hinges on the socially necessary labor time involved and, for all intents and purposes, contained within their production. Thus, if one company produces 10 beds a day with their total value, understood in terms of the labor intrinsic to their production (both "live" and "dead"/means of production) equalling 1000 dollars, while another factory utilizing an equivalent amount of labor is capable of producing, due to technological innovation or a more efficient structuring of the workplace, 20 beds for the same 1000 dollars; while the natural value of each bed produced

by the former company would total 100 dollars, the natural value of a bed produced by the latter company would only be half as much, or 50 dollars. In this light, the latter industry, desiring a competitive edge by virtue of producing a cheaper product, saw fit to invest a portion of its profits directly into the process of production itself. An investment committed for the specific purpose of transforming the workplace, making it more efficient, productive, and, most importantly, competitive.

a. Investing to be Competitive

In this regard, the profits invested might be utilized in order to enlarge the workplace itself, and thus, permit the more efficient use of labor power. Or perhaps the invested profits might be utilized to conduct research leading to technological innovations that would assist in minimizing labor costs as well as decrease production costs on the whole by allowing more products to be manufactured in a given time period relative to that produced by the level of technology presently in use. In any event, the bottom line being that such cost cutting investments would allow the cheaper yet equal quality products to dominate the market, forcing other companies to either follow suit through instituting similar innovations or be forced out of the market and out of business entirely. In short, going beyond simple reproduction, the goal of investing increasing amounts of capital into the production process is to acquire additional profit. Profit, conceived in terms of not

just to be simply invested in the, so to speak, standard production process, but also destined to affect the very process of production, making it increasingly efficient and productive via technical and structural innovation, and hence, the products it renders forth ever competitive on and demanded by the market.

3. Law of Value and Labor

Focusing on the social arena, the question becomes what role, and indeed, fate awaits the laborer residing in a society whose productive forces are governed by the capitalist laws briefly reviewed. At the outset, one may immediately and accurately state that the laborer will always exist as a mere means to an end- the end being, of course, the priority of profit. To clarify, it is essential that one first comprehend the essence, the very properties bestowed upon labor by virtue of the laws of capitalist production.

a. Value Derived from Labor

As said earlier, the value of all commodities is determined by the socially necessary labor time involved in their production. For instance, if in the construction of a bed the laborer contributes 5 dollars of value an hour to the bed, and if the bed takes a total of 10 hours to complete, the total value granted unto the bed by virtue of labor would equal 50 dollars. Thus, the natural price (the price unaffected by the supply and demand typifying market conditions) of the bed being 50 dollars plus the value contained within the means of production- the

various hardware and tools the laborer makes use of. So there is no confusion, at this point let it be noted that the value of the means of production, like any commodity, is, of course, determined by the amount of labor involved in their creation. For example, if the means of production, wood, nails, screws, pliers, and saws, which the laborer utilizes and acts upon in the production process are valued at 30 dollars, while the value the laborer himself imparts to the product stands at 50 dollars, the natural price of the finished product will equal 80 dollars.

b. The Process of Production set in Motion

So far so good. Next to understand involves the , so to speak, instigation of the productive process. In other words, how does the capitalist initiate the process of production? First, the capitalist realizes he must bring together in a manufacturing setting the means of production and labor. Hence, the capitalist goes out and, using our above example, purchases for 30 dollars the necessary means of production for creating a single bed. Next he goes to the labor market and purchases, most crucial to note, not the amount of value the laborer will create, but the very value of the worker's labor power. A value that, like any other commodity, is determined by the socially necessary labor involved in reproducing the worker in terms of the worker being capable of maintaining his traditional and cultural existence. To explain, if a worker requires 20 dollars a day to survive as he is accustomed and thereby sustain his ability to labor, the worker's labor power

as a commodity to be bought and sold is appraised at the natural price of 20 dollars.

c. The Ability of Labor to Produce Excess Value

So our capitalist has purchased the two commodities necessary for production and puts them to work. At this point, what must be understood as the essential prerequisite of the capitalist system is the fact that labor power is the only commodity able to create more value than it costs to produce.²⁰ To explain, the capitalist pays 30 dollars for the means of production which, once transferred to the bed, maintains its value of 30 dollars. This is to say, the means of production, representing, if you will, a "constant" value, imparts unto the assembled product only the value at which it was purchased for, in this case 30 dollars.²¹ Labor power, on the other hand, is so very unique in that it exists as a "variable" factor. Variable in the sense that the amount of value it creates is not determined until it has been utilized.²² To make clearer through analogy, two men purchase chairs - one for each. The first man sits upon his chair for only an hour a week; the other, 12 hours each day. Regardless of how often the respective chairs are sat on, both men paid the same price for the chairs. The above holds true for labor. For while labor power is purchased at its given value, the amount it is used, and hence, the value it thusly creates, is entirely up to the capitalist, especially in Leo's time when there existed little government regulation concerning the length of the working day.

Returning to our scenario, we see the capitalist allocating 20 dollars a day for the labor power sold as a commodity by the worker. Once purchased, it is the sole decision of the capitalist how to and to what extent such labor will be utilized. If the capitalist imposes a 10 hour working day, just enough time to build one bed, and realizes from the laborer 5 dollars of value every hour, by the time the bed is complete the laborer will have contributed 50 dollars worth of value to the finished product. Coupled with the 30 dollars of value imparted to the bed through the means of production, the total value constituting the completed bed is 80 dollars.

d. Surplus Value: Value Estranged from Labor

The contradiction becomes most blatant. In short, while the worker is paid 20 dollars as that constitutes the value of his labor power, such labor power is manipulated so that not only is the capitalist reimbursed his initial 20 dollar investment within the first four hours (each hour equalling, as we have said, 5 dollars of value), he further accrues unto himself over the duration of the remaining six hours, 30 dollars of "surplus value". In this regard, it is possible to further elucidate and clarify the above development by envisaging the working day as being composed of two distinct portions. The first portion, totalling 4 hours of labor, and hence, 20 dollars of value created, is designated as "necessary" labor time. Necessary in the sense that it is during this allotment of time that the capitalist recovers his 20 dollar investment of labor power. The second

portion, equalling 6 hours of labor time, and hence, 30 dollars of created value, is termed "surplus" labor time. Surplus in the sense that during this time all value created represents a veritable surplus over and against the capitalist's initial investment in labor. Calling forth our earlier discussion of the law of capitalist accumulation, it is exactly this surplus value, this profit, estranged and alienated from its true creator, that the capitalist swears his undying commitment and allegiance to in the sense of facilitating and securing as much as possible.

Obviously, with such laws and priorities intrinsic to capitalism in effect, it is inevitable that society's members will be manipulated into a state of capitalist conformance. Conformance which entails people being designated and degraded as nothing but the mere means necessary for satiating capitalism's accumulating ends. In this light, the previous discussion describing the horrifying life of the worker characteristic of Leo's time, so irrational, so incomprehensible when witnessed from the standpoint of humanity, suddenly assumes impeccable logic and undeniable legitimacy when interpreted and understood from the perspective of capitalism's own objective laws and principles. For example, in order to fulfill the goal of maximizing accumulation, it is crucial that the capitalist struggles to ensure that wages remain as depressed as possible in order to minimize the "necessary" portion of the working day, causing the "surplus" amount to increase in direct proportion, and hence, the surplus value created to likewise increase. Moreover, as labor power, as said earlier, represents nothing but a commodity subject

to the market laws of supply and demand, the creation of an "industrial reserve army," the unemployed, proves vital for capital's well-being as it further ensures that wages be kept to a desirable minimum. Again, the pathetic, inhumane working conditions that persisted (and still do), so senseless from the viewpoint of human care and concern, discover themselves garbed in a robe of validity seamlessly tailored by the laws of capitalist production.

e. Capitalism Oblivious to Social Health

From the above, it is quite clear that Leo's remedy for healing society's ills by acting in accordance with Christian morality and virtue is destined to fail for the simple reason that the capitalist system is immune and, in fact, opposed to the very concepts of human morality and worth particularly when such concepts detract and hinder the natural progression of the accumulation process. Indeed, capitalism transcends the individual motive. Capitalism is a social process abstracted from yet completely encompassing the individual's efforts, such that any effort, moral or otherwise, issued forth from the individual strictly conforms to the role assigned unto him by the system's laws, by the system's very needs, as defined by such laws, over and against all other considerations. In short, if it were possible for the people of society to live out a type of Christian morality actively prioritizing human worth and dignity, capitalism would not exist. It simply could not. For as no man may serve two masters, capitalism likewise is enslaved

solely unto itself, unto its preservation, and hence, unto its never denied goal of profit.

ON THE SOCIALISTS

In light of the above, in his tirade against the socialists we must find Leo guilty of levelling blame on the symptom rather than the cause. For if the economy were structured to meet and fulfill the needs of its members in terms of adequate employment of a dignified and fulfilling nature, sufficient food, clothing, and shelter; indeed, if that were the economy's overriding goal and purpose, there would have assuredly existed little, if any, social unrest and certainly no revolutionary trends as typified the socialist movements of Leo's time. In a word, if society were geared to "the human" rather than to "the profit", the breeding ground for socialist agitation would have been dried up, virtually barren of the socio-economic burdens the socialist movement sought to alleviate, and hence, was generated by.

1. Same Mistake Made Today

Looking at a contemporary analogy, President Reagan's rhetoric on the "communists" in Latin America is part and parcel based on the same faulty assumption adhered to by Leo. The policy line of the Reagan administration has been to consistently credit the socialist movements that exist so viably throughout U.S. spheres of influence, in particular, Central America, as being the direct result of foreign inspiration and guidance provided by Cuba and the Soviet Union. In specific, according

to the President the various guerilla activities in El Salvador as well as the successful socialist revolution in Nicaragua have no indigenous basis, but are, through and through, the product of an external conspiracy propagated by the Soviet Bloc. Unfortunately for the President's sake, when exposed to scientific analysis the, so to speak, Moscow/Havana conspiracy diagnosis holds little credibility.

2. Strife Tied to Economics

Experts on Central America have determined the source of the above mentioned revolutionary movements as being firmly entrenched in the economic injustices plaguing the particular societies in question. Specialists at the University of North Carolina were requested by the State Department to prepare a report concerning the troubles in El Salvador. According to their findings, the current revolutionary tide sweeping the country predates not only Cuba's socialist beginnings but as well the 1917 Russian Revolution. Since the late 19th century, coffee oligarchies comprised of native elites and foreign investors, have successfully ensured that over 65% of the peasant population remain dispossessed. Moreover, the report continued on to state that it is exactly this structure and format of economic disparity that the U.S. has been promoting and sustaining by virtue of its present policies in and attitude towards Central America.²³ The report concluded that the roots of the revolutionary turmoil presently threatening El Salvador are thoroughly indigenous to the economic injustices that have, more

or less, become institutionalized in the country as well as throughout Central America.

Even more impressive concerning the President's inability to objectively comprehend the socio-economic stimulus of Central American strife, involves an unsigned paper composed by members of the State Department, Security Council, and CIA. According to the authors, the current U.S. policy of fortifying El Salvador's feeble government through training Salvadorian troops and providing an excessive amount of armaments, will prove futile and quite possibly disastrous. Futile, in the sense that the present government lacks, by virtue of its repressive and reactionary nature, any popular support, and thus, is inevitably destined, at the expense of many lives and resources, to fall at the hands of the popularly created and supported Democratic Revolutionary Front. Disastrous, in the sense that the socio-economic injustices currently fueling the struggle in El Salvador are not in any way peculiar or unique to El Salvador alone. On the contrary, such injustices exist as a general rule throughout Central and South America. In this regard, the paper goes on to warn that the ensuing conflict in El Salvador could easily spill over its borders to any number of countries (Nicaragua) and thereby grow and develop into a regional conflict of vast and uncontrollable proportions.²⁴

To conclude, rather than acknowledging the unrest and militancy of the people in El Salvador as deriving from defects deeply embedded in the socio-economic roots of the embattled society, the President, reminiscent of Leo, ignoring studies

of objective analysis and relying on his own superficial and most inadequate preconceptions, attributes the turmoil and troubles of Latin society to the "communist" uprisings which, in reality, are nothing but an effect, an end result of a much deeper wound.

ON STATE POWER

Except for the secularization which accompanied the scourge of nationalism in many states, Leo nevertheless condones the existing network of state authority. Positing it as an essential part of the divine order of things, Leo brashly scolds the socialists in their attempt to subvert the political powers which they (the socialists) saw as an extension and sustainer of the existing economic realm. With this much said, it is apparent that a problem arises when one applies Leo's reactionary argument of, in this instance, political reality being a mandate of God's will, to different epochs in history. For instance, what of earlier governments which supported and defended the socio-economic fabric of slave and feudal societies? Were such societies also not a mandate from God? Indeed, they would appear to be as the attitude of the Church during these periods reflected a specific congruity with the various societies; in terms of condoning these societies' political, socio-economic structures. This is especially true in regard to pre-reformation feudal Europe.²⁵ In this light, what of the spontaneous violence and bloodshed as well as the eventual and drastic alteration of the state and its orientation that characterized the passage and

transition of one political socio-economic system, into another? For "the ancient world gave way to the medieval, slavery to feudalism, and feudalism to the industrial bourgeoisie. These transitions were not peaceful, but sprang from wars and revolutions, for no established order gives way to its successor without a struggle."²⁶ Can such a struggle ever be condoned?, and if not, can the conclusions, for instance, the new state and economic order rendered forth from such violence, including capitalism, ever be considered legitimate?

In any event, these are not questions for this paper to answer. They are strictly for Leo and those who support his brand of deterministic thinking. Indeed, it is solely our task to critique and, in doing so, bring forth the complications that inherently precipitate from a method of thought that is totally insensitive to the historical process, the very ebb and flow of history.

ON RELIGION

Before closing this discussion on Leo's initial encyclicals, deserving attention is a brief passage written in The Socialists which effectively demonstrates the attitude held by Leo concerning the role of the Church as it interacts with labor. In short, while committed to serving the poor through its various charities and benefices, according to Leo, the Church must actively sustain and seek to preserve the existing socio-economic system, including its, from the perspective of humanity, intrinsic defects. Hence Leo comments on labor organizations saying:

...it is well to encourage societies of artisans and workmen constituted under the guardianship of religion, which make all associates contented with their lot and move them to a quiet peaceful life.²⁷

Indeed, to make the workers "contented with their lot." In this context, how far from the truth was Marx in his declaration:

Religious misery is at one and the same time the expression of real misery and the protestation against real misery. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the mind of a heathen world, as it is the spirit of unspriritual conditions. It is the opiate of the people.²⁸

CONCLUSION

In this initial chapter it has been revealed that the first pope to address in detail the economic hardships comprising, in part, the evils of society, excluded the economic process from any real degree of investigative scrutiny. In other words, even though confronting problems economic in nature, the inner workings, the objective laws defining capitalist economics are left unscathed, seemingly immune to questions concerning their moral legitimacy and integrity. Instead, Leo issues a severe polemic against the socialists who he blames for initiating and maintaining the prevailing social instability and its negative economic consequences. According to Leo, by dispersing its evil tenets and corrupting the minds of men, the socialists have launched throughout the industrializing West a wave of discontent and violence that threatens imminent social havoc and economic adversity.

Along with the socialists, credited with blame for society's ills was the spread of nationalism throughout the continent. Obviously, such nationalism reduced the international influence of the Church by pervading various state apparati and the objectives such apparati were meant to achieve with a sense of secularism. Moreover, and just as detrimental to the Church, an inevitable consequence of nationalism entailed state confiscation of numerous Church holdings. According to Leo, both the confiscation and secular aspects of nationalism fueled the economic misery plaguing the populus. In terms of secularism, by ignoring the wisdom of God as represented through the teaching of the Church, how could the state not plunge society into a situation of economic as well as political and social chaos? In terms of confiscation, Leo charged that great numbers of poor depended on the charity made available through the many benefices and orders the state was now expropriating.

The critique section argues that it is imperative if one wishes to diagnose the economic woes of society, that one interrogate the economic realm itself. When such interrogation consists of Marxist analysis, revealed are two fundamental laws, the laws of value and accumulation, that necessarily function to the detriment of the laborer. Simply, such laws ensure that the intent of every given industry and its capitalist owner is to extract from the laborer as much created value as possible. At the time of Leo when competition was fierce and the individual laborer exceedingly vulnerable, the unbridled laws of capitalism forced the worker to live worse than an animal, often without the most basic

of necessities and always without even the slightest trace of dignity befitting a human being.

In this light, the nationalism and socialism Leo blamed for the socio-economic ills characteristic of his time, were hardly deserving. The economic misery afflicting the industrial populace of 1878 had its roots deeply embedded in the laws of an evolving capitalist system. With the emergence of Rerum Novarum in 1891, though still far from adequately investigating and understanding the dynamics of capitalism, Leo at last realized that society's economic problems were in fact due to an economic order being askew and in need of some sort of rectification.

CHAPTER II- LEO XIII - 1891

INTRODUCTION

Thirteen years after writing the encyclicals, Evils of Society and The Socialists, Leo XIII, instigated by the continued prevalence of social problems riding the crest of industrialism's wave and threatening to foment the very upheaval of the social order, realized it was imperative that the socio-economic question, in particular, the rights of labor vis-à-vis capital, be given certain and specific bounds, certain direction capable of redressing the most stark inequities, and hence, pacifying the social arena. The urgency and need for such bounds and direction were further enhanced by the bitter recession that gripped the continent and served to slow production rates and industrial growth throughout Europe and the United States between the years 1875 and 1890.¹ As far as the industrial worker was concerned, the most devastating effect of the recession entailed massive layoffs and unemployment. Indeed, coupled with the severe hardships already faced, such effects proved most devastating to the laborer, and truly, most threatening to the social order in which the worker was continually losing faith. In this setting was written The Condition of the Workingmen (Rerum Novarum²), which exists as the first papal document whose overt intention specifically concerns the precarious position of the worker caught in the throes of the industrial revolution at the turn of the century (1891). In addressing himself to the workers' plight, Leo arranges the encyclical's content on the basis

of four topics: socialism, the Church, the state, and labor organizations, which he believes contribute or should contribute a significant degree in solving or, as the case may be, aggravating labor's condition.

Thus, in the first stage of our analysis we shall dutifully put forth the thought of Leo as he relates and intertwines the circumstances of labor to the above mentioned topics. Moreover, taking advantage of our previous discussion of the earlier written "social" encyclicals, we shall, in the course of our presentation, make explicit any evidence demonstrating a continuity, or perhaps, a newly emerging trend in Leo's thought. In the second part we shall, with the assistance of Marxist theory and the benefit of close to a century's hindsight concerning the laws and effects of capitalism as evolved and made manifest in history, critique Leo's observations of the workingmen's dilemma in terms of the recommendations and cautions he issues forth. In this regard, the conclusiveness of the critique section shall be bolstered by the inclusion of a special outline explaining the Marxist theory of social development, the understanding of which proves essential if one is to fully comprehend both the intellectual reason stimulating the socialist/Marxist method as well as the insufficiency of papal thought.

SOCIALISM

1. Diagnosis Revised

If the order in which Leo addresses the four topics means anything at all, it is that the socialist movement, or from Leo's perspective, the socialist threat took precedence over and against all other concerns. Before discussing the nature of this threat, one might initially wonder why Leo would even bother to dedicate an entire quarter of an encyclical to a subject he had already, in The Socialists, addressed in very thorough and unambiguous language. On the basis of the content and demeanor of the writing, it seems quite apparent that Leo felt it necessary to construct a contemporary, and hence, more effective front from which to combat the ever growing socialist movement. Thus, while the first front, described in The Socialists, consisted of an offensive which declared the socialist cause as, in fact, a major contributor to society's ills by threatening the disruption of the "natural order" in its intent of altering the existing political, socio-economic institutions (including the Church), the second front, detailed in The Condition of the Workingmen, assails specifically the very methods the socialist movement advocated in implementing the earlier mentioned alterations (alterations, remember,) necessary from the socialist viewpoint for "emancipating" the worker and thereby instituting a socialist regime.

Thus, we notice a change of strategy as well as emphasis that, if understood properly, connotes a most important development.

For rather than deeming, as earlier, the socialist movement per se to be a direct cause of society's ills, in The Condition of the Workingmen, Leo, while still interpreting the socialists as an "abominable" sect; nevertheless, in denouncing their plan of remedy rather than their very existence, necessarily grants unto the socialist movement a definite legitimacy of being. This is to say, rather than existing (the socialists) as a primary evil in the sense of bearing responsibility for the social depravity afflicting so many, by virtue of The Condition of the Workingmen, the yoke of responsibility is removed and replaced with the comparatively reduced charge of adhering to and professing a most impractical, and indeed, detrimental objective. In this light, the question naturally arises as to where, therefore, the blame for the social situation resides? Using no uncertain terms, Leo introduces a new antagonist into the fray- that being, the destruction of the medieval "workingmen's guilds" which served to secure the laborer's position in society, and the failure to replace such guilds with organizations similar in intent and ability. Stated briefly:

For the ancient workingmen's guilds were destroyed in the last century and no other organization took their place....Hence by degrees it has come to pass that workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition.³

From this, one may perhaps infer Leo as admitting that the new productive forces left to their own accord inevitably, or better still, naturally lash out against the laborer, making his existence if not survival increasingly vulnerable, and hence,

increasingly in need of a mechanism capable of performing the duties once handled by the guilds of the past. If this be the case, and indeed it seems apparent it is, as far as our interest in papal comprehension of the social consequences stemming from the class relations to the productive forces are concerned, the above represents an immeasurable development. This is to say, it is in The Condition of the Workingmen that the responsibility for the pathetic conditions suffered by the laboring class begins its gradual shift from what came to be seen and understood as illusory sources (e.g. the socialists). to the actual, concrete, and most importantly, inherent tendencies of the capitalist mode of production. Leo writes "...a small number of rich men have been able to lay upon the masses and the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."⁴ This point shall be made more explicit in Leo's discussion concerning the topics of the Church and the state. For now though, let this gradual shift be noted as we return to Leo's critique on the socialist method.

2. Property and the Socialists

According to Leo, the greatest flaw intrinsic to the socialist prescription lies in its condemnation of "private property." Despite being a most complex term in that private property encompasses everything from the most extensive factory to a person's socks, Leo fails to differentiate between the various components and connotations of private property, and insists only in discussing the term as it relates and pertains to the specific property the worker accrues through his wages- the means of subsistence. In this regard, by virtue of neglecting the totality

of private property, Leo neglects the essential structure of the capitalist system itself, the private ownership of the means of production, and thus, the ability of the few to appropriate the value created by the many. In this light, it seems evident that the means of production existing as private property must necessarily be studied if one desires to effectively diagnose those societal ills that are of an economic nature. Moreover, as the socialists never intended the seizure of the worker's means of subsistence, Leo's whole argument against the communalization of one's personal belongings is utterly without purpose, and indeed, goes far in demonstrating Leo as either possessing a very limited and faulty understanding of the socialist alternative, or as wishing to ignore such an alternative by redirecting the argument, and hence, confusing the issue at hand. This crucial point shall of necessity be taken up further in the critique portion of the analysis, for now let it suffice to say that in discussing private property and the socialist desire to render such property communal, while the socialist perspective undoubtedly referred to property in terms of the means of production, Leo restricted his understanding of property to solely encompass the meager belongings of labor.

From the context of the above, Leo claims the socialist position on private property, its communalization, would facilitate a scenario counterproductive to the socialist objective of bolstering labor's condition. To start, Leo argues that one of the few rights possessed by the worker consists of his ability to dispose of his wage as he sees fit. Thus, the worker may purchase food, clothes, and perhaps even a bit of land as a sort

of pension or security for the future. Obviously, if private property were to be socially regulated, the worker would be estranged from the basic freedom of controlling his wages and in a very real sense, his life. A basic freedom, according to Leo, made available only when private property remains inviolate. In short, by virtue of the socialist scheme, no longer would labor pilot the destiny of its earnings; instead, that once personal and individual task, if not privilege, would be annexed from him by the state. Leo writes:

Thus, if he lives sparingly, saves money, and invests his savings for greater security, in land....a working-man's estate thus purchased should be as completely at his own disposal as the wages he receives for his labor. The Socialists, therefore, in endeavouring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, for they deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thus of all hope and possibility of increasing his stock and of bettering his condition of life.⁵

A further example of how the worker would suffer at the hands of the socialist remedy involves the very structure of the family. According to Leo, the laws of inheritance by which a husband, once deceased, is able to transfer to his wife and children his property, and hence, the means for his loved ones to continue their existence in a familial setting, exist in dire jeopardy once confronted by the socialist anti-property prescription. Simply, if the transmission of the deceased's property is not allowed to progress as it belongs to the state, the economic predicament of the family would inevitably reach such crisis level that the very structure and unity of the family would be

threatened by breakdown and dissipation as each member would find himself consumed by the severe strain of maintaining his own personal existence. Leo writes:

For it is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessaries for those whom he has begotten. And similarly, nature dictates, that a man's children, who carry on, as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honourably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life.⁶

Once again, we find Leo guilty of re-directing the argument. While it is true that particular socialist groups contended that laws of inheritance led to "undeserved inequalities" that "must be abolished," such contentions, far from threatening the impoverished laborer, sought only to tax those of excessive wealth and to distribute that collected to those, like the struggling laborer, in need. By this method, the socialists had hoped to redress the stark inequality of fortunes that so plagued the industrializing world at this time.⁷

Despite Leo's confusion on this matter, to his credit he nevertheless recognized the blatant fact that urban families were experiencing traumatic economic ordeals regardless of the breadwinner being dead or alive. In this regard, Leo initiates, in very subtle yet nonetheless potent terms, the introduction of what one would term the modern "welfare state." Unable to ignore the number of destitute families, Leo sanctioned the state to provide the means of subsistence necessary in order for families to remain secure and intact. Moreover, needing to justify

and indeed qualify such state intervention in no uncertain terms, Leo explicitly warns, avoiding any socialist waters or even puddles, against the state intervening any further in the peoples' affairs.

True, if a family finds itself in great difficulty, utterly friendless, and without prospect of help, it is right that extreme necessity be met by public aid....the public power must intervene to free each party to give the other what is due, for this is not to rob citizens of their rights, but justly and properly to safeguard and strengthen them. But the rulers of the state must go no further: nature bids them stop here.⁸

In concluding Leo's dialogue on the socialists, his basic premise consists of the belief that the inherent nature of socialist remedies, in particular, its attack on private property, would serve only to foster increased hardships upon those, the workers, the socialists profess concern for.

Thus, it is clear that the main tenet of socialism, the community of goods, must be utterly rejected; for it would injure those whom it is intended to benefit, it would be contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and it would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonwealth. Our first and most fundamental principle, therefore, when we undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property.⁹

THE CHURCH

In his discussion on the Church and its role in generating social health, Leo approaches the subject from three sides: the essentiality of the Church; the inherent soundness of the capi-

talist order; and finally, the social adjustments to be implemented in conformance with that order, in conformity with the capitalist mode of production.

1. Return to Church Teaching

Using *unambiguous* terms, Leo picks up on a theme first articulated in the encyclicals of 1878 involving the necessity of the Church and its guidance in solving the social dilemma. In this manner, Leo attempts to derive legitimacy not only for the Church in general, but, in a more specific sense, for the teachings and remedies the Church advocates in healing the hang-over that inevitably accompanies a world drunk on its own secularism, both political and economic. Truly, for Leo it was only by returning to the Church and its precepts that social "unity and harmony" could ever be restored and rendered strong. "For no practical solution of this question (i.e.--the alleviation of the condition of the masses) will ever be found without the assistance of religion and the Church."¹⁰ Again Leo writes, "If, then, society is to be cured now, in no other way can it be cured but by a return to Christian life and institutions."¹¹

2. Capitalism to Remain Intact

The question then arises, what exactly is it to live the "Christian life?" To begin, Leo argues that any life that seeks the radical change advocated by the socialist front must be forever condemned. In fact, for Leo, a certain goal of Christian virtue involves accepting and tolerating the existing envi-

ronment be it political, economic, or social. As far as personal wealth and property is concerned, Leo claims that the "inequality of fortune" existent in society, exists as an inevitable and, in fact, natural outgrowth of the inequality amongst men themselves. Stated thusly:

There naturally exists among mankind innumerable differences of the most important kind. People differ in capability, in diligence, in health, and in strength; and thus inequality in fortune is a necessary result of inequality in condition."¹²

Continuing the same line of thought but in more definite terms, Leo posits that the toiling and suffering of mankind is not a condition readily alleviated, if alleviated at all. Of course, while this does not mean to say that the very blatant and exploitative injustices should not be immediately addressed; nevertheless, to think, as the socialists, that all, in particular, economic suffering can be eliminated, is simply ludicrous. Claiming that "to suffer and endure" has been and will forever be the destiny of humankind since "the Fall," Leo asserts that though men may "try as they may, no strength and no artifice will ever succeed in banishing from life the ills and troubles which beset it."¹³

In elucidating the above thought, Leo justifies the existence and potential compatibility of the classes, in this regard, while acknowledging the stark differences in class lifestyle, Leo feels certain that adjustments can be effected to lessen such blatant contrast and, in doing so, hasten a viable and lasting reconciliation between the classes. In this manner, rather than viewing the classes to be in perpetual warfare, as

did the socialists, Leo envisaged the possibility of both labor and capital entering a symbiotic relationship with one another. This is to say, while advocating the sanctity of the classes, and hence, the differences between such classes within reason, Leo firmly believed the preservation of such sanctity as well as the existing social order depended heavily upon various measures being taken capable of facilitating a proper interdependency that, according to Leo, naturally exists between the classes. Indeed, for Leo, it was an interdependency destined to serve as the very focal point from which would evolve the harmonious reign of class cooperation.

Just as the symmetry of the human body, so is the result of the disposition of the members of the body, so in a State it is ordained by nature that these two classes should exist in harmony and agreement, and should, as it were, fit into one another, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the body politic. Each requires the other; capital cannot do without labour, nor labour without capital. Mutual agreement results in pleasantness and good order; perpetual conflict necessarily produces confusion and outrage.¹⁴

3. Role of the Church as Educator and Example

In the context of the above, for Leo it was imperative that the Church take it upon itself to educate both labor and capital on their duties and responsibilities towards one another. Thus, to labor he insisted:

Religion teaches the labouring man and the workman to carry out honestly and well all equitable agreements freely made, never to injure capital, nor to outrage the person of an employer; never to employ violence in representing his own cause, nor to engage in riot and disorder.¹⁵

To capital he states:

Religion teaches the rich man and the employer that their work people are not their slaves; that they must respect in every man his dignity as a man and as a Christian... and that it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattel to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle and physical power.¹⁶

With these general objectives stated, Leo continues on in detail to flesh out the exact role to be assumed by labor and capital in their joint effort to ameliorate social depravity, and hence, social discord.

a. Role of Capital

Starting with capital, Leo raises to a level of utmost importance the concept and practice of the "just wage." Simply put, Leo believed it crucial that the laborer receive a sufficient wage for his work. Chastizing the capitalist for securing additional profit by impoverishing the masses through disgraceful wages, Leo correlates the unjust wage to the very existence of urban unrest. "Were these precepts (referring to a just wage) carefully obeyed and followed would not strife die out?"¹⁷ In this regard, in contrast to the encyclicals of 1878 which stressed the social problem as stemming from secularism, Leo, for the first time, specifically attributes unto capital, or better still, capital's tendency to exploit one's wages, the role of facilitating society's socio-economic woes.

Other instructions prescribed to the rich involve the moral responsibilities that accompany one's wealth. This is to say, while one indeed has the natural right to possess a fortune, it

is quite another thing altogether to assume that one may use and allocate such wealth as one so arbitrarily desires. On the contrary, Leo makes it explicitly clear that wealth incurs a social as well as moral responsibility and duty. In this regard, while it is true that such duty and responsibility cannot be judged and enforced legally, spiritually and morally it can and shall be. Citing passage after passage of scripture testifying to the necessity and virtue of charity, Leo summarizes the issue stating:

Whoever has received from the divine bounty a large share of blessings whether they be external or corporal, or gifts of the mind, has received them for the purpose of using them for perfecting his own nature, and, at the same time, that he may employ them, as the minister of God's providence, for the benefit of others.¹⁸

In stressing the need for the "rich" to develop and maintain a social consciousness, Leo offers up the Church as a prime example of the type of alms giving the rich should emulate. Leo writes:

But the Church is not content with pointing out the remedy. She also applies it....the common Mother of the rich and poor has exerted herself to gather together funds for the support of the needy. The Church has stirred up everywhere the heroism of charity...¹⁹

b. Role of Labor

From the above it is evident that the Church envisaged the wealthy as assuming a vigorous role in lessening the hardships of the masses. Indeed, whether it be establishing and maintaining a dignified wage or distributing amongst the needy the

excess wealth that abounded, according to Leo's remedy, the rich were to be the "active" participants in facilitating social health. Accordingly, if the rich were to be "active", the poor were expected to remain "passive." Obviously fearing the revolutionary spirit growing amongst the poor which threatened imminent social disintegration, Leo recalls a theme written thirteen years earlier in The Socialists, develops its message more thoroughly and applies it to the contemporary situation. Precisely, it is the theme emphasizing the need for the poor to be "content with their lot." As crucial as it was for the rich to actively enact the "social remedy" as put forth by the Church, Leo believed it equally essential that the poor resist the temptation of violent upheaval as advocated by the socialists. In this context, all the poor need do was accept the beneficial effects that would eventually be generated unto them by virtue of the wealthy and powerful acting in accord with Church teaching. In making and fortifying his claim of the essentiality of the "passive" worker, Leo presents an abundance of Gospel evidence which he interprets as giving absolute credence to his mode of thought. Hence Leo writes:

In God's sight poverty is no disgrace. This is strengthened by what we see in Christ Himself...God Himself seems to incline more to those who suffer evil: for Jesus Christ calls the poor blessed; He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to him for solace; and he displays the tenderest charity to the lonely and oppressed.²⁰

Finally, in summarizing his position he asserts:

These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of those who are well off and to cheer the spirit of the afflicted; to incline the former to generosity, and the latter to tranquil resignation.²¹

Seemingly insecure about the reception his concept of "tranquil resignation" would receive amongst the workers, Leo goes so far as to mystically elevate the pain of the worker to a higher and more tolerable level. Such an attempt consists of relating the suffering of the masses to the suffering experienced by Jesus. In brief, Jesus' acceptance of the agony accompanying his life and death should serve, according to Leo, as an example par excellence for labor to respect and imitate. "His labors and his sufferings accepted by His own free will, have marvellously sweetened all suffering and all labor... He has made pain and grief more easy to endure."²²

THE STATE

Of the four topics discussed in The Condition of the Workingmen, it is the concept and interpretation of the state and its role in alleviating the social problem which has undergone the most marked development since the initial encyclicals thirteen years earlier. To explain, in The Socialists Leo discussed the state in strictly laissez faire terms. This is to say, in regards to the realm of economics, the sole duty of the state was to protect and ensure the inviolability of private property.

As far as contributing to the social remedy, Leo remained absolutely mute concerning the role of the state. For remember, it was the worker controlled state that the socialists advocated as the foremost institution to be utilized in facilitating their radical socio-economic innovations. In contrast to the above, in *The Condition of the Workingmen*, by granting unto the state a definite role in correcting and alleviating the social dilemma, it would seem apparent that Leo acknowledged the plague of social unhealth as responding unfavorably to his original prescription (in *The Socialists*) of Christian "charity and virtue" practised on an individual level. Of course, while this is not to say that Christian charity and virtue if adhered to by all would not solve the problem, it is to say that such charity and virtue were either ignored by the many, or simply, and more probably, proved incongruous to the capitalist system and its social tendencies.

Thus, still assuming a functionalist stance in wishing the preservation of a social order that was finding itself ever more jeopardized by revolutionary ferment, Leo ascribed to the state a program of action designed to preserve the status quo by legally enforcing specific adjustments in the economic sphere, in particular, in the relation between labor and capital. In light of the above, Leo structures his discussion of the state on two premises: first, the sanctity of the capitalist system; and second, how such a system can only be maintained by improving, through state action, the plight of the worker.

1. Capitalism Legitimate

Wishing no obscurity of thought, Leo begins by positing the state's foremost responsibility as protecting the right of "private property", the very essence of capitalism's being. Leveling a direct attack on the socialists, Leo claims their fundamental tenet that all property should be communally owned and regulated by the state is based on an "evil greed" which the socialists purposely seek to imbue in the minds of the masses. In this context, emphasizing a perpetual theme and belief he unflinchingly adhered to throughout his life, Leo thoroughly renounces any intrusion into the realm of private property, claiming it, property, to be a natural, and indeed, ordained phenomenon of the present age. Hence he describes the state's role:

It must be borne in mind that the chief thing to be secured is the safeguarding, by legal enactment and policy, of private property. Most of all it is essential...to keep the multitude within the line of duty; for if all may justly strive to better their condition, yet neither justice nor the common good allows any one to seize that which belongs to another, or, under the pretext of futile and ridiculous equality, to lay hands on other people's fortunes...But there are not a few who are anxious for revolutionary change, and whose great purpose it is to stir up tumult and bring about a policy of violence. The authority of the state should intervene to put restraint upon those disturbers, to save the workmen from their seditious acts, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation.²³

2. State Welfare Sanctioned

Having established the qualification that state authority is designed to first protect the vested interests, Leo feels secure in developing and promoting his plan of state strategy, the entail-

ment and enactment of which Leo believed to be of paramount importance if society were to successfully rehabilitate itself. To start, Leo begins by making the impressive observation of the key role played by labor in terms of its relation to the nation. Indeed, perhaps not realizing the extent to which he was echoing a socialist theme, Leo asserted the state as achieving its wealth, and hence, power through the committed labor of its populus. "It may be truly said that it is only by the labor of the workingmen that states grow rich."²⁴ With this indebtedness of the nation to labor in mind, Leo continues on to say that even though the government is purposely designed and naturally expected to render secure the interests of all its classes; nevertheless, a specific amount of "special consideration" must be granted unto the comparatively "poor and helpless" laboring class. Thus he writes:

Still, when there is question of protecting the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have a claim to special consideration. The richer population have many ways of protecting themselves, and stand less in need of help from the state; those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly rely upon the assistance of the state. And it is for this reason that wage earners, who are, undoubtedly among the weak and protected by the commonwealth.²⁵

With this said, the question arises as to what specifically it is that the state is expected to accomplish in behalf of the worker? First, Leo returns in detail to the earlier mentioned and all crucial concept of the "just wage." Claiming the capitalist, by virtue of his wealth and power, inevitably assumes

an advantageous position over and against the worker in the sense of being able to manipulate the wage to a level often beneath the worker's interest, Leo felt it nothing less than essential that the state intervene on behalf of the worker in order to assist the facilitation of a wage congruous to ensuring the worker's "reasonable and frugal comfort." Hence, we find the beginnings of Church support for the contemporary concept of "minimum wage." Leo writes, "Nevertheless there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage earner in reasonable and frugal comfort."²⁶ Furthermore, and demonstrating a rather vulgar materialist interpretation of human nature, Leo believed it important that the wage agreed upon be such that the acquisition of property by the worker be possible. From such a belief, one may infer Leo as suggesting that it is by virtue of possessions that man may achieve happiness, and hence, be pacified and immune to the extremely infectious revolutionary spirit of the times.

The law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners...If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the great abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own...A third advantage would arise from the fact that man would cling to the country

in which they were born...no one could exchange his country if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life.²⁷

Besides the issue of wages, Leo goes on to insist that the worker be legally guaranteed the right to rest and observe the sabbath as well as other religious festivals. For if the entire week is consumed in pure labor, the sacredness of the soul will likewise be consumed. In this regard, Leo felt the spiritual welfare of the individual to be, in part, dependent upon the individual being allotted the time to be in repose with the creator, to meditate and worship. Along with one's spiritual welfare, Leo fortified his position by arguing, that the person's "corporeal" welfare is as well dependent upon a weekly allocation of rest. He writes:

Repose united with religious observance disposes man to forget for a while the business of this daily life, and to turn his thoughts to heavenly things and to the worship which he so strictly owes to the Eternal Deity. It is this, above all, which is the reason and motive for the Sunday rest....The first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of grasping men who use human beings as mere instruments for making money. It is neither justice nor humanity so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go.²⁸

Leo concludes his discussion of the state by insisting that it is the absolute duty of the state to ensure that the work to be done suits the nature of the worker doing it. Criticizing

capitalism's exploitative use of women and children, Leo demands legal sanctions that would not only prevent factories from destroying the physical and moral fabric of women, women who Leo interpreted as "best fitted for homework and to promote the good bringing up of children and the well-being of the family."²⁹ but would as well restrict children from any type of industrial labor until they are both physically and mentally capable of negotiating the stress and burdens that inevitably accompany labor. Leo states, "Work which is suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or a child. And, in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently mature."³⁰ Indeed, through the use of such language, one can only infer Leo as petitioning the state to initiate adequate and efficient gender as well as child labor laws.

LABOR ASSOCIATIONS

Though Leo ascribes unto labor a role of passive involvement in the process of social rehabilitation, passive in the sense of being non-revolutionary; nevertheless, an aspect of such passive involvement included the development of labor organizations. In this regard, the purpose of such organizations was not, in any way, to be offensive, but defensive in terms of protecting and maintaining the most fundamental rights and dignities of the worker.

To better understand the above is to understand that, for

Leo, the need for workmen's organizations derived itself from the dissolution of the guild system, and hence, the benefits such a system make available to the worker. In this light, recognizing the extreme vulnerability characterizing the isolated worker when confronted by the capitalist market in which his labor is bought, sold, and manipulated, Leo insists that it is natural, and thus, legitimate that the worker seek to shield his individual weakness by congregating with those of similar circumstance. He writes, "It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them bond themselves together in associations of citizens with citizens..."³¹ While still denouncing certain noxious societies, the socialists, whose purposes can only be perceived, according to Leo, as disruptive and evil, Leo makes certain the validity of the, so to speak, passive organizations citing it to be a duty, and indeed, responsibility of the state to protect and serve the autonomy and freedom of such tolerable organizations and their members. "The administrators of the State, therefore, have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their management; on the contrary, it is rather the State's duty to respect and cherish them, and, if necessary, defend them from attack."³²

As far as the purpose and design of the organizations were concerned, Leo petitioned that all content of discussion and action be defined within precepts set by the Church. Leo argues, "Let our associations then, look first and before all to God; let religious instruction have therein a foremost place, each one being carefully taught what is his duty to God, what he is to

believe, what he is to hope for..."³³ In this manner, Leo asserts that only "goodwill and honourable intentions" can come forth from such organizations, resulting, in turn, in the cooperation between classes necessary for society to heal itself. "They who rule the State must avail themselves of the law and the institutions of the land; employers and wealthy owners must remember their respective duty; and the poor, whose interests are at stake, must make every lawful and proper effort."³⁴

Finally, in closing the topic of organizations as well as concluding the encyclical itself, like a thread woven throughout and binding in a tight unity all his thought concerning the social question, Leo once again resounds the extreme importance attributed to an unconditional return to the Church. A return that exists as the first and foremost prerequisite for evolving any degree of social well-being. Leo argues, "But since religion alone, as I said at the beginning, can destroy evil at its roots, all men must be persuaded that the primary thing needful is to return to real Christianity, in the absence of which all the plans and devices of the wisest will be of little avail."³⁵

PART II - MARXIST CRITIQUEON THE SOCIALISTS1. Achievement

As far as being a more realistic interpretation of the socialist movement, it has been noted that the position of Leo put forth in The Condition of the Workingmen exists as a significant ideological advance over and against his initial stance as recorded in The Socialists. Simply stated, while in The Socialists Leo identifies the socialists and their movement as a primary impetus for the prevailing social ills, in The Condition of the Workingmen he alters his course completely ^{by} introducing the much more applicable and realistic diagnosis that the unfavorable social legacy bestowed upon labor derives its very being from the capitalist mode of production, in specific, from the class relations involved in such a mode of production. Of course, while the socialist perspective interprets the pathetic legacy as an intrinsic tendency of capitalism, Leo believed that the "legacy" could be altered to the point of virtual elimination without threatening any disruption of the status quo, and thus, without any intrusion into the right of "private property." Now while this point of disagreement has been and still is heatedly debated, on the basis of our previous discussion concerning the intrinsic and foremost motives of the capitalist system, in particular, the law of accumulation, it was demonstrated that all other considerations including the fulfillment of humanity and all that such fulfillment entails, will always and forever be shadowed ^{by} and manipulated into "capitalist conformance." As far

as the human condition is concerned, the above point cannot be overestimated. For it is by virtue of capitalism's "humanly transcendent" objectives that humanity's quest on earth, far from representing and attaining humankind's true needs and desires, has found itself madly crippled and inexorably confined to the contradictory role of a taskmaster whose sole responsibility is to render subservient humanity and its unlimited potential to capitalism's ends. And of course, far from invisible, the plunder and carnage strewn forth from such subservience have become common and sadly accepted phenomena of our time (e.g. unemployment, job insecurity, the poverty of imperialism, threat of nuclear annihilation, alienation from one another, the estrangement of spiritual values and purpose). In any event, suffice it to note that regardless of his failure to perceive the inherency of capitalism's social consequences, Leo made great strides by recognizing that such social consequences were not dependent upon the existence of the socialists per se, but were contingent upon the operative relations and interaction of labor and capital.

The rest of the critique on Leo's discussion of the socialists will concern his interpretation, or better still, faulty interpretation of the exact purpose assigned unto "socialism" by virtue of Marxist thought. In this regard, it is essential that we review Leo's understanding of property vis-à-vis socialism, the Marxist conception of social development, and finally, Leo's perception of the socialist end objective over and against what such an objective actually entailed.

2. Property

To start, one may briefly summarize Leo's polemic on the socialist remedy by stating that the socialist intent of communalizing property would, if actualized, manifest itself as a major detriment to labor's very existence. According to Leo, the precious, God given freedom of the worker to dispose of his scanty "personal property," means of subsistence, would be, by virtue of the socialist remedy, denied. Simply, if one's property is confiscated by the state, to speak of one's freedom to utilize such property as one sees fit is, of course, a contradiction of terms as such freedom is entirely subject, and hence, vulnerable to state approval.

Moreover, because of the impersonal and bureaucratic nature typifying the state, it is without doubt that the most fundamental needs and basic desires of the populus would be grossly neglected if not entirely frustrated.

With this much said, first to note in our correction is that the socialist goal of "socially regulated property" does not intend let alone envisage the type of tyrannical state control which Leo so greatly feared and denounced. Crucial to point out in this regard is that socialist intent and activity following a Marxist line were purposely committed to free the laborer from the exploitative relations of production which did and still do characterize capitalism. This is to say, the socialist cause realized that the very crux of humanity's existential existence evolved forth from the prevailing social relations as determined by the economic mode of production in vogue at the time. In this context,

duly noted by the socialist effort was the fact that the social relations of the capitalist mode of production centered on and pivoted around an inherent conflict of interest between labor and capital. Hence, while it is labor's desire to retain unto itself the full value it has created, capital, on the other hand, espouses a policy by which it is able to alienate as much value from labor as possible. Once acknowledging the reality of capitalism's primary alienating tendency involving surplus value, the socialist movement further posits that there are bred, from this initial alienation, a whole host of, so to speak, "alienating effects". To clarify, directly related to the estrangement of labor created value from the working class, is the phenomenon that the laborer is likewise separated from the product in which his created labor is instilled. Again, by virtue of labor power existing as a mere commodity to be bought and sold for capitalist exploitation, the laborer discovers himself alienated from those of his class as he competes in the job market. Finally, and perhaps the most ferociously damaging yet least recognized form of alienation involves the separation of man from his very being, or better still, from his ability to establish, understand, and hence, fulfill his most intimate essence - his "self."³⁶ This most important notion shall be elucidated upon and clarified shortly in our discussion of the socialist objective.

3. Law of Social Development

In the context of the above, the socialists argued that the prevention of such unjust tendencies can only be achieved by nationalizing and thereby rendering communal that particular segment of private property utilized in the initial alienating experience involving "surplus value". In simple terms, this meant state expropriation of the forces of production,

the means of production and the technology inherent to it, and not, as Leo confusedly suggests, the expropriation of labor's personal property. Therefore, in order to completely understand the motive behind the socialist demand for the communalization of the forces of production, as well as the Marxist insistence that such a communalization existed as a necessary and inevitable dictate of human history, it is imperative that one first comprehend the law of social development as discovered and articulated by Marx and how such a law specifically applies to and conditions history.

In general, when one speaks of social development, one refers to every facet that is society - the economic, the political, and the ideological. In specific, when one speaks of social development, one refers to the qualitative nature of the above mentioned facets, as well as the reasons why such facets and their particular qualities tend to evolve and are made manifest in the fashion that they are. In this light, it is only by discerning the latter, the reasons "why," that the former, the society that "is," can be adequately explained. Hence, from the Marxist standpoint, all that society is, is determined by the degree to which the forces of production are developed. Such a standpoint is best illustrated by the fact that directly dependent upon the status of the forces of production are the relations to production - the manner in which the populace relates and understands its position relative to the economic realm, and thus, affirming the primacy of the economy, relative to life itself.

a. Hunter and Gatherer

In the hunter and gatherer societies of antiquity, charac-

terized by the most rudimentary forces of production, there existed a common, and indeed, communal relationship amongst the populus and between the populus and the few and inefficient implements used to produce and that which was produced. Indeed, it was precisely because the forces of production were so undeveloped such that a surplus of the means of subsistence was unable to be procured, that it was essential for all to contribute their time and labor into a cooperative productive effort and thereby ensure the community's continuation over time. In short, the primitive forces of production necessitated that the entire structure of these societies remain extremely simple and streamlined with very little apparatus (government and religion) that did not relate directly to the economy, to the act of securing the material means of survival. Of course, while one may be inclined to praise these societies for emphasizing and prioritizing the values of togetherness, fraternity, and cooperation, values which had to be practised if the society were to survive; nevertheless, the reality of such communities was that of great peril and vulnerability.³⁷ Due to the lack of productive forces, these communities were continually at the mercy of the environment. Ravaged by floods, drought, and disease, the primitive community existed day by day, exceedingly dependent upon and susceptible to the environment of which it had absolutely no control over, no mastery of or freedom from. Besides incurring the obvious physical disadvantages of existing so precariously, the virtual absence of the forces of production necessitated as well the absence of human understanding. In

other words, because the community was so engrossed in obtaining that needed to endure, there was precious little time for man to conceive of himself, to fathom his purpose, to wonder. Hence, the degree to which the forces of production remained unevolved in the primitive society, ensured that society's participants were to remain enslaved, both physically and mentally, to the most basic of animal instincts, that of survival.

b. Development of Production- Property and Class

Conditions inevitably changed as the forces of production proceeded to develop and began to assist mankind in its quest to obtain freedom from the dependency and misery imposed upon it by an unmediated environment. Moreover, such change was wrought precisely by mankind's conscious desire to, in fact, free itself.³⁸ In this regard, to improve their immediate situation, the primitive community sought to ensure enough material goods, in particular, foodstuffs, to make their condition a bit less vulnerable. The forces of production initially developed may have well consisted of both technology such as crude stones and stick implements used to make the soil arable and conducive to planting, and knowledge such as understanding fire and its benefits of warmth and cooking as well as knowledge of agriculture and livestock in general, planting seeds and domesticating animals.

Truly, these advances in the forces of production, simple as they may appear to us today, exist as a watershed in the history of mankind and civilization as a whole. The ability to plant and harvest and to herd livestock as opposed to gathering and

hunting, rendered unto the primitive community a benefit of significant consequence that served to transform the very nature of the community. To begin, the community changed in that it was no longer nomadic but situated in a permanent locale necessary for allowing agricultural and animal husbandry procedures to be carried out. Accompanying such development was an unavoidable division of labor whereby individuals began to specialize in particular fields- some farmed, some herded, and some maintained, built, and continually improved upon the implements of labor, the means of production. Moreover, as the forces of production continued to develop ensuring an ever increasing amount of the goods produced, it was no longer required that everyone's working time be dedicated to the economic pursuit, the pursuit of obtaining the means of subsistence. Thus, a further and most fateful division of labor occurred in which the community developed a political and ideological superstructure whereby dominant individuals segregated themselves from the productive process and assumed the role of "leader." By virtue of their title and position the leaders survived by exacting tribute from the producers or, in many cases, appropriating the land which was farmed, the cattle that was herded, or the very producers themselves. Far from the days of communal ownership, the nature of the community had been irreversibly infected and wholly altered by the innovation of private property.³⁹ An innovation, crucial to note, necessitated by the advance of the forces of production which were directly responsible for the existence of the tools that were fashioned, the surplus produced,

the land cultivated, and the cattle raised.

The nature of the community's members changed in that classes had emerged. Classes determined and opposed to one another on the basis of how they related to the means of production. The tools, the land, the produce, depending on the community in question, to some degree came under the jurisdiction of the leaders. In simple terms, what all this meant was that one class produced while the other class parasitically fed on that which was produced, on the labor of the producing class. Moreover, realizing that labor, due to improvements in the productive forces, was a very valuable entity in terms of producing surplus goods, and hence, wealth, leaders would often engage in warfare in order to appropriate, not just material goods such as cattle or other foodstuffs, but labor itself in the form of slaves.⁴⁰ Of course, such warfare as well as the consolidation of the leader's own position over and against his less fortunate subjects necessitated the eventual creation of an armed force as well as legalistic and religious procedures designed to specifically assist the ruling elite in maintaining the ever-emerging socio-economic inequalities upon which the elites' very existence was wholly dependent.⁴¹

Now, while the above represents an extremely simplified version of events that included many more variables and transpired over a period of thousands of years, the point to be made clear is the predominant role played by the forces of production in transforming the ancient communal tribes into, for instance, the classical slave societies of Greece and Rome. Such societies

were typified by private property, class divisions centered on the ownership of private property in the form of the means of production, and a strong state and judicial religious apparatus intended to, in the case of the former, preserve the status quo by repressing any indigenous or external challenge, and, in the case of the latter, to legitimize and morally sanctify the entire social order through decrees of divine right and other supernatural injunctions. Of such a drastic transformation of both community and people wrought by mankind instituting and advancing the forces of production in order to be as free from the hazards of an uncontrolled environment as possible, Marx writes:

Man opposes himself to nature as one of her own forces, setting in motion arms and legs, head and hands, the natural forces of his body, in order to appropriate nature's productions in a form adapted to his own wants. By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature.⁴²

c. Forces of Production in Conflict with Class Relations

Just as the forces of production develop and engender unto society a particular set of economic, political, and ideological institutions, so too do the forces of production eventually facilitate a contradiction between their advance and the class relations to such productive forces. According to Marx, while the forces of production experience a certain degree of growth and advancement in each socio-economic epoch (slavery, feudalism, and capitalism), the transition from one epoch to the next is precisely because the forces of production have progressed to

the point of being constrained by the class relations in mode at the time.⁴³ In other words, the passage from one socio-economic era to another is precipitated because the class relations of the period in question no longer conform to the needs of the advancing productive forces but go so far as to actually prohibit any further advancement from taking place. A prohibition that is only resolved by restructuring the class relations so as to encourage the continued advance of the productive forces that is desired and, in fact, initiated by a human condition that perpetually seeks to broaden its freedom through mastery of the environment.

In the Graeco-Roman slave societies, while the forces of production did undergo minor improvements, no major innovations of economic technology or thought were featured. The reason for this being the class relations inherent to a slave oriented economic realm. The great landowners saw no reason to seek or employ technological advancement as their needs were adequately met by the abundance of slave labor.⁴⁴ In this regard, from the dominant class' point of view, the technology presently in use was quite sufficient in terms of securing the freedom from the environment they sought and enjoyed. Of course, the same cannot be said of the slaves and their drudgery filled lives.

d. Superiority of Feudal Class Relations

Where the forces of production prospered at this time was in Northern and Western Europe. Because of the scant population, and hence, lack of labor, it was essential that technology be

implemented in order to secure an adequate amount of goods. Moreover, the established class relations responsible for fettering the forces of production in the slave societies of Rome and Greece, were not at all in force in the politically fragmented Europe of the twelfth century. In short, due to the scarcity of labor necessitating the complete absence of slave relations, the class relations that did ultimately evolve throughout the rugged area of Northwest Europe were dependent upon and specifically geared to encourage and allow for technological innovation. Such innovation notably included the heavy wheeled plow capable of piercing the hard and rocky northern soil as well as horseshoes and a type of horse harness that allowed the creature to pull five times the weight previously drawn.⁴⁵ Looking specifically at the class relations of this time and area, such relations featured a decentralized conglomeration of numerous, self-sufficient fiefdoms. The predominant social classes comprising these fiefdoms were the dominant Lords and the subservient serfs.

Along with these classes there existed a minority of freemen who resided in proto-type cities which bordered the various fiefdoms. These freemen came together in guilds as masters and apprentices for the expressed purpose of crafting such things as clothing, implements of labor, assorted luxuries and weapons of war, all of which were in great demand amongst the Lords and their estates. Referring back to the class relations of the fiefdom itself, the serf, though not a slave, was tied to and considered a part of the Lord's estate. In return for tilling,

herding, and doing general work for the Lord, the serf was granted a plot of his own on which he was to work and derive his existence. In this fashion, in contrast to the binding effects of slave class relations, feudal class relations encouraged the advance of the forces of production. For not only was technology necessary to compensate for the lack of labor in feudal Europe, the feudal classes themselves, both Lord and serf, stood to benefit from technological innovation. In terms of the serf, by not being owned and, in fact, being given control over a portion of land and its produce, the serf had great incentive to utilize technology in order to increase his yield.⁴⁶ For remember, class relations were structured so that that which the serf produced on his own plot was considered not only his only property, but his sole means of subsistence. Thus, if little was produced, little was consumed. If an abundance was produced, life's most pressing concern for the serf was proportionately eased. In terms of the Lord, the technological push for economic productivity was enhanced by both the Lord's desire to purchase the lavish and expensive goods being imported from the East, as well as by the perpetual feudal wars that necessarily accompanied the politically fragmented nature of the feudal order. Such conflict obligated the Lords to secure excessive amounts of foodstuffs to sustain their ever active armies as well as to purchase finished armaments and the raw materials to construct armaments from the craftsmen and the merchants in the developing cities.⁴⁷ In this regard, the burden of generating the exorbitant revenue necessary to fulfill the Lord's needs was borne

directly by the sole producing feudal class, the population of serfs. A burden that, as shall be revealed shortly, grew to such proportions as to cause, in effect, the eventual demise of the entire feudal system.

In any event, crucial to note for now is that the class relations that initially typified feudalism were wholly conducive to the progression of the productive forces, and thus, ensured unto the feudal order an extended period of viability and success. In contrast, the class relations of an advanced slave society served to ultimately shackle the forces of production, relegating slavery to the realm of obsolescence. In Rome, for instance, the ever increasing number of slaves due to conquest and the displacement of freemen led to a growing consciousness amongst the slaves concerning their exploited and subordinate position.⁴⁸ Such consciousness resulted in work slow downs as well as periodic revolts which effectively weakened the slave dependent empire, making it ever^{more} susceptible to the hordes of Mongols and Huns sweeping in from eastern Europe in search of the arable land of a technologically regressed and diseased empire.

e. Feudalism to Capitalism- Forces of Production Again set Free

The basic difference marking the transition from slavery to feudalism and from feudalism to capitalism is the fact that while feudalism did not stem directly from slave society itself, capitalism has its roots sunk deep in the preceding feudal order. The basic similarity being that each order represents an advance

of the previous order in terms of mankind obtaining greater mastery over its environment. A mastery, remember, engendered by the continued development of the forces of production in conjunction with the particular class relations in vogue at the time. Class relations that are entirely responsible for determining the degree to which the productive forces shall advance, and hence, contribute to the social order as a whole. To explain, as long as the productive forces serve to benefit the status quo, or better still, serve to ensure and maintain the privileged position of one class over another, they are encouraged and developed. However, as soon as the dominant class perceives the continued development of the productive forces as either unnecessary or as constituting a direct threat to the prevailing social structure, the productive forces are immediately hindered and repressed precisely by the dominant class in question.⁴⁹ Such repression inevitably necessitates the contradiction between mankind's quest for freedom, maximum control of his environment and life, and the narrow desires of a particular class in history. Narrow desires that as history has repeatedly demonstrated, are inevitably swept aside by the unceasing objective of the productive forces to provide mankind with a degree of freedom never before known. With the differences and similarities aside, one can refer to the feudal order stating that though not an outgrowth of slavery per se, it nevertheless represented a more viable alternative that was destined to succeed slave society by virtue of its type of class relations initially allowing the development of the forces of production to proceed past the limits imposed

by slave relations. In short, feudal society, in particular, feudal class relations encouraged the development of the forces of production and thereby granted unto the feudal community the increased ability to control and manage its environment. Capitalism, on the other hand, while itself representing an improved alternative to feudalism in terms of its class relations offering unto society ever greater mastery of the environment through facilitating an ever greater advance in the productive forces, found its impetus contained within the various emerging class elements comprising the feudal order itself. Elements out of which were forged, through class struggle and violence, a new set of class relations that effectively set free the forces of production allowing a tenure of unprecedented development that is still in the process of being realized to this very day.

To begin, the warring nature of feudal society coupled with the campaign of crusades as well as the Lord's desire for luxuries, in particular, of the East, culminated in intolerable pressure on the serf. For remember, it was the serf and his efforts of labor that were expected to finance the enormous costs incurred by the above.⁵⁰ In this regard, it was precisely by virtue of the Lord's attempt to secure as much revenue as possible from the serf, that the lord himself initiated the process of feudalism's dissolution. Indeed, by being forced to work ever increasing hours on the lord's land, the serf had no choice but to ignore his own plot, and hence, his own needs for survival. In the end, such a predicament proved disastrous as the serf either died of over-work and neglect or fled to the cities to work in

the emerging industries. Thus, the very foundation of the feudal structure, the producing serf, was eradicated and made extinct by the lord's incessant demands for funds that, using current productive techniques, could not be met.⁵¹ Moreover, it was no longer even possible to improve productive techniques as such techniques became increasingly bound and confined by the aging and strained feudal class relations. Specifically, the exploitative techniques of the lord served to, in effect, signal the end of the feudal order by discouraging the serf from improving upon, inventing, or using new forces of production. For the serf realized the increased produce resulting from the application of an advanced means of production would be entirely appropriated by the lord. Hence, by virtue of the serf experiencing a lack of incentive attributable to a high rate of exploitation, the forces of production remained dormant. The end result being that feudal class relations had begun to inhibit the progress of the forces of production. Moreover, such an inhibition represented an irreconcilable contradiction of the feudal class relations and the forces of production, and as such, was destined to effect the eventual decay and collapse of the feudal order.⁵²

Coupled with the lord's contribution to feudalism's demise was the development of an industrial and merchant class brought into being by the lord's desire for luxuries, the fiefdom's armament and hardware needs, and most importantly, the increase of and potential for trade, the impact of which was first realized during the Crusades. To start, there had always existed guilds consisting of masters and apprentices who helped supply

that desired by the local fiefdoms. In general terms, such guilds were self-sufficient producers in the sense of engaging in a process of simple reproduction with no desire to transform or enlarge the productive process. The reason being that the existing markets, and hence, demand for their goods were confined and limited to the immediate area.⁵³ However, with the occurrence of the Crusades and the exchange of goods between different geographical areas, West and East, it was only a matter of time before the guilds realized that markets existed for their wares and that, in order to satisfy such markets, a transformation of the productive process, making it ever more productive and efficient, was necessary. In response to such a development and challenge, great technological strides were made. After the eleventh century water and wind power were proficiently used to operate forge hammers and bellows, sawmills and lathes, fulling mills making cloth, pulping mills making paper, and stamping mills curshing ore. The drive to trade, find, and establish new markets led to new developments in shipping and arms making. Shipping to transport goods back and forth, armaments to protect the goods and to, if necessary, enforce terms of trade.⁵⁴

In regard to feudalism, the entrepreneurial class, industrialists and merchants, held very definite opinions. Feudal land, whether held by the Church or the lord, was in great demand, particularly by those entrepreneurs who sought to supply wool to the growing textile industries. Feudal labor power, the serfs, were considered a most precious and needed commodity in the cities. Indeed, it was labor power in the form of the wage laborer that

was to become the cornerstone of the emerging capitalist order. Finally, the reality of feudal decentralization resulting in various trade restrictions, trade tariffs, and assorted duties, was utterly detested by both the industrialists and merchants who realized such restraints served to hamper trade and lessen profit. Thus, it was at this time that the call for a centralized state headed by a single monarch who would abolish all such restraints as well as protect and support emerging industries and trade, gained great popularity amongst the entrepreneurial class. So came to be the fateful contradiction of the old order and the ever encroaching new one. While the lords sought to retain a system of class relations that ultimately shut down the productive forces and thereby ensured the system's eventual collapse, the new order, headed by the dynamic entrepreneurs, sought to shatter such limiting class relations and, in their place, establish new ones capable of reviving the productive process, granting unto such forces the potential to achieve new and boundless heights. Thus, the entrepreneurs, allied with the serfs whose lot was certain to improve as wage laborers, eventually, through supporting and funding a particular monarch against the numerous fiefdoms, enacted the concept of the contemporary centralized state and, in doing so, brought the feudal order to its knees and completed its extinction.

f. Capitalism and the Continued Advance of the Forces of Production

From the ashes of the feudal order arose the class relations of capitalism. Class relations that have allowed and encouraged

the forces of production to develop at an unprecedented rate. A development, moreover, that has rendered unto mankind a control of his world, and to some degree, his universe, that could not have been dreamt of by even the most imaginative of lords. Today in the western world the majority exist free from life threatening hunger, free from numerous mortal diseases, and free from extremely brutal labor. As should be evident, such freedom exists wholly dependent upon the forces of production. For it is the forces of production and only the forces of production that have created an abundance of foodstuffs and material goods; that have laid low and have completely eradicated certain diseases that had at one time crippled nations and even continents; that have successfully introduced technology into the workplace, freeing labor previously exposed to perilous and difficult work conditions.

As was the case in all preceding economic orders, so too do the contemporary advances of the forces of production have their locus in the prevailing class relations, specifically speaking, the class relations of capitalism. To explain, the two most dynamic, though not only elements comprising capitalist class relations are the capitalists and the workers. The capitalist is the individual who owns the forces of production, the means of production and the technology inherent to it, and, in doing so, owns as well and decides upon the future of the commodities that are to be produced and the value they command. In contrast, the worker owns only his labor power which is purchased by the capitalist to be immersed with the means of pro-

duction. In this simplified manner, the process of production is organized and ready to commence. In the last chapter it was shown that the primary concern for the capitalist and his enterprise is that sufficient profit be generated. In terms of sufficient, it is necessary that enough profit, capital over and above the initial investment, be available for transforming *the* workplace making it ever more efficient and productive, and hence, the commodity put forth ever more competitive in price. In this regard, what is crucial if one is to properly comprehend and correctly interpret the workings of a specific capitalist enterprise, is the fact that no enterprise exists isolated or by itself. Capitalism is a system, and as such, is practised on a systematic level. Thus, the individual industry is extremely sensitive to market conditions and, in particular, the manner in which a competitor industry affects such conditions. For example, if an industry succeeds in producing, relative to the competition, a commodity of equal quality and lower price and is thereby able to command a large segment of the market and its corresponding profits, it is paramount that all competitors seek to produce commodities at similar costs. For it is the entrepreneur who presents the most attractive product, in terms of quality and price, who accrues unto himself and his business the better part of the market and the profits thereof. In light of the above, the capitalist is always pursuing new methods of production specifically designed to eliminate costs. Furthermore, on the basis of the law of value which states that a commodity's value is determined by the amount of socially neces-

sary labor time intrinsic to its production, there *inevitably* exists the compelling drive amongst capitalists for technological efficiency allowing for the production of ever increasing amounts of commodities in ever shorter periods of time. Because such technological efficiency requires a combination of scientific research, production of the technology itself, and its eventual installation, it is crucial that the industry secure adequate amounts of revenue to fund such a process. And of course, such revenue is only possible if one remains competitive. Thus, a cycle develops which continually perpetuates itself. Indeed, by virtue of the competitive essence that is capitalism, the capitalist has no option but to continually develop the forces of production with the specific intent of producing a commodity competitive in price, and thus, capable of allowing the capitalist command of enough of the market to guarantee the quantity of profit necessary for re-developing the productive process and remaining competitive. To conclude, it is by virtue of competition, and hence, the quest for profit that the capitalist system has precipitated an advance in the productive forces that remains unparalleled in history.

g. Capitalism's Inherent Contradiction Based on Class Relations

Such an advance has, as has been said, unquestionably benefitted mankind in terms of making available over greater control of and freedom from the environment. However, as great an advance as it may be, such an advance is necessarily limited, in terms of benefitting all of humankind, by virtue of its initial

impetus being that of competition. Indeed, while the success of capitalism, relative to feudalism, stemmed directly from the fact that capitalism offered unto humanity an unprecedented freedom from the confines of the environment, a freedom, remember, dependent on the fact that capitalist class relations inspired the forces of production onwards; nevertheless, such an offering was and still is necessarily limited in the sense of being directly defined by the class relations in question, the class relations of capitalism. Simply, the material advance and security typifying the western world exist as a conclusion of capitalist competition and struggle for profit. Thus, while such competition inevitably benefits mankind, such benefit, far from being an end in itself, is nothing more than a by-product of the functioning capitalist order. Basic observation bears this out. For example, in its endeavour to create a commodity as competitive in price as possible, capitalism has consistently resorted to instituting capital intensive technology for the expressed purpose of dismissing labor, and thus, cutting labor costs and the cost of the finished product in general. In many instances, complete facilities of production have been uprooted and moved across continents to, in most cases, Third World regions where wage levels are exceedingly low.⁵⁵ In such a manner, not only is the former community left out in the cold as far as jobs and tax revenue are concerned, but the latter community inevitably suffers an unprecedented rate of exploitation that is, of course, in the interest of the company to maintain. In this regard, the tendencies of the capitalist order assisted and

fulfilled by the capitalist state has rendered much of the Third World poverty stricken and politically repressed. A poverty and repression that thoroughly coincides with and is necessitated by capitalist intrusion. This crucial topic shall be talked of more extensively in the next chapter which deals, in part, with the specifics of capitalist imperialism.

Even the advances in medicine, giving humankind perhaps its greatest and most prized freedom from the hostile environment, are propelled and mediated by the class relations of capitalism. Indeed, medicine, like any commodity, is produced by the capitalist to serve a need and acquire a profit. Thus, based on the extent *of* the need in question and the profit such an extent can potentially generate, is determined where and how the capitalist of medicine seeks to, first and foremost, involve himself in securing both a portion of the most lavish markets and the tidy profit such markets entail. It is not uncommon, therefore, to hear scientists speak of obscure yet deadly diseases that receive virtually no attention in terms of research and understanding, while money is flooded into, for instance, development of weight control prescriptions, sleep aides, and tranquilizers that strive to alleviate common yet hardly fatal ailments. The reason being, of course, the profit motive inherent to capitalism deems it unprofitable, and hence, capitalistically foolish to fund expensive research to satisfy a relatively small need and derive a small source of profit when there exist much greater needs and corresponding amounts of profit.

A further example of how the capitalist system has alienated the forces of production from human concerns is made evident in the fact that while it is technologically possible to produce enough energy and food for the entire world to consume, such possibilities are far from realities. As far as energy is concerned, capitalism's subservience to profit demands that solar research, which science claims could translate into efficient, clean, and inexpensive energy capable of being utilized throughout the world, should be abandoned in favor of the relatively archaic, though much more profitable, petroleum fuels. In terms of food, while science informs us that no one must die of hunger in this day and age, thousands do. In the U.S., fields lay fallow while surplus agriculture goods rot in warehouses or are outright destroyed, all in the name of ensuring price supports, all in the name of making agriculture a capitalistically viable institution. Throughout the world where famine and need is so apparent, great acres of land are cultivated to produce, not foodstuffs to be consumed by the local populations, but profitable export crops destined for foreign markets, and thus, to satisfy the international capitalist economy as opposed to the local one.⁵⁶

Finally, the one phenomenon revealing the utter extreme to which capitalism has alienated the forces of production from serving the needs of humanity such that the forces of production have actually begun to constitute a *detriment* to humanity, is the proliferation of nuclear weaponry over the last century- nuclear weaponry that is an essential and inevitable component of capita-

list consolidation. As a system of competition, capitalism dictates that the capitalist state preserve the integrity of the capitalist enterprise both at home and abroad. At home it has meant instituting protectionist measures, granting government bailouts, and protecting the private ownership of the means of production. Abroad it has meant creating conditions favorable to the success and profitability of capitalist enterprises in terms of imperialistically securing raw materials and cheap indigenous labor. Furthermore, it is crucial that such multinational enterprises be protected from competitor states. Presently, such competition predominantly features the United States and the Soviet Union which, far from being communist, represents nothing but a relatively poor consumer capitalist state where the capitalist network is organized and initiated at the state level as opposed to the individual. The degree to which both countries seek to globally dominate, is evidenced in the fact that the Soviet Union currently maintains 800,000 troops in 22 foreign countries, while the United States has 500,000 troops stationed at bases in 40 foreign countries.⁵⁷ In this light, to keep one another at bay it is essential that both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. protect their vital global interests through threats and intimidation that are effectively backed by an everpresent and increasing nuclear arsenal. Moreover, the military industries of both countries are eager to satisfy the enormous needs of the capitalist state. In the United States alone approximately half the yearly budget is allocated to defense, 300 billion dollars as compared to the 85 billion which comprises the entire

federal budget of Canada.⁵⁸ Indeed, the military industrial complexes of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. exist as a veritable economy within an economy, as an intricate and permanent aspect of a maturing, or better still, aging capitalist world.

h. The Capitalist Dilemma- Profit Versus Humanity

From these examples, it is possible to see how capitalist class relations, in particular, the competition for profit and market success amongst the capitalist class itself, has necessitated that all advances concerning the forces of production be conditioned and determined by an essential drive for profit intrinsic to capitalist production. An essential drive for profit that, in the final analysis, has rendered human destiny far from secure, far from certain, but ever vulnerable to the effects of an alienated forces of production. In short, as with the economic systems preceding capitalism, there has risen within capitalism itself an irrefutable and ever tensing contradiction. In this fashion, the contradiction can be thought of as containing two aspects. First, there exists the relatively provincial contradiction between the capitalist and laboring classes of the developed states. Simply, the former class wishes to secure as much profit as possible, while the latter class desires to retain unto itself the greater portion of the value it creates, and thus, seeks to minimize the rate of capitalist exploitation. Second, there exists a most significant contradiction, in terms of universality, between the forces of production and the realm of humanity. As has been said, it is a contra-

diction whose initial instigation is to be found in a capitalist class caught in the throes of competition. To explain, despite leading to numerous technical and scientific advances, such competition necessarily ensures that all such advances are achieved only by virtue of and within the parameters of a competitive drive for profit. Truly, it is precisely this race for profit which has propelled capitalism to exist as a world-wide economic network, and as such, has relegated the humanity of both the developed capitalist states and the underdeveloped neo-colonial holdings to a position of subservience, to a position of, in fact, existing as a mere means to an end - the end of profit, and hence, the end of capitalism's preservation. Such a contradiction, as in the past, will be resolved only by establishing a new set of class relations allowing both the further advance of the forces of production and the application thereof to be determined and based on the needs of humanity. In other words, rather than the advance of the forces of production precipitating from, dependent on, and serving capitalism's demand for constant accumulation, the new class relations will be of a social kind such that the forces of production will be communally owned and operated. A communalization that will necessarily advocate the values and reality of social well-being and cooperation as opposed to competition and profit.⁵⁹

i. The Socialists' Intent

It was this objective of communalizing the means of production that the socialists of Leo's era insisted upon. Furthermore, it was upon the merit of materialist theory just put forth

concerning social development that the socialists based their challenging objective and arguments for its enactment. Of course, as history tells us, no such communalization ever did take place. This is in no way to suggest however that the socialists were misled in their goals or that the materialist theory was lacking. Rather, the socialists at this time simply underestimated the capacity of the capitalist system to develop, consolidate, and preserve its being. To explain, the contradiction the socialists sought to mitigate through establishing new class relations, was what we previously deemed provincial, and hence, limited in that it involved only the capitalist and laboring classes of the industrializing world. The essence of this relatively narrow contradiction involved the awful living standards imposed upon labor by virtue of the capitalists' attempt to estrange as much value created by the worker as possible. Truly, if the condition of squalor experienced by the majority of the working class at this time were left unchanged, it is without doubt that substantial conflict would have ensued leading, quite possibly, to a change in class relations. However, the rapidly evolving capitalist system, realizing its precarious status at home and constantly searching for new markets and sources of cheap labor and raw materials, began a process of exporting the method of severe exploitation practised at home to undeveloped areas throughout the world where such exploitation could be more easily conducted and managed. In the end, the institution of imperialism, an institution that has and still allows the capitalist enterprise to enjoy an unprecedented rate of return on

investments, rendered unto the capitalist order the crucial ability to secure great sources of revenue enabling the successful pacification of local labor through improving wages and decreasing hours, and hence, the social stabilization of the homefront in general as the threat of socio-economic revolution quickly dissipated. Indeed, such stabilization has gone so far as to feature the labor of the industrialized state actually identifying its interests with that of the capitalist. Such a pseudo-alliance of labor and capital founded on the extreme exploitation of foreign labor markets has done much to sustain the capitalist order allowing its continued development over time. However, it is a development that has finally and inevitably resulted in a contradiction of a global nature. A contradiction pitting the whole of humanity against a ^{set of} capitalist controlled and restricted forces of production. As we have shown, the urgency and potential devastation of such a contradiction is most evident in the reality that while extraordinary amounts of capital are spent on improving and devising technology destined to destroy all that humanity is and will ever be, the technology necessary to feed the world is neglected and under-utilized, allowing thousands, in a potential world of plenty, to starve. Further testimony to this contradiction is evidenced in the reality that the U.S. which comprises 6% of the world's population consumes over 40% of all that is produced annually.⁶⁰ Such statistics cannot help but signify that the U.S. is presently engaging in an act of economic terrorism against the vast majority of the world's population. In this light, therefore, rather than change

coming from, as the socialists of Leo's time claimed, an industrialized society that presently languishes in the stupifying effects of perverse materialism, it is apparent that change is going to come from the exploited periphery which, as shall be shown in the following chapter, exists as the very cornerstone of the capitalist order. Truly, the revolutionary movements in El Salvador, Cuba, Nicaragua, South Africa, and the Philippines, coupled with the capitalist states' great concern about and ardent resistance to such movements, testify to this fact.

4. Socialist Objectives

In any event, despite failing to realize capitalism's ability for developing into a worldwide economic system that served to temper, and to a great extent, dissipate the conflict between labor and capital in the industrialized states; nevertheless, such development has precipitated contradictions of a global nature that, due to their irresolvable proportion and destructive potential, can only be remedied by applying the socialist prescription of communalizing the means of production. For it is through such communalization that the forces of production, rather than serving a system of profit at the expense of humanity's needs, will become directly responsible to such needs and their fulfillment. In this regard, Let us examine the prominent characteristics that would typify a true socialist society.

First, in a socialist environment man is destined to produce in a cooperative rather than competitive manner. This is to say, rather than the masses enduring the misery wrought by

a productive process guided by an anarchy of competition, and thus, resulting in the perpetual cycle of boom and bust, the socialist method ascribes to an economy based on reason and association. Hence, produced is the type of product and amount needed that would guarantee the satisfaction of the human condition. Moreover, unlike the capitalist system in which one is thoroughly manipulated in terms of how and what to produce, in the socialist system democracy plays a vital role in the workplace. The worker, not allowed to deteriorate into a mental peon performing a menial task, is trained and educated to actively and effectively contribute to the planning and execution of the productive process.

While the above differences alone between existing capitalism and dreamed of socialism contrast with one another as do night and day, there is one goal of the socialist movement that exists as the ultimate accomplishment, not just of socialism, but of humanity. That goal being the realization of absolute freedom. Indeed, as has been indicated in our outline of the forces of production, such development was and still is necessarily inspired by humanity's natural desire to gain mastery over, and hence, freedom from a hostile and unpredictable environment. In this regard, by virtue of the preceding economic systems' accumulated contributions to the development of the forces of production, the socialist movement acknowledges the fact that the technical and scientific expertise presently characterizing the forces of production are capable, if communally owned and operated, of sustaining all of mankind, freeing it from the perpetual and life-

consuming act of laboring for the mere sake of surviving. In this sense, there exists perhaps no greater intellectual sin than the failure to understand Marx's true interpretation of the socialist objective. Anyone believing that Marx spoke "primarily" of the economic exploitation of the worker is negligent, and indeed, most guilty of burdening Marx's thought and intent with the weight of an undeserving materialism. In other words, essential to understand is the fact that the economic correction sought by the socialist/Marxist cause exists only as a prerequisite, as a means allowing humankind to achieve its triumphant destiny. Put as simply as possible, such a destiny entails humankind's "actions" being consonant with its "will." In the socialist construct, Marx envisaged man as no longer estranged from his true self, from his true nature - a self and nature that is only to be realized, only to be fulfilled when the person's actions and labors find themselves in accord with the person's will. Truly. Marx's greatest complaint of capitalist society involved the fact that for the greater part of his life, man's activity exists in contrast, in opposition to his desire and will. For Marx, it is only by one's free action, whether it be thinking, building, or plowing, that the development of one's self may proceed.⁶¹

Continuing on, according to Marx an inevitable consequence following in the wake of the socialist transformation consists of a new, so to speak, "state of mind." To clarify, while capitalism breeds an exaggeration of the alienated self over and against the priority of the community, socialism is designed to reinstate the priority of the community, the social. However,

this is not in any way to suggest that socialism wishes to deny the individual self. Indeed, it is the socialist view that the person's self is best developed and nurtured when it invests itself in the community in terms of operating from the orientation of the community's interests and needs. In short, from the socialist perspective, it is only by losing one's self to the needs of the community that one finds and, in fact, actualizes one's self.⁶²

ON THE CHURCH

I. Inequalities Inevitable

First to note in our critique of Leo's discussion on the Church, concerns his rationalization of the existent economic inequalities. According to Leo, it is precisely because men are born with different capabilities in terms of mind and body, that they garner different degrees of fortune. Thus, the weak and insipid will generally be of a poorer status than those blessed with strength and intellect. And indeed, according to Leo, reality, more often than not, demonstrates this to be the case. However, even if it is the case, the question that must be asked is whether or not it is "reflectively right" that society dole its benefits upon its members on the basis of inherent ability. If we turn our attention to the "wild kingdom" for a moment, we see the human situation pretty much applies there as well. Animal communities have and always will exist on the principle of "survival of the fittest." Hence, those beasts which are able, take, use, and benefit, while those that are not

remain subservient and struggle to survive. And that is alright, for animals. Lacking the grand ability to reason and reflect, animals are forever condemned to endure a life where the conditions of such life are fully contingent upon arbitrary strengths of mind and body. Of course, if a creature does possess the ability to reason and reflect, it will inevitably acknowledge the lack of justification warranting that one, on the basis of his physical and mental faculties, live a style of life superior or inferior to those around him.

Without delving into abstract and obtuse argument, suffice it to say that reason dictates that one is hardly entitled to wealth and fortune simply because one is blessed with certain talents. Indeed, while one may work to cultivate and nurture such talent; nevertheless, the origin of the, so to speak, seed of talent has as its "creator" something other than the individual. In short, the individual is not responsible for the talent per se, it exists arbitrarily and by chance. In this context therefore, why should the intelligent or powerful annex unto themselves a disproportionate amount of society's social wealth relative to those of lesser ability? Does not reason and reflection *impel* each and every individual to perceive that the particular superiority or inferiority distinguishing one person, could have just as easily distinguished another? In this sense, looking beyond one's own particular situation in terms of mind and body, and realizing such a situation is largely dependent on variables which exist outside the realm of human manipulation (e.g. one's genetic makeup), it seems absolutely nonsensical

that reasonable, rational creatures would let such variables of chance determine how their lives will be lived and fulfilled. Indeed, are we to let the handicapped and retarded be pushed to the brink of extinction simply because the genetic "wheel of fortune" proved unkind in their instance? Or do we, utilizing our reason and reflection, recognize their existence as marred by a cruel fate, and at the same time, desire for them as we would for ourselves if in their position, a quality of life capable of rendering one's existence as joyful and as worthwhile as possible? In short, acknowledging the fact that any one person is born with a varying degree of beneficial and detrimental traits, it is only rational that the partitioning of the resources of the earth be immune to such traits of fate, and that such resources be divided up according to one's needs amongst all of humanity's divergent yet, nevertheless, rationally motivated members.

A further and perhaps more basic error intrinsic to Leo's argument sanctifying the inequalities of wealth, involves his complete disregard of the role played by one's environment as affecting the degree to which one achieves, in particular, material prosperity. By such an omission, Leo implies that those men presently occupying positions of wealth and power do so solely on the merits of their superior individual abilities. Obviously, simple observation tells us this is not the case as such men are hardly inclined in terms of possessing great physical and mental prowess. Indeed, the primary contributor to the present status of such individuals is, in fact, the environ-

ment from which they developed and emerged. For example, the rich child of average ability exposed to the finest educational institutions and various opportunities that money can buy, holds an inevitable advantage over and against the poor child of similar ability and his corresponding lack of benefits. It is an advantage, moreover, that the individual is born into, and hence, wields little if any control over. Thus, by restricting the scope of his argument to the confines of an extreme individualism, Leo neglects the foundation upon which the individualism of every person proceeds and develops. Truly, it is the foundation of environment that predominantly determines the extent to which a person is to succeed or fail in his life's endeavors. Of course, this is not to say that one's individual abilities play no part in one's development and material success. What it is to say is that Leo's argument of individualism is only plausible when conditions, in particular, environmental conditions are made as equitable as possible thereby allowing the individual talents of the persons in question to dominate and determine the course and eventual destiny of their lives. And of course, since this prerequisite of environmental equality is hardly evident, Leo's position of material inequalities based on individualism is void of meaning, and hence, realistically untenable.

To conclude, unlike Leo, rather than one's quality of life in terms of economic status being determined by factors firmly entrenched in the luck of the draw (genetics and environment), it is crucial that one perceive man as capable, on the basis of his unique ability of reflection and reason, of seizing

the moment, of rising above his selfish and non-reflective pattern of mere survival, and establishing a mode of existence in which priority centers on the individual, each individual, developing and fulfilling his being to its ultimate extent.

2. The Role of Capital

The criticism to be made here is similar to that made earlier in the critique portion of The Socialists and Evils of Society. To start, what Leo insists the capitalist do, is to manage his operation from a perspective of Christian charity and virtue. Thus, rather than utilizing employees as a mere means to an end, the end of profit, the employees themselves and their interests should assume a position of priority within the workplace. Of course, from our previous analysis of the capitalist mode of production and its immutable laws, it is obvious that if such, so to speak, Christian reform were enacted, the mode of production would no longer be capitalist as accumulation would be superseded in importance by the new priority given unto labor, and hence, would no longer serve as capital's sole source of instigation and incentive. To clarify, it must be understood that capitalism exists as an unconsciously evolved system complete with its own set of laws and priorities which prevail over and against all other considerations, including the issue of morality. In terms of the capitalist per se, it is not a matter of his personal integrity or morality; on the contrary, it is only a question of the impossibility and failure involved when attempting to inject values of Christian ethic into a system such as capitalism. In other words, the morality of the capitalist, especially at the turn of the century

when competition was cut throat, could not and still cannot be a factor in solving the social question as long as the capitalist desires to compete and remain economically sound. For once assuming the role of capitalist, the individual immediately conforms to capitalism's demands and needs. Thus, in maintaining a competitive edge in terms of production costs, it is necessary that the cost of labor be kept to a minimum, that the expenses involved in safeguarding the worker from industrial mishaps be limited, and that there be facilitated an "unemployed reserve army" essential for manipulating even lower the wages of labor and minimizing the threat of strikes. In short, to fail to realize, as Leo, the transcendent, self-serving nature of the capitalist mode of production, is to fail to realize the utter futility involved when attempting to instill such a mode of production with a code of morality, in particular, Christian morality, that is both foreign and adverse to capitalism's very objective, its very essence.

As far as the critique on the role of labor is concerned, because Leo's directive to the individual laborer virtually parallels the advice and guidance he offers to worker organizations, we shall, so as not to be repetitive, combine and critique both subjects in our later discussion on organizations.

ON THE STATE

In critiquing Leo's recommendation on the role of the state, what is most important to note is not the specific measures Leo felt it crucial for the state to enact, but how he inter-

preted the overall intent of such measures to be. This is to say, from Leo's perspective, the social legislation he advocated which the state eventually acted upon had as its origin the genuine need of the people. In brief, the intent of such legislation was to explicitly assist and benefit the laborer. However, viewing the state from the socialist perspective, one immediately senses an ulterior motive behind such seemingly noble intentions. Stressing the priority of the economic realm as being the base, the foundation of society's superstructure, the socialists interpreted the capitalist state as oriented to, and hence, functioning from a capitalist bias. In other words, since the economic realm according to the socialists is that from which society's social and ideological system's stem, it can only be concluded that the existence of the state has its purpose, its very being firmly entrenched in protecting and maintaining the existing mode of production. Thus, it is a mode of production which is responsible, not for the state's origin per se, but for the very blueprint of class bias such origin is based on, developed from and into - indeed, into the contemporary "capitalist state."⁶³

In this light, while the state through its social programs desired to improve the worker's lot, such improvement was not, in and of itself, all that was sought. Such improvement existed as only a means to an end. To clarify, according to the socialist perspective as noted above, the capitalist state exists primarily to organize and fulfill the interests of capital on a political level. Moreover, if there is one interest that all capitalists can readily agree upon, it is that interest which

comprises the chief function of the state - the protection and preservation of private property, in particular, the private ownership of the forces of production. In this context, accompanying the revolutionary ferment of the time, especially when such ferment was organized around the socialist flag, was the vulnerability of private property.

Hence, the state, acting in behalf of capital, took it upon itself to defuse the potential social upheaval by ameliorating, to some degree, the workers' suffering. Thus came to pass the various social legislation and industrial reforms of the period which, by alleviating the most blatant social inequities, stole away the socialist momentum rendering incapable the more extreme socialist groups from making a run at their far flung objectives.

To summarize, while Leo saw the impetus for state legislation lying solely in the need and desire to assist the down-trodden masses, from the socialist perspective, such legislation was never meant to be an end in itself. Indeed, such legislation had as its locus the desire of capitalism, in specific, the need of the capitalist system to retain and ensure its being and application in reality. In short, while an intended by-product of the state's enactment of industrial reform was to promote the condition of the workingmen, such a by-product was exactly that, a by-product in the sense that it was specifically designed to serve and benefit a greater end, a greater purpose - the purpose of capital.

Perhaps the greatest contemporary example of such state intervention on behalf of the people in order to secure the capitalist system was evidenced in the United States during

the Depression under the Roosevelt administration. To *begin with*, the decade preceding the Depression was a time characterized by an unconditional individualism. In this regard, the economic realm was distinguished by an unprecedented laissez faire attitude. Of course, operating under such unregulated conditions, business speculated beyond its means, or better still, beyond the ability of labor's wages to absorb that which the market offered. Banks as well speculated and over-extended themselves in terms of loans and credit. And so ensued the Depression in which the United States experienced a great and rapid decline in the standard of living, in the number of those employed, and in the number of those with sufficient shelter and food. Furthermore, in relation to such decline existed a proportional increase in social dissent and "communist" groups calling for the organized nationalization of the means of production necessary for ensuring against future crises.⁶⁴ In the social context of the above, President Roosevelt, fulfilling his duty to the status quo, to the capitalist mode of production, entirely dismissed the longstanding ideology of darwinistic individualism (which in its time served capital's needs) and embarked on a series of socio-economic reforms destined to placate and restore stability to the disruptive imbalance afflicting the social scene. Again, reforms, not done in and of themselves in the sense of serving the needs of the people per se, but done to serve the reign of capitalism by, in effect, tranquilizing the populus into a state of continued socio-economic submission and tolerance.⁶⁵

ON LABOR ASSOCIATIONS

If any one facet of Leo's prescription has proven itself most flawed over the course of history, it is his advice to labor. Imploring labor to form organizations of a defensive nature in contrast to the socialist associations which often aspired to a most radical offensive, Leo hoped to inculcate within the labor movement a feeling of toleration and patience that would serve to pacify labor long enough to allow the earlier discussed "benevolent actions" on the part of capital to trickle down and benefit labor, and thus, prevent social disruption. From our discussion concerning capitalism as impervious to a Christian ethic, it is apparent that a stance of passivity by the workers would not only be for naught, but would indeed encourage the exploitative conditions to continue unhindered. Simply, once understanding capitalism's priority of self preservation through accumulation, it is clear that if the social realm remains staid, capital will feel no threat, and hence, will inevitably continue down its exploitative path.

It was for this reason that the socialist organizations inspired by Marxism, in particular, the Communist League (1847) and its successor, the International Working Men's Association (1864), embodied tenets and principles of proletarian revolution. Comprehending the interests of the laborer to be wholly adverse to the very essence that is capitalism, the socialists realized the utter futility of solutions within the system. Indeed, recognizing the very real threat that the International posed in terms of its growing numbers and militant attitude, the

capitalist order realized that it was imperative that the movement be unhinged and the imminent threat presented by labor diffused. Such diffusion eventually involved a moderate improvement in the workers' standard of living which included higher wages, fewer hours, and child labor laws. Overall, these concessions were generally accepted by the laboring class which, in return, tempered their demands to the extent of granting a certain legitimacy to the capitalist order. However, far from ensuring an indefinite prolongation of capitalism, the compromise reached initiated the development of conflict on a global scale that is not so easily resolved. This is to say, the benefits given to the workers of the industrializing state at the turn of the century were funded in part by revenue derived from foreign labor and economies that were being increasingly exploited. Such exploitation, as has been mentioned, is now in the process of being violently and successfully repelled by those peoples who have inevitably organized themselves to combat the capitalist network and the debilitating effects it has had on their countries' development (i.e. Cuba, Nicaragua, South Africa, Colombia).

In any event, the point to be made clear is that it is and was the militancy of the people of both the developed and underdeveloped worlds that has served to evoke response and eventual change from the system. In the case of the former, such response entailed compromise; in the case of the latter, since there are no longer any people or land left to exploit, and thus, find another compromise, the response has been staunch

resistance which has been, in some cases, triumphantly broken down. Indeed, from a socialist/Marxist interpretation and understanding of the capitalist order, to be "passive" in terms of organizational strategy is to be sterile in terms of affecting one's demands. For as has been said, capitalism is impervious to human suffering, agony, and wretchedness. Capitalism, existing utterly engrossed in its own maintenance and development, transcends the human condition totally unaware of its qualitative status. Truly, it is only when such engrossment is pervaded, in particular, by a menacing challenge capable of disrupting if not subverting the entire order, that the system reacts, instituting the various alterations necessary for liquidating the challenge.

To conclude, realizing the impotence inherent to a strategy of passive tolerance, the socialists at the time of Leo opted for a militancy that held nothing sacred in the present order. It was precisely this brand of militancy that eventually secured for labor a more adequate means of survival by signalling to capital that concessions were mandatory if the aroused consciousness of labor was to be appeased without harming or dismantling the capitalist structure. In this light, capitalism is revealed as a system that is slave and master to itself. It finds itself, serves itself, and evolves itself. Thus, it is an evolution that includes the enactment, from time to time, of social reforms, done not in and of themselves in terms of bettering the community's welfare, but for the continuation and preservation of a particular economic system.

CONCLUSION

Of the entire encyclical, the most significant development concerns Leo's revised diagnosis that the economic difficulties plaguing the working class are attributable to the very system of capitalist production. Thus, rather than naively blaming the socialists as he did thirteen years earlier, Leo invokes a more critical dimension to his study and understanding of the economic order, capitalism, and the social consequences thereof. In this respect, the Marxist critique made it evident that the conclusions rendered from such critical astuteness not only existed as a vast improvement over Leo's initial thought, but as well necessitated that the papal conception of economic reality be more in accord with the insights of Marxism. Of course, while such accordance hardly involved the specific and intricate workings of and tendencies intrinsic to the capitalist network, agreement is nevertheless evident amongst the two camps by virtue of their common belief that modernity's socio-economic hardships are attributable, at least in part, to the economic realm itself.

In 1891, this was the extent that papal and Marxist philosophies coincided. Indeed, as the critique portion of the chapter indicated, while the papal attitude suggested such hardships were the result of abuses within the system, abuses, crucial to note, susceptible to adjustment and correction within the structural parameters of capitalism, the Marxist position counters that such abuses were and still are inherent to the system itself, and as such, are indispensable for maintaining the very nature, the very essence of capitalism. In this regard, unique to and without

question adding to the credibility of the Marxist position vis-à-vis the pope's, is the fact that the Marxist argument is founded on a comprehensive study of both capitalism's laws as well as the development and manifestation in reality of such laws. Truly, what should be evident at this stage of our investigation is the crucial point that whereas the Marxist position is the culmination of analytical study and research, the papal position is not. Whereas the Marxist argument presents one with the scientific analysis leading to and resulting in its eventual claims, the papal position does not. Furthermore, the effects of such an exclusion by the papal camp cannot be denied. To clarify, while the fundamental tenets of the Marxist position have remained applicable and relevant to this very day, the position of Leo, in particular, his diagnosis, exhibits disconcertedness and uncertainty. In this respect, it would not be far from the truth to attribute Leo's confusion to a basic lack of analytical insight and objective investigation. Two items that exist so essential for establishing the validity of any attempted study.

CHAPTER III - PIUS XI - 1931

INTRODUCTION

Forty years following Leo XIII's celebrated exhortation on the social question, The Condition of the Workingmen, the world found itself in the clutches of one of the worst and most encompassing socio-economic crises ever known. In one way or another, almost all, the world over, were detrimentally affected in terms of their economic well-being. As far as the social scene was concerned, the stability and strength that had characterized the socio-economic realm in the preceding decade was recognized for what it was, a mere facade that was stripped away by the system's demand for and society's allowance of unregulated market conditions that featured a complete anarchy of production resulting in a glut of unsold commodities and the inevitable halt of the production process as a whole.

In terms of the human condition per se, the above translated into unprecedented suffering amongst those of the industrialized nations. Unemployment, debt, inadequate housing and clothing, and even instances of starvation became commonplace. Moreover, as is always the case when social misery abounds, the appeals from "communist" and "socialist" groups chiding the tenets of liberalism while advocating alterations of a social design for restructuring the crumbled economy, were ever present.¹ In this regard, traumatized by the desperate economic environment with which it was confronted, labor, most of which found itself utterly without hope and assistance in meeting the prevailing hardships, sought to minimize if not eradicate its plight through unionization.² Hence, under the direction of socialist rhetoric,

increasing numbers of workers aligned themselves with newly emerging unions, some of which desired only to secure adequate provisions for ~~their~~ members while others insisted upon a total renovation of the economic order, replacing capitalism with a form of socialism depending on the group in question. In any event, whether moderate or radical, all such groups along with most individuals questioned the very legitimacy of the capitalist system including the social values (e.g. individualism and the role of competition) that naturally accompanied and coincided with such a system.

It was this reality of economic turmoil and social distress that motivated Pius XI in 1931, wishing to restore a degree of equilibrium to the social scene, to compose and deliver the encyclical, On Reconstructing the Social Order (Quadragesimo Anno³). With the above in mind, the following analysis of the encyclical shall proceed, as usual, in a twofold manner. First shall be presented the thought of Pius which can be divided into three distinct sections: 1) the reaffirmation of certain and specific aspects of Leo's forty year old encyclical which Pius interpreted as equally pertinent for his own age, and thus, worthy of being updated; 2) a contemporary and, relative to Leo, much more ardent and precise criticism of the capitalist order, in particular, the social impediments associated with the concept and reality of an unregulated free enterprise system; 3) and finally, a warning of the ominous signs and detrimental social effects rendered by a maturing capitalist system - the spread of imperialism, the concentration of capital in fewer hands, and the diminished distinction between state objectives and capitalism's needs.

The second part of the investigation shall, on the basis of Marxist analysis and fifty years hindsight regarding the social consequences of a now advanced capitalist system, make clear the erroneous presuppositions of Pius based on a general naivety concerning capitalism's intrinsic laws, as well as give credit and conclusive elaboration to his perceptive observations concerning the virulent social effects associated with an unhindered evolution and manifestation of a capitalist mode of production.

REAFFIRMING LEO

1) Return to the Church

The essential topic Pius recalls from Leo's encyclical concerns the proper course to follow for establishing social health and tranquility. First and foremost, it is crucial that all agents, in particular, all classes involved in the social dilemma honestly and wholeheartedly seek a "return to the Church." According to Pius, the deep rooted socio-economic ills plaguing society can only be resolved through consultation with the Church.

But this order, which we ourselves desire and make every effort to promote, will be quite faulty and imperfect, unless man's activities harmoniously unite to initiate and, as far as humanly possible, attain the marvelous unity of the divine plan. This is the perfect order which the Church preaches with intense earnestness, and which right reason demands: which places God as the first and supreme end of all created activity, and regards all created goods as mere instruments under God, to be used only in so far as they help toward the attainment of our supreme end.⁴

2) Failure of Socialism and Liberalism

Using the above affirmation as his starting point, Pius inevitably denounces the efforts of the socialists who stand in stark contradiction to the idea positing the primacy of God. In this ^{regard,} interesting to note is that in the forty years since Leo's commentary, it is evident in light of Pius' remarks that the socialist front had experienced a definite schism of sorts. Thus, recognizing an emerging difference of attitude, and indeed, purpose as disrupting and dividing the socialist ranks, Pius redefines the socialist movement as being comprised of both "communists" and "socialists," and addresses both groups accordingly. The communists, obviously referring to those subscribing to the beliefs and condoning the activities of the Soviet state, are a despicable and blind lot perpetually disposed to an attitude of class warfare and conflict. In this context, Pius proceeds to reaffirm Leo's earlier conclusions concerning the socialists, or more precisely, the socialist sect Pius terms "communist," that not only is the communist remedy most impractical in method, but that its very theory, for instance, class warfare and the expropriation of private property, is thoroughly illegitimate and would, if enacted, prove most detrimental to the welfare of the very class, labor, the communists insist their concern and efforts are directed towards.

Communism teaches and pursues a twofold aim: "erci: less class warfare and complete abolition of private ownership, and this it does not in secret and by hidden methods, but openly, publicly, and by every means, even the most violent....' e cannot contemplate without

sorrow the heedlessness of those who seem to make light of these imminent dangers and with stolid indifference allow the propagation far and wide of those doctrines which seek by violence and bloodshed the destruction of all society.⁵

In contrast, Pius discusses the group labelled "socialist" as being much more tempered and flexible in its demands to the point of condoning the existence of private property as long as it is utilized for the expressed purpose of social justice and the benefit of the common good.

Not only does it condemn recourse to physical force; it even mitigates and moderates to some extent class warfare and the abolition of private property.... The war declared against private ownership has also abated more and more, in such a way that nowadays it is not really the possession of the means of production which is attacked but that type of social rulership, which, in violation of all justice, has been seized and usurped by the owners of wealth.⁶

Though acknowledging the degree to which such a relatively sedated objective conforms to the hopes and desires of the Church; nevertheless, Leo remains adamant in his belief that compromise and union of the Church and the socialists is strictly forbidden by virtue of their contrasting viewpoints on human nature and purpose. As touched upon earlier, while the Church posits God as the destiny and authority of human action, the socialists adhere to the tenets of a materialist humanism that emphasizes the economic environment as conditioning and determining the fate of all humankind.⁷

Upon concluding his deliberations on the "socialist/communist"

shortcomings, Pius, in a fashion more specific and critical than Leo, proceeds to the opposite end of the socio-economic spectrum and delivers a compelling polemic against the liberal method and application which he explicitly implies as, in fact, responsible for the current economic demise and the coinciding hardships suffered by so many. Indeed, for Pius, it was the principle and operation of laissez faire liberalism, held close to the heart of those holding the reigns of power in both state and industry, that had rendered the worker impoverished and defenseless.

Property, in the sense of capital, however, was long able to appropriate to itself excessive advantages. It claimed all the products and profits, and left to the laborer the barest minimum necessary to repair his strength. For by an inexorable economic law, it was held, all accumulation of capital falls to the share of the wealthy, while by the same law the workingman must remain perpetually in indigence or reduced to the minimum needed for existence.⁸

In this light, Pius attempts to make it absolutely clear that social health is not to be derived from either liberalism or socialism. According to Pius,

The former had already shown its utter impotence to find a right solution of the social question, while the latter would have exposed human society to still graver dangers by offering a remedy much more disastrous than the evil it designed to cure.⁹

3. Compromise- A Middle Road

As a solution to the above dilemma, Pius proposes a compromise of the two extremes. This is to say, while liberalism

is correct in holding fast to and affirming the natural right of private property; nevertheless, such a right must be understood as existing properly only when operating from, and indeed, founded upon a perspective of "social" responsibility. According to Pius, while one has the undeniable and God-given right to possess property, such possession incurs the equally God-given duty of social concern.¹⁰ Practically speaking, while the capitalist is entitled to own a factory, the means of production, the manner in which the factory is oriented and manipulated must be to and for the benefit of the "common good." Hence, wages must be sufficient, safety in the workplace must assume priority status, working hours must not *be detrimental to* one's health, and pensions and other such benefits must be of an adequate sort. Truly, it is this type of middle road, therefore, that the economic realm should be made to traverse, always veering away from the dangers lurking at the extremes. Stated thusly:

A double danger must therefore be carefully avoided. On the one hand, if the social and public aspect of ownership be denied or minimized, one falls or comes near to falling into individualism, as it is called; on the other hand, the rejection or diminution of its private and individual character necessarily leads to some form of Collectivism, or something approaching it.¹¹

FREE ENTERPRISE CRITIQUED

1. Capitalism Presently Void of Justice

In developing and defending his position concerning the need for such a middle road, Pius initiates a stunningly objective and,

relative to Leo, in depth analysis of the free enterprise ~~method~~. To start, Pius explicitly denounces the free enterprise system as completely void of the justice and charity essential for facilitating social health. In stating his argument, Pius presents the socio-economic chaos of the present day as irrefutable testimony to the inevitable social depravity to be had from an economy impervious to any humanistic responsibilities. In this context, Pius argues that the free enterprise method is wholly incapable of progressing according to its own tendencies and laws without affecting periodic economic crises and the suffering of the many who exist so vulnerable and susceptible to such crises. Thus he claims:

Just as the unity of society cannot be built upon class warfare, so the proper ordering of economic affairs cannot be left to free competition alone. From this source as from a tainted fountain have proceeded in the past all the errors of the "Individualistic" school. This school, ignorant or forgetful of the social and moral aspects of economic matters, teaches that the state should refrain in theory and practice from interfering in them, because these possess in free competition or open markets a principle of self-direction better able to control than any created intellect. Free competition, however, though within certain limits just and productive of good results, cannot be the ruling principle of the economic world. This has been abundantly proved by the consequences that have followed from the free reign given to these dangerous individualistic ideals.¹²

According to Pius, what is essential is that the free enterprise *system*, far from being allowed to unconsciously evolve itself on

the basis of an attitude of "social disregard," be given a distinct objective that has as its ultimate goal and consideration the welfare of society, in particular, the welfare of the laboring class. In this regard, unlike Leo whose prescription was limited to Christian charity and virtue being practised by the individual capitalist in the running of his own particular operation, Pius, as evidenced in his recommendation, demonstrates a greater appreciation and awareness of the total scheme that is the capitalist system. To clarify, as has been indicated, the particular capitalist operates, not from an individual standpoint, but from one of "free market" competition with others.

Moreover, by virtue of such realization, Pius' prescription is naturally more encompassing than that of Leo's in terms of positing that it is the entire capitalist system, a system which transcends the individual owner by incorporating his process of production into a complex and fluctuating network of competition, that is in dire need of a, so to speak, transfusion of Christian charity and virtue that would serve as the entire system's, and not just the individual capitalist's, social mandate. Pius believed it imperative that such a mandate control the reigns of the presently unbridled free enterprise system, and thus, be capable of issuing and enforcing a directive demanding the prioritization of the human condition throughout the entire arena comprising socio-economic activity. Pius writes:

To that end all the institutions of public and social life must be imbued with the spirit of justice, and this justice must above all be truly operative. It must build up a juridical and social order able to pervade all economic activity.¹³

2) Role of the State in Instituting Justice

In asserting the lack of and need for a social directive, Pius recognized the importance of locating the arena from whence such a moral directive was to be based and emanate. Thus, ignoring his predecessor's relatively tentative attitude that the state's agenda should seek only to preserve the rights and dignities of its respective classes, Pius instructs the state to assume the bold and aggressive responsibility of monitoring any and all economic activity. In other words, operating from the context of social justice, the state is to supervise all facets of economic policy, ensuring that such policy facilitates both social and economic justice.

To define in detail these duties, when the need occurs and when the natural law does not do so, is the function of the government. Provided that the natural and divine law be observed, the public authority, in view of the true necessity of the common good, may specify more accurately what is licit and what is illicit for property owners in the use of their possessions.¹⁴

In this respect, Pius goes so far as to actually sanction government control over various, though unspecified properties that he believes society is too dependent upon to remain in private hands. Pius writes:

For it is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the state since they carry with them an opportunity too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large.¹⁵

At this point let it be noted that, despite the above testimony, it is certainly errant for one to interpret Pius as advocating

a state regulated economy. On the contrary, as has been shown, Pius believed that the essentials of capitalism, for instance, the right of private property and the appropriation of profit, were indeed valid and ordained norms of the time; however, Pius also realized such norms, as evidenced by the depravity of the age, were in desperate need of qualification. According to Pius, this qualification being the social guidance and direction that can only be obtained when the components comprising a free enterprise system have their very being firmly entrenched in a foundation of Christian love. In a word, the state was to ensure that the up-to now absent principle of social justice be instated and adhered to throughout the socio-economic format of society.

OMINOUS FOREWARNINGS

Proceeding on with his criticism of the free enterprise system, Pius, perhaps not realizing the extent to which he testified in behalf of Marx's predictions made decades earlier, spoke of the tendency of capitalism to globally spread its "advantages and vices" through imperialism as well as to concentrate wealth and power in the hands of an increasingly unscrupulous few.

1) Imperialism

As far as imperialism is concerned, Pius recognized that the scope of capitalism was in no way confined to the boundaries of the particular capitalist state in question. Indeed, Pius recognized an inevitable consequence stemming from capitalism's competitive nature, was the dissemination of the capitalist

network throughout the world. Like the tentacles of a famished creature, capitalism was and still is determined to impose itself, to gorge itself on any region, any people where profit lies waiting. Therefore, Pius felt it to be essential that when discussing the adverse effects of capitalism and recommendations to ameliorate such effects, not only should the social dilemma plaguing the industrialized nation be addressed and dealt with, but likewise, so should the devastation incurred on the world beyond industrialized borders.

But it is the capitalist economic regime which, with the world-wide diffusion of industry, has penetrated everywhere, particularly since the publication of Leo XIII's Encyclical. It has invaded and pervaded the economic and social sphere even of those who live outside its ambit, influencing them, and, as it were, intimately affecting them by its advantages, inconveniences and vices. When we turn our attention, therefore, to the changes which this capitalistic economic order has undergone since the days of Leo XIII, we have in view the interests, not only of those who live in countries where "capital" and industry prevail, but of the whole human race.¹⁶

2) Threat of Monopolies

As far as capitalism's centralizing tendencies in terms of wealth and power are concerned, Pius, demonstrating as earlier his keen awareness of the overall flux and progression of the capitalist system, saw the free competition scenario as promoting and fostering the darwinistic principle that those capi-

talists who survive and prosper are precisely those "who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."¹⁷ Besides the obvious negative moral and social implications of the above, even worse to contemplate was the fact that it was precisely these men, these dominating financial and industrial capitalists who, spurred on by their greed and cut-throat methods of appropriation and accumulation, exerted absolute control over the pulse of the nation's economy, and thus, rendered the masses, whose welfare was and still is so very contingent upon the health and viability of such a pulse, at their mercy. Stated accordingly:

This domination becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will.¹⁸

Before concluding the encyclical, Pius elaborates on a further, ominous consequence directly precipitated from and associated with an advanced capitalist order. Echoing the Marxist interpretation of the state's role within a capitalist framework, Pius warns against the diminished distinction between capital's interest and state policy. Far from operating from a neutral edifice in terms of serving objectively the needs of all its members, Pius acknowledged the reality that

state policy was intentionally designed to secure the interests of capital over and against all other class considerations. In this manner, not only does biased state action represent a breach in the state's true function of irrespectively protecting and promoting the interests of all its members, it also and perhaps more dangerously, causes states to assume an adverse if not actual warring posture towards one another. Hence, the imperialist states confront their repressed colonial holdings as well as each other in a seemingly endless competitive struggle for economic dominance over as much of the world as possible. Indeed, it is a struggle that, as demonstrated in the last chapter, has achieved and amassed over the years such attention and concern that it currently engrosses the greater portion of a state's effort (e.g. the U.S.S.R. has military troops stationed in 22 countries while the U.S. has troops based in 40 countries). Pius argues:

First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles. Finally, the clash between states themselves....the nations apply their power and political influence, regardless of circumstances, to promote the economic advantages of their citizens; and because, vice versa, economic forces and economic domination are used to decide political controversies between peoples.¹⁹

PART II - MARXIST CRITIQUETHE VALIDITY OF THE MIDDLE ROAD1) Defects of Economic Liberalism

In his discussion of the socialists, unlike the polemical Leo who hastily denounced the movement with an emotional fervor, Pius, still adverse to the socialist (communist) tenets proclaiming class warfare, expropriation of the means of production and, of course, antipathy towards the Church, nevertheless allowed himself to rationally examine and evaluate all facets, intents, beliefs and methods comprising the socialist movement. In other words, although reaffirming Leo's reasons for condemnation, Pius was still capable of extrapolating from the movement a particular criticism of "liberal" society he believed to be quite legitimate. In specific, such criticism entailed "liberal" society's total neglect of the community's needs and interests. In this manner, unlike the socialists, Pius professed the right for a particular individual to own the factory, the means of production; like the socialists, he believed such a factory should be organized and operated with the common good as its overall objective and intent.

2) Abused Individualism

With this in mind along with the previous chapters' discussions divulging the tendencies and laws of the capitalist mode of production, tendencies and laws that exist and operate irrespective of the needs and desires of the human condition, it seems quite apparent that Pius, in his declaration of and demand for the virtues of a "middle road," is most guilty of

desiring an impossible reconciliation. In this light, the fundamental error of Pius involves the illusion of a, so to speak, "abused individualism." To explain, according to Pius, individualism is perfectly compatible and, in fact, desirable to the point whereby the private individual owns the means of production. But only to this point. For once possession is realized, that which takes precedence concerns the method in which such possession is manipulated, or better yet, the intent determining how the process of production is carried forth and proceeds. Thus, if executed on the basis of Christian standards, the right of individualism would prescribe unto the process of production the duty of social responsibility. In this way, the process of production would have as its specific purpose in terms of objective and goal, the betterment and strengthening of the community it serves. In this regard, reality demonstrates that the concept of social duty has, more or less, been virtually ignored, and thus, rather than being served, it is the community that, often to its own detriment, serves capital. Hence, it is this latter alternative of disregarded duty that Pius interprets as embodying the concept of "abusive individualism."

The question may arise, well is this not the case?, was not Pius correct in realizing that the fabric of society has been torn asunder by such widespread instances of "abused individualism?" Indeed, the error referred to here does not deny the fact that the individual capitalist hardly thinks

twice, if at all, of how he can better the human plight through the socially proper utilization of his capital. What is being argued is that in making his decision concerning the operations of production, the capitalist is simply not provided the alternative of enacting policy that is "socially" orientated, or for that matter, "individually" orientated. While Pius correctly recognized the system of capitalism and the social consequences thereof, he failed by attributing the origin of the system to the motives of private individuals, rather than to an evolving historical process. To clarify, according to Pius, it is quite apparent that if the impetus for a particular capitalist's decision fails to involve the "social arena," it is obvious that such impetus has as its origin the "individual arena." In short, if economic policy is not designed to assist the social, it is designed to assist the individual, the capitalist. But is it? From earlier discussions it would seem not. For capitalism develops and matures irregardless of the fulfillment of society or the capitalist. This is to say, capital serves only itself. It fulfills only itself. Therefore, in terms of role and function, the laborer as well as the capitalist exist only as a means to an end. Specifically, only as a means to ensure the health and welfare of the capitalist mode of production.

3) Systematic Essence of Capitalism Determining the Individual

Thus, while an inevitable consequence of the capitalist mode of production involves the enriched status of the capitalist

in relation to the rest of the populus, such status should never be conceived as being the prime concern and lauded achievement of the capitalist structure. Indeed, capitalism desires one thing, and one thing only, the ability to accumulate, and thus, the ability to introduce and involve in the productive process as much capital as necessary in order to remain competitive. In this regard, the amount of capital removed from the process of production and converted into the possessions of the capitalist relative to that which remains productive capital, is miniscule. Of course, from the perspective of the depraved laborer, such possessions are inevitably interpreted as being a direct result of the capitalist system in general. And indeed they are, but they are far from the goal. This is to say, while the poor laborer who, much like Pius, understands the reality of the luxuries possessed by the capitalist as the ultimate goal of the capitalist system, and thus, the ultimate consideration for the capitalist when analyzing and deciding upon certain productive policies; in actuality, such "goals and considerations," far from being entrenched in the individual capitalist's needs and wants in terms of unproductive possessions, are created by and emanate from the very crux of capitalism's essence - an essence of accumulation. An essence of accumulation impervious to all things tainted of human concerns, needs and wants.

Translated into practical terms, although the capitalist derives and inevitable material advantage from the role he assumes by virtue of the capitalist motif; nevertheless,

the policies he decides upon and enacts are, first and foremost, designed to ensure the success and well-being of his particular process of production. In other words, it is of paramount importance that the productive process be capable of accumulating the amount of capital necessary to compete, and thus, survive. Indeed, the degree to which such a productive process is successful, is the degree to which the capitalist is able to splurge on luxury. In this light, if competition is fierce, making accumulation vital in terms of being able to invest in technological innovation and inexpensive resources, all necessary tactics for producing a cheaper and competitive product, little capital will be available for diversion into money, and hence, into unproductive possessions. Likewise, if competition has been absorbed or downright eliminated, there exists a lesser need for productive capital, and thus, a greater availability of and tendency for capital to be converted into unproductive articles to be enjoyed by the capitalist. In either scenario, essential to note is the fact that the capitalist's productive policy has as its foundation the need to accumulate, the need to compete, the need to persist over time. Truly, any capitalist who fails to implement those policies most advantageous to the process of accumulation, and thus, effective competition, will be at the mercy of, and in all likelihood, be absorbed by those competing capitalists who are, in fact, wise enough to enact such superior policy.

4) Inevitable Failure of the Middle Road

In light of the above, Pius' talk of the need for a middle road is reduced to nothing but empty rhetoric simply because Pius attributes an importance that is hardly warranted to the role played by the capitalist's personal greed in terms of shaping economic policy. For as has been demonstrated, the neglect of the "common good" is not^{so much} due to the individual's insatiable desire, as it is to the very essence of the system itself. Likewise, Pius' recommendation for an economic "guiding principle" to serve as a social mandate comes across as, more or less, ludicrous. For it is simply not a matter of telling "greedy" men to be more "giving." The supposed greed they demonstrate is nothing but a requirement of the functioning capitalist system in which they operate. Indeed, to eliminate the greed and selfishness that seemingly abounds would be tantamount to eliminating the system itself. For it is the very essence of the system, the need to be competitive, and thus, the need to accumulate, from whence is born and nourished the capitalist's unquenchable thirst for additional capital. In this regard, it is most evident that in order to evoke the well-being of the "common good" in the economic realm, it is necessary to divest capitalism of its essence, and hence, of itself. It is necessary to replace competition and the need for accumulation with a humanly rational economic strategy. A strategy that stresses a coherency, as opposed to an anarchy of production, as well as the inherent objective of fulfilling the basic needs and desires of humanity. Indeed, such needs and desires have yet to be fulfilled, and must be fulfilled

if humanity is to ever be freed from its toilsome lot and allowed to, at last, know, experience, and enjoy its unshackled self.

EVIDENCE OF IMPERIALISM - ITS REASON FOR BEING

If there exists one observation made by Pius that warrants particular acclaim, it is his statement concerning the expansionist tendencies associated with an evolving "free enterprise" system. In this regard, Pius was perceptive enough to recognize both that the capitalist system, far from confined, extends beyond the geo-political boundaries of the capitalist state in question, and that the socio-economic effect levelled on the underdeveloped world by such imperialist extension is often of a detrimental kind.

1) Imperialism - Essential for Capitalist Development

Impressive as such observations are, Pius nevertheless failed to comprehend the motivating factors stimulating imperialism, particularly in terms of how such economic expansion and the affliction it rendered on those of foreign origin, served to benefit the populus of the industrial state wherein the capitalist mode of production originates and, by virtue of imperialism, emanates from. To explain, referring back to the discussion on Leo, it was noted that the condition of labor at the turn of the century was such that revolutionary sentiment amongst the masses became ever more prolific and appealing. In this respect, recognizing the potential that existed for a complete disruption of the social order that would

directly challenge capitalism's ability to accumulate if not the system's very existence, it was understood by the political-economic leaders of the time that labor must be appeased and, to a degree, reconciled unto a belief condoning the legitimacy of the capitalist method. And of course, the most effective way of facilitating such reconciliation was for the system to redefine the workers' social status in terms of their economic well-being. Thus, after World War I Pius describes the situation as follows:

When after the great war the rulers of the leading nations wished to restore peace by an entire reform of social conditions, and among other measures drew up regulations for the just rights of labor, many of their conclusions agreed so perfectly with the principles and warnings of Leo XIII as to seem expressly deduced from them.²⁰

The question now becomes, at a time when competition was cut-throat and available capital was scarce in the sense of being fully involved in the production process, where was the wealth for such social reform to be derived without impeding the current process of accumulation? Simply, it had to be derived, in part, outside the country itself. Although economic imperialism had proceeded, in fact, centuries earlier (e.g. the Spaniards in Latin America), it was now imperative that the methods of imperialism be deployed by the industrialized states at an unprecedented rate. Such a step was inevitable. Without even considering the need to spend on social and industrial reform, the individual capitalist, always desiring to accumulate more than his rivals in order to develop and

market a more desirable and competitive product, realized it was essential that markets outside his particular state be exposed to his product, and in regions where such markets did not even exist, it was equally crucial that they be created. Furthermore, and just as significant, was the capitalist's allocation, if not theft, of the raw materials and labor typifying the resource rich and labor abundant Third world regions. Again, inexpensive labor and resources that served to fulfill capitalism's objective of increased accumulation by allowing the production of ever cheaper, and thus, competitive products. From the turn of the century to the present, capital has involved itself in a most intensive program of accruing profit through these and other imperialist options.

In terms of social reform, the upshot of such colonial interaction *was*, of course, a source of revenue that capital was able to direct towards the laboring class of its own state without directly hindering the accumulation process. The end result being, capital was able to shorten the working day, establish more adequate wages, provide safer working conditions; in short, to follow, to some degree, the prescription set forth in The Condition of the Workingmen. In this regard, important to note however is the fact that such improvement granted unto the laboring class was not, in any way, done in and of itself, strictly for the betterment of the worker. Indeed, while such betterment was desired by the capitalist system, it was desired in the sense of serving, of fulfilling the system itself. It was desired in the sense of pacifying

and terminating any revolutionary fervor that had been generated amongst the depraved, and in doing so, of ensuring social tranquility, and hence, the system's continuity over time. In short, when interpreted from the narrow perspective of capitalism's own laws and tendencies, the impetus for capital's relative enrichment of the worker was deeply entrenched in a most primeval instinct, "preservation" - the preservation of the capitalist mode of production.

In specifically examining the institution of imperialism and its objective of profit, we shall, for the most part, confine our analysis to that of Latin America wherein the United States finds itself most economically entwined. In conducting the analysis, examined shall be the five major components that comprise the imperialist method used in that area: 1) export economies; 2) inefficient agricultural practices; 3) multinational corporations; 4) foreign debt; 5) cheap labor.

2) Export Economies

To start, the general pattern of economic development that has proceeded in the Third World by virtue of imperialist interference is one denoting incessant dependency at the cost of development. Thus, imperialist dollars are being continually pumped into an area where industrial resources, necessary for capitalism's production of consumer and industrial goods, are to be inexpensively had. In this manner, the imperialist, the U.S., ensures that the Latin country becomes efficient

only at extracting and transporting raw materials and nothing more. Indeed, the U.S., as a competitive capitalist state, refuses to encourage or even tolerate the development of indigenous industry within Latin America capable of processing raw materials into finished products. Such finished products, of course, would greatly benefit the Latin country in terms of its ability to attract far greater revenue relative to that presently garnered by the raw materials left untouched. In a word, the conditions placed on capital and technology provided by the U.S. is such that the exploited country's entire economic infrastructure remains dedicated to obtaining raw materials, transporting them to the nearest ports, and promptly exporting them to their imperialist financiers.

By virtue of developing within the confines of such restrictive economic parameters, Latin America exists as a conglomerate of nations whose economies are structured around the exportation of usually one or two raw materials. For instance, oil and tin comprise 95% of Venezuela's products, coffee and bananas 85% of Guatemala's, wool and meat 70% of Uruguay's, copper and nitrates 77% of Chile's, bananas and coffee 75% of Ecuador's, coffee and oil 70% of Colombia's, and tin and silver 59% of Bolivia's.²¹ As dismal as the above scenario appears, making it even more desperate is the prevalence of two economic trends. First, because the world demand for raw materials is generally less than supply, causing the price to be severely depressed, the relatively expensive finished

products needed to be imported by the Latin nations inevitably cost the countries more than the revenue generated by their exports. Second, the technological and scientific revolution has begun to make certain underdeveloped states' resources even more obsolete. This is to say, new substances are continually being developed which can be procured at a fraction of the cost involved in the process of extracting the various resources such substances are specifically designed to replace. For example, according to the American Iron and Steel Institute, due to the success in the development of synthetics, the U.S. consumption of major raw materials per net ton of pig iron produced has persistently decreased since the late 1940s.²² Presently, "some experts now predict that with the development of composite materials of extremely high stiffness and high-strength filaments bonded together with a soft plastic matrix, the volume of steel, aluminum and wood currently used in structures today may be reduced by as much as 50% in the near future."²³ Undoubtedly, such a development has resulted in a virtually unsolvable dilemma for the exceedingly vulnerable Latin countries. Indeed, not satisfied with forcing the Latin region to endure the crippling effects of underdevelopment, the U.S. has seen fit to firmly entrench such effects by reducing its needs for raw materials, and hence, limiting its desperately needed expenditures throughout the area.

3) Agriculture

Closely associated with the unfavorable terms of trade

mentioned above, is the ineffective method of agriculture which typifies Latin America. In this sense, the problems of agriculture can be discerned as threefold: 1) ineffective land utilization; 2) prevalence of cash crops; 3) dependence on food imports.

a) Ineffective Land Utilization

To begin, throughout Latin America inequitable land distribution is the rule. 75.6% of all the farms in Latin America represent but 6.6% of the land capable of cultivation. In contrast, 1% of the farms control approximately 60% of the countries' arable land.²⁴ Of the large land holdings, such ownership can be divided into two groups. One group being the native elites that are, more times than not, directly associated with or greatly influence the government. Such holdings tend to function as feeble "haciendas" that desire but minimal output necessary to satisfy the needs of the owning family. For example, in Colombia it has been reported that while those farmers owning no more than 13 acres cultivate at least two-thirds of their land, those owning 70% of the land leave 94% of their fields fallow, working only 6%.²⁵ In Latin America overall, it has been calculated that out of 2.2 billion acres of potential farmland, no more than 270 million acres are actually farmed.²⁶ Coupled with the ever increasing population of Latin America, such statistics translate into the structural inability of Latin America to even feed itself. As far as U.S.

responsibility for such structural crisis is concerned, the fact of the matter is that it is precisely this type of economic and political domination of landed oligarchies that the U.S. seeks to foster throughout Latin America. Indeed, the U.S. realizes that it is the conservative landowners, adamantly opposed to socio-economic reform, that wish to preserve present conditions, conditions not only benefitting the native elites' own privileged position in society, but as well allowing the unhindered U.S. exploitation of these countries' economies.

The greatest testimony admitting to U.S. support for and insistence upon the structural inequalities plaguing Latin America, in particular, the inequality and corresponding inefficiency of contemporary land ownership, can be aptly seen in the history of the U.S. initiated Alliance for Progress. The Alliance for Progress, born in 1961, was conceived in the success of the Cuban revolution. Fearing that other Latin states might follow Cuba's socialist path in order to shake the imperialist grip, the U.S. constructed a program designed to restore Latin America's waning faith in both the U.S. and its policies in the region. In the beginning, the rhetoric surrounding the Alliance sounded most promising. With its ten year program committing 100 billion dollars to the tasks of land reform, increasing agricultural output and wages, encouraging trade and industrial diversification, elimination of illiteracy, and low cost housing, it appeared the U.S. was embarking on a new course of action designed to rehabilitate a part of

the world it helped so much to plunder. Unfortunately, the Alliance was doomed to failure from the very beginning. Simply, the unstated yet essential objective of the Alliance, the protection of U.S. economic investments abroad, stood in complete opposition to the various reforms the Alliance claimed it supported. In other words, from the time of its commencement there existed within the Alliance a fatally irreconcilable contradiction between the professed goals of the program, basic reform, and its actual intent, the consolidation and preservation of existing socio-economic structures and the inherent inequities thereof. In specific, trade diversification and indigenous economic growth clashed with the interests of the multinational corporations, while viable agricultural reform threatened the very foundation upon which the ruling elite dominated. Thus, on the basis of their respective interests, the multinational corporations and the native elites joined forces in preventing the theory of the Alliance from becoming reality. The agricultural "oligarchies blocked land reform and welcomed counter-insurgency measures. The multinationals endorsed the building of roads, utilities and other works providing an infrastructure supportive of American investments. At the same time the multinationals secured Washington legislation requiring harsh punitive measures against countries that nationalized American properties."²⁷

Following the assassination of President Kennedy, the

reformist idealism of the Alliance was finally dropped and replaced with a philosophy reflecting the Alliance's true and only intent - the promotion of a socio-economic status quo that encouraged the continued, unrestricted infiltration of U.S. investments serving to further delapidate the Latin American economy. In redefining the purpose of the Alliance, David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan Bank stated:

In my view, a primary reason for this relatively good performance (increased investment) is a change in the policy which prevailed in the early years of the Alliance, placing too much emphasis on rapid and revolutionary social change and on strictly government-to-government assistance. This approach, while it took into account the fact that there is genuine need to do away with social inequities, did not encourage the conditions which are essential to stimulating private investment and economic growth. Revolutionary change which shakes the confidence in the fair treatment of private property is incompatible with rapid economic expansion. Now that the vital role of private enterprise is being recognized in a number of Latin American nations, we see the development of a more favorable business climate. 29

The "favorable business climate" referred to found itself specifically induced by the U.S. government. In particular, such inducement involved a shift in purpose concerning the military aid supplied by the U.S. to Latin countries. Following Castro's revolution, experts in the Kennedy administration realized it was imperative that, in order to protect

U.S. possessions and interests throughout Latin America, all reformist tendencies be curtailed and repressed. Thus, rather than, as had been the case, supplying military aid and advice intended to prevent external aggression, the U.S. re-oriented its military offerings to be of a type designed to dissuade and crush "internal insurrection." To this end, the U.S.-created School of the Americas located in the Panama Canal Zone has done much in the training of Latin American police forces. While the school does offer training concerning "conventional military topics," the bulk of the courses consist of "counterinsurgency operations, military-intelligence interrogation, security management and other such subjects that relate to internal policing rather than external defense."²⁹ The graduates from the School of the Americas have exerted great influence throughout Latin America, not just in terms of serving in various administrations, but as the heads of various states: Generals Augusto Pinochet of Chile, Hugo Banzer of Bolivia, Omar Torrijos Herrera of Panama, Juan Alberto Melgar Castro of Honduras, Carlos Humberto Romero of El Salvador and Romeo Lucas Garcia of Guatemala.³⁰ Like the School of the Americas, the Inter-American Defense College situated at Fort McNair along the Potomac River "functions as a veritable graduate school for juntas."³¹ The professed goal of the College is to "develop techniques for the collective planning at the highest international level in order to achieve greater unity in matters of doctrine relating to the security of the continent."³² Since its inception, the College has

graduated over 450 Latin American students who eventually went on to serve in the administrations of various military dictatorships.³³

In light of the above, the inequalities of land distribution and its corresponding inefficient utilization are part and parcel of the imperialist network. The landed oligarchies together with the U.S. government have forged out of their common exploitative natures an alliance and purpose destined to preserve the repressive socio-economic conditions typifying Latin America. In the case of the former, such preservation maintains their privileged status relative to the dispossessed and deprived masses, in the case of the latter, such preservation ensures a lucrative and secure business climate in which U.S. economic interests may thrive and prosper.

b. Cash Crops

Besides the native elites, the other dominant land owners consist of agribusiness originating mainly from the U.S. (e.g. United Brands Co., Dole, Domino.). Unlike the native elites, the soil controlled by the agrarian capitalists is put to maximum use. Utilizing the latest in technology and expertise, the agribusinesses have managed to transform Latin American land into a most productive natural resource. In this regard, one might be initially inclined to believe such capitalist induced ventures would serve to benefit the community in terms of existing as a counter-balance to the productive inefficiency of the native owners. Unfortunately, such is not the case.

If anything, by virtue of being conceived by, and thus, responsive to the needs of the international market economy, agribusinesses further exacerbate both the scarcity of local foodstuffs and the need to import such goods. For remember, as said earlier, such agribusinesses represent "capitalist ventures," and as such, their primary intent and goal is that of profit. Thus, totally oblivious to the needs of the surrounding community, the agribusinesses cultivate those crops capable of retrieving the greatest profit on the world market. The end result being that much of the farmland in Latin America, rather than producing grains destined to support the indigenous population, produces bananas, strawberries, coffee and other such crops meant to satisfy foreign markets and foreign tables. As a case in point, concerning Colombia it is written:

A hectare planted to carnations yields 1 million pesos a year, as against 12,500 pesos yielded by wheat or corn. So the best Colombian land is used to grow carnations, and also asparagus and strawberries, which airlifted to foreign markets, while increasing amounts of scarce foreign exchange are used to import foodstuffs that formerly had been grown at home. Theoretically, more food can be imported with the high return from luxury crops, but the profits from those crops go to the multinational corporations. Thus, the formerly self-sufficient peasant find himself forced to eke out a living on the remaining marginal land, or to scramble for the few available jobs in the cities, where he must feed his family with expensive imported foodstuffs.³⁴

Overall, in Latin America between the years 1964 and 1974, export crops increased by 27% as compared to a 10% decline in the production of locally consumed subsistence crops.²⁵

c) Dependence on Food Imports

While the frequent eviction of the peasant throughout Latin America is often the result of agribusinesses and / or native elites trying to increase their already vast holdings, contributing as well to the plight of the peasant has been the imperialist policies of the U.S. government. These policies, designed to bolster the viability of U.S. agriculture, have effectively liquidated many locally producing peasants and, in doing so, have decimated the prospects for much of the Third World to ever become agriculturally independent. Perhaps the most notable of such policies has been the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954, more commonly referred to as the Food for Peace program. Following the Korean war, American agricultural strategists realized that there existed a dangerous abundance of U.S. agricultural products which imminently threatened to plummet the value of farm products, and thus, throw the entire U.S. farm industry into peril. In this context, it was imperative that the existing excess be disposed of in such a way as to ensure the stability of the agricultural sector. The solution inevitably entailed a six year distribution program in which 30 billion dollars worth of foodstuffs flooded markets in over 130, mostly Third World countries.³⁶ In many instances, the local producers and their products were undermined by the relatively

cheaper American imports. Truly, this was the precise intent of the Food for Peace program. Though thickly cloaked in humanitarian rhetoric by the year 1961 when the legislation initiating the program was amended to include the objective of ending world starvation; nevertheless, the callous needs of capitalism proved to be the heart and soul of the law since the time of its inception. Indeed, the text of the 1954 law claims its primary purpose is to "promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare."³⁷

In any event, local producers could no longer survive by farming, and thus, were promptly ousted from their land, land that was eagerly assimilated by, among others, agribusinesses seeking to turn such plots into profitable farms specializing in export crops. As serious as the disappearance of local producers and the crops they normally would produce was, was the fact that such expulsion from the land and its economic consequences served to fortify, to cement bonds of fundamental dependence between the imperialist state and its subordinate colony. And of course, the cost of such, so to speak, food-dependence was to make the crippled state ever more susceptible to increasing degrees of U.S. manipulation. Of such manipulation, Senator Hubert Humphrey stated in 1957:

I have heard....that people may become dependent on us for food. I know that was not supposed to be good news. To me that was good news, because before people can do anything they have got to eat. And if you are looking for a way to get people to lean on you and to be dependent on you, in terms of their cooperation with

you, it seems to me that food dependence would be terrific."³⁸

Such a coniving posture is still quite prevalent as evidenced in the attitude of President Reagan's Secretary of Agriculture, John Block who argued, "Food is a weapon but the way to use that is to tie countries to us. That way they'll be far more reluctant to upset us."³⁹

4) Foreign Debt

The need to import foodstuffs as well as the many consumer goods which the economies of Latin America are presently incapable of producing, has levelled upon the entire Latin region a debt of phenomenal proportion. Indeed, the revenue that is amassed through the export of raw materials does not come close to equalling the costs incurred from importing the most basic of goods, including food. Realizing the Latin communities' precarious situation, private as well as international banks readily, if not eagerly supply lucrative loans and credits. To explain, because Latin America's economic structure features great dependence upon U.S. goods, it is inevitable that Latin countries rely upon foreign banks providing the necessary capital allowing the importation of such goods essential for the countries' continuation over time. Hence, functioning as capitalist institutions, banking interests do not hesitate to take full advantage of such countries extreme vulnerability and dependence by initiating and establishing bank credits and loans ensuring the greatest returns on investments made. Simply put, the terms of credit created and announced by banks exploit to

the hilt Latin America's economic destitution and extreme need for immediate capital. Truly, the financial capitalist recognizes that great profit can be had where there exists great need. That is why a Vice President of an American bank stated, "I should not really tell you this, but while we earn 13 to 14 percent in our U.S. operations, we can easily count on a 33 percent rate of return on our business conducted in Latin America."⁴⁰ Generally speaking, therefore, the ability of the banks to efficiently prey upon the needs of underdeveloped states, is the reason why between the years 1966 and 1974, "foreign profits returning to the U.S. exceeded foreign investments leaving the U.S. by three billion dollars."⁴¹ In most cases, U.S. banking interests accrue more revenue than initially lent as in 1977, when it received 150 million dollars more than was originally allocated for a particular Export-Import loan.

In the context of the above, to believe that Latin America's present debt will ever be paid off in full, is absolutely absurd. The exploitative terms defining loans and credit coupled with the complete lack of a functioning, self-sufficient and indigenous economy capable of generating adequate revenue, will ensure that Latin America remains forever and increasingly in debt. In this regard, the UN commission for Latin America has reported and alarming rate of increase in Latin America's debt over the last 20 years. While it was a mere 10 billion dollars in 1965, by 1980 it ballooned to 150 billion dollars.⁴² Presently, the combined debt of Latin America stands at a staggering 360 billion dollars.

Again, as has been implied, the only method in which such debt can be realistically eased, would involve the facilitation of self-sufficient economies throughout Latin America. Economies capable of producing for and satisfying local needs as well as diverse enough to manufacture raw materials into those finished products demanded on the world market. Unfortunately, such development is utterly objected to and actively resisted by both the industrial and financial interests of the imperialist state. In terms of financial resistance, banking institutions specifically condition their loans and credits so as to encourage and promote imperialist intrusion and manipulation at the expense of local development. A case in point is Brazil during the early 1960s when President Goulart embarked on a program of economic development which included agrarian reform, income redistribution, reliance on domestic capital, restrictions on foreign investments, massive state intervention in the national economy and the pursuit of new markets in Latin America, Africa, and other socialist countries.⁴³ Supported by the lower middle class and urban and rural workers, such socialist objectives were detested by the U.S., in particular, the CIA which eventually assisted Brazil's military in ousting Goulart. Prior to his expulsion, international banks, realizing Goulart's policies excluded foreign investment and exploitation, conspired to ~~ex~~ert financial pressure on Brazil by reducing its amount of financial assistance. Thus, the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation and the Inter-American Development Bank reduced *their* commitment to Brazil from \$27.6 million in 1962 to \$23.1 million in 1963.

Once deposed, the military quickly reversed Goulart's policies by depressing wages, prohibiting costly reforms and ensuring foreign capital a stable climate in which all investments **are** secure and capable of generating healthy returns. In lieu of such a dramatic turn around, the financial institutions reacted accordingly, increasing their loans to an incredible \$159 million by 1965. Moreover, as the military firmly entrenched itself, dispelling, by virtue of brutal dictatorial policies, any traces of counter-revolutionary activity, banking investments continued to grow at an unprecedented rate: \$212 million in 1967; \$377.4 million in 1970; \$631.9 million in 1972.⁴⁴ Brazil was and is, for all intents and purposes, having its economic life-blood sucked from it. Indeed, it was no surprise when the 1978 annual report of New York's Citibank, one of the five largest banking institutions in the world, declared that "over 20% of all its profits came from Brazil, more than those generated in the U.S."⁴⁵ Presently, the situation in Brazil is so desperate in terms of its finances, that a whopping 40% of its entire GNP is consumed annually in a pathetic attempt to pay off just a part of the unfathomable interest that has accumulated from its debts.⁴⁶

5) Cheap Labor

Presently, the imperialist method that is most widely employed and perhaps best accomplishes the imperialist objective of obtaining substantial profit while effectively sedating the homefront with excessive material advantages, is the method of labor exploitation. As said earlier, because capital realized at

the turn of the century that it was imperative to bolster labor's standard of living or face social revolution, pay increases, along with other reforms, were inevitable. Moreover, such increases and reforms were financed, not by capital cutting into its own profits, but by imperialistically obtaining additional funds through partitioning and exploiting the economies and peoples of the less developed world. In any event, as the wages of the developed world increased relative to the rest of the world, many manufacturers realized it could be advantageous to move their operations to a part of the globe where the cost of labor would not be as demanding. As capitalists, these manufacturers simply realized such a move would allow them the ability to produce and sell more competitive products on the world market, and in doing so, accrue unto themselves a greater degree of profit.

a) Cheap Labor as a Source of Profit

Currently, four of the greatest centers involved in U.S. manufacturing abroad are Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea and Latin America. Establishing and maintaining repressive governments capable of restricting union activity and worker demands, U.S. manufacturers have been able to produce goods at a cost far below the projected expense if production were to transpire at home. Social critic Gus Hall writes:

It is an extension of the "runaway shop" across the borders to lower wage areas. For example, U.S. corporations have moved their operations to South Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong. The workers there are forced to work under inhumane conditions, long hours, no standards of health protection or social security. Their wage scale is about \$15 to \$20 per month.... Some 3,400 corporations now have 23,000 separate

businesses abroad. They produce over 200 billion dollars worth of goods.⁴⁷

In Hong Kong, for instance, many U.S. corporations have set up shop in order to take advantage of a labor force, 60% of which works seven days a week. Showing no tendency to discriminate against age in their employment practices, these U.S. corporations presently employ 34,000 children of age 14 or younger, half of whom labor for 10 hours or more each day.⁴⁸ In 1977, 193 U.S. electronic plants located in Mexico managed an excellent rate of profit courtesy of hourly wages being but 50 cents per adult male. When union pressure forced wages to increase to \$1.13 an hour, the factories immediately began to search for greener pastures. Such pastures were eventually found in Haiti where a full days labor could be purchased for a mere \$1.30.⁴⁹ In South Africa, the 300 U.S. corporations situated there boast a 33% rate of profit derived from goods produced or raw materials extracted. Of course, the reasons for such a lucrative return on investments being the pathetic wages paid unto the black majority. Compared to the relatively few whites, the black workers earn approximately 79% less in wages whether it be in mining, construction or manufacturing. Specifically speaking, while a white worker employed in the extraction industry earns \$1,027 a month, the black earns but \$124. In the past decade the gap in the wage structure has actually increased. While in 1974 the difference between white and black earnings amounted to \$722, in 1977 it had increased to \$903.⁵⁰ Such a system of economic injustice prevailing in South Africa

necessarily demands an equally unjust political scheme designed to repress popular resentment and change, and thus, protect and preserve the economic status quo. Hence the existence of apartheid. Though rarely acknowledged in a western world which boasts itself as the protectorate of freedom and democracy, the very existence and perpetuation of apartheid and the economic and social depravity it represents is wholly dependent upon the allegiance of and active support provided by the West, in particular, the U.S. which, as the dominant capitalist state, recognizes South Africa as a crucial source of abundant revenue, and hence, economic power. The intimate alliance between the U.S. and South Africa is effectively demonstrated in the following quote:

During every crisis that has beset the apartheid regime, Western governments and corporations have provided economic, military and diplomatic aid. The Sharpeville¹ Massacre of March 1960, during which 69 demonstrators - against the pass law were killed, was followed by severe political repression... The resulting worldwide protests hurt South Africa's economy, but the continuation of apartheid was ensured by a timely \$40 million loan arranged by a consortium of U.S. banks. The next major crisis was the 1976 Soweto uprising, during which officials listed 231 dead and 1200 wounded. This reduced investments by industrial corporations, but American banks showed no such restraint. Also, the International Monetary Fund, with strong U.S. backing, loaned South Africa \$464 million, which paid for Pretoria's sharply increased military spending during that period.⁵¹

In light of the above economic and political reality, one should no longer be confused as to why the Reagan administration, always boasting of the need to impose "democracy and freedom" throughout the world, has been so impotent in denouncing and imposing effective sanctions against such a clearly "evil" regime as is South Africa. Truly, the extent to which "freedom and democracy" are tolerated and allowed, is the extent to which the capitalist system finds itself *immune* to challenge and threat.

b) Western Standard of Living Founded on the Exploitation of Foreign Labor

Besides saving great sums of capital in terms of labor costs, the eventual destination of those products produced overseas contributes as well to the ability of the capitalist to both further augment his financial coffers and, at the same time, promote an environment of social stability. Perhaps the most crucial destination for such products is the U.S. itself where they are eagerly purchased by American labor. In this regard, accepting the **fact** that the value of labor power corresponds, on the average, to the amount it costs the laborer to culturally reproduce himself in terms of food, clothing, and shelter, the role of such imported goods becomes paramount in the sense of minimizing the overall increase of U.S. wages. To explain, as discussed earlier, necessary for ameliorating the severe tension dividing labor and capital during and after the pontificates of both Leo XIII and Pius XI, was the material improvement of the workers' condition. And so were implemented the various social reforms,

part of which included a hike in wages or, at least, an increase in the wage's buying power. Initially, capital was able to compensate for such a hike through the exploitation of Third World resources. However, when further concessions were grudgingly made to a beleaguered workforce that barely tolerated the depression and war of the 30s and 40s, capital began to increasingly compensate itself through the importation of those goods made by U.S. industrial plants throughout the world, particularly, the Third World. Exploiting the low wage scales of these various areas, a shirt, for instance, costing 20 dollars to produce in the U.S. would cost but 5 dollars in Korea. The difference in cost being, of course, the difference in wages. Thus, getting back to our earlier statement concerning the wage of labor being that amount which it costs labor to reproduce itself over time and in accord with the cultural norm of the area in question, if purchasing five shirts a year is the norm for a particular segment of the U.S. working class, the worker of that segment would pay 100 dollars for the shirts if produced in the U.S., but only 25 dollars if produced in Korea. The point should be clear. Simply, the cost of the laborer's shirts, pants, shoes, cars and radios are less when imported from American manufacturing plants overseas, than if produced here at home. Moreover, important from capital's perspective is the fact that the wages of the American worker are likewise less. To explain, since the wages in the U.S. are much higher than those in, for instance, Korea, the value of the product produced is likewise

higher. Thus, if all consumer goods were to be manufactured in the U.S., in order for the American worker to purchase as much as he currently does, wages would inevitably spiral upwards. Simply, if wages were to remain as they are while prices of consumer goods increased, the buying power of one's wage would diminish significantly, as well as one's standard of living. In this light, the importance of goods produced in foreign holdings cannot be overestimated. Their pivotal role is essentially of a twofold nature: first, they ensure capital of procuring a lucrative profit from the labor of those working the colonial holdings; second, they serve to foster worker complacency in the U.S. by granting unto American workers wages possessing unprecedented buying power. Such buying power not only allows capital the ability to limit domestic wages to a certain extent (an extent much lower than if all goods were produced in the U.S.), but creates as well a nation representing the bastion of capitalist stability by materially inducing from the American worker a fundamental trust and acceptance of the capitalist mode of production.

To conclude, though Pius XI did recognize the adverse effects of capitalist expansionism on the rest of the world, his understanding was nevertheless impaired in the sense that he failed to comprehend or at least make explicit capitalism's imperialist motivations as being systematically and necessarily induced. Hence, Pius failed to realize that the imperialist deprivation typifying a maturing capitalist system, can in no way be rectified

within the parameters of the system itself. Indeed, to do away with the social ills of imperialism is tantamount to doing away with the entire capitalist order. Simply put, imperialism, along with its socio-economic devastation, precipitates directly from the capitalist system's perpetual need to accumulate as well as from the system's requirement that the developed capitalist state be stabilized in terms of there existing adequate worker support for and belief in the virtues of capitalist theory and reality. In this regard, as has been indicated, such support and belief is purchased by capital with the blood, sweat, and dignity of millions of economically and politically oppressed human beings the world over. The importance of fully understanding this goal of imperialism and its entailing costs is most crucial. Truly, the relative well-being of the American worker generated by the capitalist system is a most dangerous illusion that has its very being grounded in the foundations of a fascist exploitation throughout the world. In this light, if the U.S. were to suddenly lose all of its raw material, banking and manufacturing interests outside of its own geo-political boundaries, gone would be America's unprecedented standard of living, gone would be the supposed "freedoms and democracy" that now only exist so long as one's words and actions do not threaten the capitalist format. Truly, if all neo-colonial holdings were to rid themselves of U.S. domination, it is certain that the hideous *spectre* of fascist exploitation that has already broken the spirit of so many, would lift its diseased head and cast its glance homeward. Indeed, the repressive tactics used abroad

would be imported home. Why?, simply because the need for accumulation would deem it necessary. In this respect, wages would be cut, worker rights restricted, a police state enforced. Of course, while this scenario may appear strictly hypothetical if not nonsensical to those presently luxuriating in the seemingly impregnable tranquility of the materialist West; nevertheless, if one correctly perceives and comes to grips with the intrinsic laws and tendencies comprising the capitalist order and determining so much of contemporary reality, such a scenario appears to be anchored in a virtual excess of probability.

EVIDENCE OF THE CAPITALIST STATE

Closely associated with if not essential for the promulgation of the capitalist system, is the "capitalist state" which serves to enact the overall needs of capital both at home and abroad. Recognizing it for what it was, Pius XI denounced the capitalist state if for no other reason than that it failed to make itself objective in terms of representing all of society's classes in an equitable fashion. Astute as such an observation was, conclusive evidence regarding Pius' inability to properly comprehend the inherent nature of the capitalist system involves his declaration and belief that it is the destiny and purpose of the contemporary state as is, to both nurture the concept and need for social responsibility and to ensure that society's various sectors, in particular, the economic sector, regulate their activities to be in accord with such responsibility.

Of course, in making such a statement it is exceedingly clear, from the basis of our earlier discussion concerning the role of the state within a capitalist format, that Pius had yet to comprehend the all-encompassing and determining nature of the economic realm. This is to say, it is the economic realm, much like the seed to be sown, that generates and defines both the role and purpose of the political and ideological realms comprising society. In this light, as the existence and activity of the capitalist state bears witness, the operative political realm within capitalist society persists solely to organize and enact the interests of capital on both a national and international level.

1) Legislation Responsive to Economics

In substantiating this essentially Marxist claim, the evidence available is more than abundant. Perhaps the most conclusive source of such evidence can be located in the very process of policy formation itself. Indeed, in order to interpret the particular bias of any organization, political or otherwise, one only need investigate the roots from which its eventually enacted legislation derives. Indeed, it is precisely where such roots are sunk and nourished that determines the exact purpose and scope of the policies and programs subsequently brought forth. In the case of the most prominent capitalist state, the United States, the national and international legislation passed by the government is unquestionably entrenched in, and thus,

responsive to the demands of the economic powers that be. In this sense, the policy formation process of the U.S. is best understood as being conducted through three types of organizational structures: 1) multiple business councils and committees; 2) "think tanks;" 3) presidential commissions.

2) Business Councils and Committees

Of the three structures, the one possessing the greatest influence in terms of consistently producing significant legislation of both a national and international character, are the councils and committees.

a) Council on Foreign Relations

As far as international policy is concerned, the council exerting the greatest impact relative to any group or individual, is the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). The CFR was established in 1921 by a group of prominent bankers, academicians and lawyers perceptive enough to realize that the role of the U.S. in international affairs would grow dramatically after World War I. Currently, there are 1500 members belonging to the council consisting of financial and industrial capitalists, executives and lawyers, and a minority of intellectuals and journalists.⁵² The interests represented are those of the various banks and corporations responsible for funding the council and its proceedings. In this regard, the overt purpose of the council is to conduct research and study seminars that will eventually lead to a foreign policy initiative best suited to preserve and extend U.S. business interests abroad. Such

initiatives often take the form of books, pamphlets and articles that are thoroughly disseminated amongst various government officials and commissions pertinent to the issue at hand.⁵³ The Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations have been consistently involved in underwriting the costs of such studies and the publication of their results.⁵⁴

Overall, the CFR has been extremely successful in terms of having its conclusions and ideas transformed into pursued government directives. For instance, after World War II the CFR was directly responsible for supplying the Roosevelt/Truman administration with a foreign policy strategy committed to securing, for economic exploitation, the so-called "Grand Area." According to the Council, the Grand Area, encompassing the Western Hemisphere, the United Kingdom, the remnants of the British Commonwealth and Empire, the Dutch East Indies, China and Japan, had to be consolidated under U.S. control and domination. This was to ensure that the flow of vital imports from these areas to the U.S. would not be restricted and that the U.S. would have adequate foreign markets in which surplus agricultural and manufactured products could be sold.⁵⁵ Closely associated with the above, the CFR further suggested the establishment of international banks capable of demanding that governments meet specific conditions before granting assistance funds, in particular, that there be high returns on investments made and that there exist a stable social and business climate in which to invest. Thus, for precisely this purpose came into being the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.⁵⁶

Again, a slew of study groups initiated by the Council during the 1940s and 50s concocted and helped instill throughout Washington the dogma that Vietnam must be defended at any and all costs. Finally, sponsored by a one million dollar grant from the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, in the early 1960s the Council appointed a study group to examine U.S. relations with China. Recognizing the incredible market potential of communist China, the study group concluded that relations with China must be normalized with the intent of securing China as a regular and profitable trading partner. Presently, this is the exact course of action being pursued by the U.S. government.⁵⁷

Along with providing the government with policy guidance, members of the Council directly participate in the process of foreign policy formation. A newsbrief issued by the Council reported that in the last 20 years over one-third of the Council's 1500 members have been recruited by the government to undertake and assist in policy creation. The great influence exerted by the council in lieu of such appointments is most evident in the fact that twelve of the fourteen men comprising President Johnson's secret Senior Advisory Group on Vietnam were members of the Council, as were the majority of top level appointments made to the State Department during the Carter years.⁵⁸

b) Committee for Economic Development

In charge of domestic issues, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) was established in the early 1940s consisting of approximately 200 corporate leaders. The initial purpose

of the CED was to ensure that a future depression along with its debilitating national and international effects, would never again occur. Moreover, in protecting against such economic crises, the CED recognized it was imperative that any alteration to the domestic economic format, must be conducted strictly within the parameters of the existing capitalist system. In other words, any and all economic safeguards to be initiated, must be in complete accord with, and thus, accomodate the needs of the business community.⁵⁹

Following the recovery period of the 40s, the CED has been actively involved in researching business problems and the solutions thereof. Utilizing, like the CFR, study groups comprised of economic experts, the conclusions and recommendations of such groups are dispersed throughout business, government and media circles. That the activity of the CED has been influential in the policy formation process is reflected in the fact that on numerous occasions the government has enacted legislation initially proposed and suggested by the Committee. Further evidence admitting to the impact of the CED, is the reality that the government has consistently relied on the expertise of the CED's members. For instance, of the 150 men who sat on the CED's board of directors between the years 1942 and 1957, 38 were appointed to top level positions in the Republican as well as Democratic administrations.⁶⁰

3) Think Tanks

The CFR, CED and other capitalist policy groups are

exceedingly dependent on so-called "think tanks" which provide the policy groups with expert advice and inscrutable research on various business and financial concerns. The most notable of the think tanks are the RAND Corporation, the Stanford Research Institute, the Urban Institute, the National Bureau of Economic Research, Resources for the Future, and the Center for International Studies at MIT.⁶¹ Once the think tanks complete their detailed research of the specific concern, the conclusions rendered are often translated into policy initiatives that are then offered to the particular policy group responsible for contracting the think tank's services. In this regard, that such think tanks are confined to serving corporate and financial interests, in terms of the method in which analysis is conducted and the policy options explored, is confirmed in the fact that the think tanks are funded by the CED, CFR and other capitalist policy groups, as well as by business foundations, banks and corporations.⁶² Indeed, that which is served is that which pays.

4) Presidential Commissions

The final policy formation structure to be mentioned is the presidential commission. For the naive observer, the presidential commission composed of a myriad of social classes, excluding the poor and unemployed, may glitter with an objectivity foreign to the earlier mentioned policy initiators. However, employing a degree of scrutiny to one's investigation of the commission, the facade of objectivity is quickly stripped away,

revealing in its place a stranglehold of corporate interests. For instance, between 1945 and 1972, fifteen commissions were created dealing with foreign and military affairs. Twelve were chaired and directed by members of the CFR, while two were headed by trustees of the CED. Moreover, the information, statistics and policy alternatives considered and debated on by the commissions, were supplied by the pertinent study groups of the CFR and/or CED.⁶³

Thus, while the conclusions and recommendations eventually approved by the presidential commission may appear derived from the American public by virtue of the social diversity of the commission's members, closer examination reveals such diversity and its potential for objectivity are effectively and wholly negated by capitalist interests controlling both the format in which discourse transpires, as well as the information and options that are, in fact, considered.

CAPITALIST STATE AND WAR

Despite failing to grasp the penetrating roots of the economy's design, for the time period in which he wrote, it was a significant accomplishment on Pius' part just^t recognize and boldly criticize the fact that the state was operating under the thumb of the prevailing economic powers. In this regard, Pius as well realized that the capitalist state threatened a potential global holocaust.

1) Competition Necessitating Conflict

Along with the adverse effects wrought by imperialism throughout the world, Pius comprehended as well the dangers involved as states of capitalist bias engage in imperialist foreign policy. According to Pius, the aggressive tactics used by such states in competition for the world, shall inevitably lead to open and unrestrained conflict. The classic fulfillment of such prophecy being a few years later in the form of World War II. Briefly, in the European theater, Germany, being unified relatively late by Bismark (1870s), was inevitably behind in its economic development, and hence, neither possessed the essential colonies as did the other powers nor received the benefits that accrued from such colonies. Thus, because Germany's economic circumstance was so precarious, causing, in turn, its very autonomy, its integrity to waver in the threat of the always progressing and expanding imperialist powers, it had no choice but to reorganize itself into a fascist state of expansionism. On the pacific theater, the U.S. involvement with Japan existed as nothing more than a struggle for control of markets in an exceedingly vulnerable China, ripe for imperialist rape.

Presently, the imperialist designs of both the United States and the Soviet Union have brought these countries into a permanent state of potential conflict, as well as into a seemingly endless struggle with their respective colonies. In this regard, such colonies are at last refusing to accept their exploited status, and are willing to risk life and limb against their respective overlords in an attempt to gain and exert

their national sovereignty. Moreover, such risk has not been without reward. The persistence of the solidarity movement in Poland, the rebels of Afghanistan, and the nationalist uprisings in various states within the Soviet Union itself, have endured and proven viable, giving inspiration to areas of similar situation. As far as the U.S. is concerned, the regions of Latin America, Asia and Africa are embroiled with the fervor of rebellion. Whether it be El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Haiti, or South Africa, the determination of these people to replace the age old pattern of dependency with one of autonomy, has been taken to heart.

2) Imperialist Ideology Crumbling

Crucial to note as well in this imperialist era is the fact that the ideological rhetoric used by the imperialist state in justifying its aggressive actions abroad, is losing, by virtue of blatant evidence, its credibility amongst the very populus native to the imperialist state. Whether imperialist aggressions be done in the name of the "free world" or in behalf of the "proletariat," time after time, colony after colony, successful American as well as Russian policy has entailed the establishment and support of a military backed dictatorship capable of resisting and turning back popular dissent. Such dictatorships, in return for arms and military training and advice, allow the economic interests of the particular imperialist state to conduct unhindered *their* exploitive techniques.

As has been shown, in terms of Latin America the result of such economic exploitation is made most apparent in the 360 billion dollar debt currently owed to imperialist banking and industrial interests. Moreover, it is a 360 billion dollar debt that the South has nothing to show for. Nothing except a loss of resources, a loss of surplus value from their repressed labor force, and perhaps most costly of all, a loss of human dignity and worth.

CONCLUSION

Relative to the efforts of Leo XIII, one immediately notices that Pius XI employs a significant degree of scientific analysis when composing, in particular, his diagnosis of society's socio-economic ills. Thus, while Leo asserted the fundamental observation that labor exists extremely vulnerable to the unbridled greed of the employer, Pius, *aligning* papal thought ever closer to the Marxist position, goes a step further than his predecessor by unveiling and disclosing the very means by which such greed and vulnerability are realized. According to Pius, the social harmony and equity responsible for binding and integrating society as one, existed in perpetual danger of being torn asunder by an unrestrained competitiveness that typified, if not dominated the economic realm of his day. Specifically speaking, though admitting that competition is proper and healthy to a certain and limited extent, Pius nevertheless condemned its unregulated form, claiming the present crisis (the Great Depression) and

its coinciding social depravations as being the direct result of competition's freedom of reign.

Despite such strides in terms of properly comprehending the pertinent role and effect of competition within a capitalist framework, the position of Pius represents at best a compromise between Marx and Leo. This is to say, though admitting to the existence and pervasiveness of competitive economic laws as argued by Marx, when interpreting the origin and reasons for such laws, Pius subscribes to the flawed individualist approach of Leo. For Pius, the competitive extremes of capitalism emanate from the individual nature of the capitalist himself. Hence, in attempting to rectify the present competitive excess, Pius stressed the need for and duty of the individual capitalist to engage in the practice of social responsibility. In short, while the capitalist has the right to possess property, in particular, the factory, he has as well the responsibility to utilize such property in accordance with the needs of the surrounding community. According to the previously discussed Marxist position, competition exists as a veritable law, and as such, as an inherent component of capitalism itself. Hence, the capitalist is never free in terms of existing and acting as if he were isolated and by himself. On the contrary, the capitalist is forever motivated by and responsive to the competitive nature of the capitalist order of which he is an undeniable part. Thus, his actions and decisions concerning the workplace are never individually based, but are systematically induced by the requirements of the order. Truly, it is the capitalist

who fails to adequately respond to the conditions presented by the market in terms of formulating competitively effective policies, who is quickly displaced and eliminated from economic participation. Therefore, to suggest as Pius that social health is to be achieved, in part, by the individual capitalist tempering his competitive spirit, is to blatantly deny the competitive essence that is capitalism, and thus, the capitalist system itself.

Regarding the other half of his prescription, one notices Pius allocating unto the state a degree of responsibility that Leo would have hardly condoned, if not have condemned. Indeed, while Leo, in safeguarding the sacred inviolability of private property, put great restraint upon the activity of the state, Pius goes so far as to designate unto the state a very dynamic and most pervasive role in generating social health. Seemingly unsure of the individual capitalist's response to his plea that social responsibility dictate one's business policies, Pius felt it necessary that the state function to ensure, regardless of such response, that all economic activity be conducted in behalf of the "common good." Of course, from the Marxist standpoint as well as from the abundance of evidence substantiating such a standpoint, it was made apparent that Pius failed to understand the primary purpose of any capitalist state. Far from objectively representing all classes, the state within capitalist society is designed to, first and foremost, serve the capitalist system by promoting and achieving the economy's requirements on both a national and international level. Indeed, the intimate relation between the capitalist economy and state, hinted at by Pius

himself, as well as the nature of the capitalist system as a whole, is completely divulged in the reality of capitalist imperialism. In this context, imperialism, in and of itself, exists as the foundation and purpose of a maturing capitalist realm stripped of all its ideological veils and cloaks, bare for all to see. In its nakedness, one is confronted by a political, socio-economic system that worships profit, sacrificing unto it the absolute beauty and dignity of a humanity made subservient.

In closing, while Pius, relative to Leo, embarked upon a more thorough examination of the capitalist format, and thereby discovered the adverse phenomena of competition, a capitalist state, and imperialism, such discoveries were themselves left uninvestigated. Hence, Pius naively assumed such phenomena were wholly correctable within the confines of the capitalist order. In this regard, had Pius conducted the necessary investigation, he would have realized that the very vices intrinsic to competition, a capitalist state, and imperialism, are necessary, and indeed, permanent features of a functioning capitalist realm. Truly, so essential to capitalist development are such features that to divest capitalism of their being and purpose, is to divest capitalism of its very self.

CHAPTER IV - JOHN XXIII - 1961

INTRODUCTION1) Why The Encyclical

In the thirty years following Pius XI's social exhortation, On Reconstructing the Social Order, the history of humankind has endured and, at least for the moment, has survived a number of its greatest, and indeed, self-induced calamities. In this regard, one is of course referring to the all pervading economic and social misery that accompanied the Great Depression, as well as the utter horror of human waste that is indelibly associated with and forever a part of that hideous event recorded in history as World War II. Overall, following the grief and uncertainty marking the 1930s and 40s, the 50s, despite occasional outbreaks of isolated and contained militarism, were generally characterized as a time of global recuperation and ease of mind. For instance, the Marshall Plan was recognized throughout Western Europe as at least moderately successful in its bid to resuscitate the continent's economies, the Berlin accord between the Soviets and the United States was functional and temporarily aided in the dissipation of heated tensions, and finally, West Germany and Japan, on the wings of U.S. aid and advice, both exhibited unparalleled progress in reconstructing their tattered economies and ideologies.

Of course, the above is not to imply that the 1950s was an idyllic time, for it was not. Without question, the decade is properly understood only when it is understood in terms of its historical context. In a word, the fifties represented

a perculator in time. A perculator in which there brewed the interaction of various economic, political, and social realities that, far from remaining staid, eventually culminated in most certain and potent unrest. Whether it be the Cuban Revolution, the Cold War, French and U.S. occupation of Vietnam, the civil rights movement, feminist awareness and the demand for women's rights, or the emergence and rapid spread of the drug culture and other forms of destructive escapism, the period of time marking the fifties existed as the breeding ground for such inevitable phenomena.

In any event, with this stipulation aside, one may go on to correctly argue that as far as actual events ^{were} ~~is~~ concerned, the 1950s, particularly in relation to the preceding decades, were indeed both tranquil in terms of global conflict and prosperous in terms of western economies. As far as papal social teaching was concerned, one would have hardly expected the release of a social encyclical following the conclusion of the 50s. Simply, the two earlier encyclicals were both conceived at a time of acute and immediate social crisis. Again, it must be reiterated that the time period, 1961, marking the publication of John XXIII's The Church and Social Progress (Mater et Magistra)¹ did have its injustices, as all times do. However, such injustices had not achieved a fever pitch as in times past, 1891 and 1931, when complete and total social disintegration threatened. In this regard, some commentators might simply dismiss the issue stating that John XXIII wrote

in order to commemorate the 60th anniversary of Leo XIII's The Condition of the Workingmen, much in the same manner Pius XI commemorated the 30th anniversary of the same writing. And indeed, John XXIII does make note of the time of his writing as one of remembrance.² Others might say that the world had changed in the thirty years since Pius XI's pontificate, which, of course, it had. Moreover, they would continue, it is imperative that contemporary advances and social issues such as the scientific revolution, the role of increasing public ownership, and the myriad of problems afflicting world development, be addressed and interpreted from the papal perspective. And again, John does remark on the importance of elucidating the vast and dynamic changes and challenges facing an increasingly complex and intricate world.³

2. The Encyclical's Radicalism

However, as important as the above mentioned reasons are for writing, it seems apparent that neither reason, by itself or together, can claim to be the prime instigation motivating John XXIII to compose and deliver, The Church and Social Progress. In this respect, and differing from the majority of papal commentators, it is most difficult to evaluate The Church and Social Progress as being, in terms of calling into question the very structure of society, a safe and generally uncontroversial document. On the contrary, this writer cannot help but perceive John as calling forth a revolutionary, in terms

of socio-economic implications, yet essential and basic, in terms of the individual's "self," prerequisite and dimension of human development. To clarify, while much of the encyclical reiterates, though using contemporary language and hindsight, social problems previously addressed in past encyclicals; nevertheless, the social justice (decent wages, better health care, improved working conditions) demanded of society by past encyclicals is simply not enough for John. Indeed, at the time of his writing much improvement had been made throughout the West in terms of social rehabilitation. Although it has been shown how such improvement was alien to and contributed in large part to the socio-economic devastation of the world's underdeveloped regions, it is generally conceded that by 1961 times were never better in the West.

Important to note, however, when one states "never better," one must interpret it in an economic, material sense. In this regard, John, exhibiting a tremendous sensitivity towards the "human condition," realized that to be secure physically is but half the battle. For the human being is a creature like no other. The human being is continually in the process of striving towards a goal unique only to himself. It is a goal that sets it apart from all else and exists as its ultimate fulfillment. Such is the goal of freedom. As noted in chapter two concerning the development of the forces of production, such development, and thus, the course of human history, has as its impetus the objective of freedom from environment. Freedom from a life perpetually mediated by and limited to the pursuit of achieving and sustaining physical existence. It cannot be denied that since humanity's existence, an overwhelming percentage of its efforts

have been consumed in the primordial task of accruing the necessities required for survival - food, clothing, and shelter.

In this context there is very little to distinguish the existence of man from any other creature inhabiting the earth.

However, where difference is apparent, and indeed, absolutely decisive, is found in the reality that humankind has the ability and inherent desire to transform the environment, altering it for the expressed purpose of controlling and thereby limiting its relentless demands. As has been shown, such ability and purpose are most evident in the perpetual evolution of humanity's socio-economic systems. Whether it be the format of slavery, feudalism, or capitalism, each mode of production represents, in and of itself, a marked advance over its predecessor in terms of affording humankind ever greater freedom from its surroundings, and hence, control of its destiny.

In the maturing capitalist world of which he writes, in particular, the West, John realized society had matured to the point where basic survival played less of a role in terms of consuming all of man's activity. Along with the general rise of *one's* standard of living, came shorter work weeks, more leisure time, savings accounts, and overall security. Though previous popes, Leo and Pius, would at their deprived time construe such social progress as a great achievement, John realized such achievement was far from enough, far from satisfactory. Simply, now that a social order had developed which was capable of offering

material security, it was time that man unshackle his essence imprisoned for centuries by the dictum of survival, and thus, for the first time, make "living" his prime order of business. In other words, rather than just existing, John realized the individual must assert his dignity as a person and have the courage to develop his essence and be true to his desires, to be reconciled unto his very being. In short, the person must, as John succinctly says, be able to "perfect" his self. This most innovative and crucial idea shall be elaborated upon throughout the course of the chapter, particularly since John employs the notion of perfection as a common thread pervading and unifying the various topics he chooses to discuss.

With this said, the first part of the paper shall present John's views on four subjects pertinent to our study: 1) private ownership versus public ownership in light of the "common good;" 2) the evolving definition of the proper wage; 3) the idea of economic development versus social progress; 4) and finally, the most explicit statement, until Paul VI, concerning the dichotomy existing between the developed and underdeveloped world. The second part of the essay shall, first of all, offer for consideration John's concept of humankind "perfecting itself" in terms of how such sentiments stand in close accord with Marx's own aspirations concerning humanity's ultimate fulfillment. Secondly, the chapter shall conclude by critiquing the remaining subjects from a Marxist standpoint, demonstrating

how John either surpasses or stumbles behind his predecessors in his comprehension of the social problems addressed, as well as in his proposed remedy for such problems.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP AND THE COMMON GOOD

1. Responsibility towards the Common Good Enlarged

If thirty years time has caused any deviation in papal social teaching, such deviation finds itself most evident in John XXIII's discourse on "property." Briefly recalling Pius XI's teaching on the subject, his main concern pivoted upon the individual owner utilizing his right of ownership in accordance with the social or "common good." Thus, the factory, privately owned, should always operate from the perspective of the social needs of the community in which it is centered. In short, Pius stressed the proper balance between the rights of individual ownership and the social obligations such rights entail. Furthermore, the extent to which Pius allowed the state to involve itself in the affairs of, so to speak, private enterprise, was to regulate the trends of industrial progress ensuring that industry functioned within the constraints dictated by the common good. Hence, crucial to note, even though Pius sanctioned unto the state the power to guide economic affairs to be in accord with the social as well as the right to manage those economic operations too essential for the health of the community to be left in private hands, he nevertheless

insisted that ownership of property, the means of production, should be delegated as a right of the private individual.

Turning to John, while he is as well concerned about maintaining a particular balance, such balance is no longer limited to the scenario of individual owner versus social responsibility, but involves as well the novel relations between individual ownership and public ownership or public regulation of private enterprise, as well as both forms of ownerships' mutual commitment' to promoting the common good. In other words, still affirming Pius' call of achieving the common good through business practices, such responsibility and duty now applies as much to the "state" as it does the "private owner." In this regard, John is simply responding to a phenomenon whose very being was conceived in the socio-economic conditions that prevailed during the pontificate of Pius XI. Indeed, it was the onslaught of deprivation brought on by the depression which led many governments to the realization that "laissez faire" capitalism, if unguided, leads to its own destruction as well as society's as a whole. In this light, throughout Western Europe and the United States massive government programs were initiated in order to mobilize an idle workforce, and thus, provide buying power and the monetary breath of life the world capitalist network so desperately needed. Hence, not only did industries become accountable to state regulatory committees, some were expropriated by the state outright. However, the majority of those industries that were nationalized were not of a profitable sort, such that once the

terms of compensation had been worked out the "capitalist interests made an excellent bargain, in many instances a much better one than they could have made had they been left in command of their property."⁴

In any event, recognizing the vast increase in government regulated industries, John . constructed a new "balance" involving the legitimacy of public ownership as well as the right of private initiative. With this development, the concept of the "common good" assumed a duality. First of all, the owners of property, means of production, whether they be private or public, have the responsibility of assuring that their mode of industry be carried out in accordance with the common good, in accordance with what is best for the community in which such industry is situated.

Consequently, it is requested again and again of public authorities responsible for the common good, that they intervene in a wide variety of economic affairs, and that, in a more extensive and organized way than heretofore, they adapt institutions, tasks, means, and procedures to this end.⁵

Secondly, John recognized that in this era of dual ownership, public and private, it was essential that a particular balance or cooperation be facilitated between the two spheres of ownership in order that both private freedom may be maintained and ensured, and at the same time, the welfare of the community at large be likewise secure.

Experience, in fact, shows that where private initiative of individuals is lacking, political tyranny prevails. Moreover, much stagnation occurs in various sectors of the economy, and hence all sorts of consumer goods and services, closely connected with the needs of the body and more especially of the spirit, are in short supply....Where, on the other hand, appropriate activity of the state is lacking or defective, commonwealths are apt to experience incurable disorders, and there occurs exploitation of the weak by the unscrupulous strong, who flourish, unfortunately, like cockle among the wheat, in all times and places.⁶

2. Increased Interdependence Threatening Perfection

In close association with the above, John reflects upon and evaluates the economic structure as a whole. His general conclusions being that there presently exists, more than any other time in history, a complexity of social relationships that has rendered all in society susceptible to ever increasing levels of socio-economic association and interdependence.

One of the principle characteristics of our time is the multiplication of social relationships, that is, a daily more complex interdependence of citizens, introducing into their lives and activities many and varied forms of association, recognized, for the most part in private and even public law.⁷

Furthermore, inevitably accompanying such socio-economic entanglement, is a corresponding increase in the number of rules and

regulations one must adhere to if one is to adequately function within and maintain the proper equilibrium required by the continually developing and expanding social body. According to John, it was precisely such "rules and regulations," if allowed to excessively proliferate, and hence, dominate one's actions, that threatened to burden the individual, coercing him into a particular mode of life that is apart from his will, that is alien to his "self." John argues and warns:

As a consequence, opportunity for free action by individuals is restricted within narrower limits. Methods are often used, procedures are adopted, and such an atmosphere develops wherein it becomes difficult for one to make decisions independently of outside influences, to do anything on his own initiative, to carry out in a fitting way his rights and duties, and to fully develop and perfect his personality. Will men perhaps, then become automatons, and cease to be personally responsible, as these social relationships multiply more and more?⁸

As was mentioned in the introduction, this call for "perfecting the personality," as opposed to the past popes' central interest being man's ability to sufficiently obtain the means of subsistence, serves to propel Catholic social teaching into a new and decisively human realm. Indeed, the social demand is no longer confined to the basic requisite that humankind be able to secure the material stuff necessary for survival. At this most primitive level, man is merely struggling, like all creatures if they are to survive, to sustain his physical being. In

contrast, according to the radically new level introduced by John, not only must man be free from basic want, conditions must further exist which allow and encourage man to develop his unique personhood. In a word, the individual must be allowed to live his life, to be active in a fashion that is consonant with his will.

THE QUESTION OF WAGES

Though a comparatively brief passage in John's commentary, it is nevertheless most fascinating to note how the concept of the wage has evolved in terms of assuming a more explicit definition in the sixty years since Leo XIII first penned the proper wage as one allowing the worker and his dependents to live in "frugal comfort."

1. Criticism of Contemporary Wages

a. Wages of the Third World

Viewing the overall world scene through pessimistic eyes, John first comments on the underdeveloped world stating, in some instances, it is because "modern industrial techniques either have only recently been introduced or have made less than satisfactory progress"⁹ that many families are forced to exist in conditions beneath human dignity. In other cases, while the economy may be generating a fairly substantial amount of revenue, the problem lies in the fact that the distribution of such revenue is far from fair. Whether it is produced by

impoverishing the working class, hoarded by a few or wasted on excessive armaments, John condemns such unjust manipulation of social wealth, citing it as a major cause of Third World deprivation.

It happens in some of these nations that, as compared with the extreme need of the majority, the wealth and conspicuous consumption of a few stand out, and are in open and bold contrast with the lot of the needy. It happens in other places that the commonwealth may achieve an increase of wealth such as can by no means be achieved without violating the laws of justice and equity. Finally, it happens elsewhere that a disproportionate share of the revenue goes toward the building up of national prestige, and that large sums of money are devoted to armaments.⁹

b. Wages of the Developed World

Looking at the developed lands, John's major grievance seems to lie in the fact that large financial rewards are granted to those whose contribution to the social body is more than dubious, while those whose efforts exist as the mainstay of society are fiscally neglected, allocated but a pittance of the social wealth their labor contributes to.

Moreover, in the economically developed countries, it frequently happens that great, or sometimes very great, remuneration is had for the performance of some task of lesser importance or doubtful utility. Meanwhile the diligent and profitable work that whole classes of decent and hard-working citizens perform, receives too low a

payment and one insufficient for the necessities of life, or else, one that does not correspond to the contribution made to the community.¹⁰

2. Proper Wage Defined

With his criticism of the contemporary wage aside, John delves into the principle of the proper wage by, first of all, reaffirming an earlier tenet initially put forth by Leo XIII and emphasized by Pius XI concerning the injustice involved when wages are determined through market competition. Simply, because of their dominant position over and against the propertyless, in need of work laborer, the owner of the means of production is effectively able to manipulate the vulnerable condition of the isolated worker, forcing his wage to the lowest possible extent. Thus, in place of such free market tactics where the worker exists as nothing but an impersonal commodity to be bought and sold, John argues that it is of utmost importance that laws of "justice and equity" be instituted and observed.

Wherefore, we judge it our duty to reaffirm once again that just as remuneration for work cannot be left entirely to unregulated competition, neither may it be decided arbitrarily at the will of the more powerful. Rather, in this matter, the norms of justice and equity should be strictly observed. This requires that workers receive a wage sufficient to lead a life worthy of man and to fulfill family responsibilities properly.¹¹

Realizing no two areas are economically similar, John admits

that a unique combination of variables necessarily figures into the formula discerning the proper wage of each particular area. Stated thusly:

But in determining what constitutes an appropriate wage, the following must necessarily be taken into account: first of all, the contribution of individuals to the economic effort; the economic state of the enterprises within which they work; the requirements of each community, especially as regards over-all employment; finally, what concerns the common good of all peoples...¹²

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL PROGRESS, AND PERFECTION

Though the idea of perfection was introduced by John in his initial discussion concerning the increasing complexity of social relationships, it is in his discourse on the economic rights of those residing in the prosperous West that the concept of perfection achieves complete fruition in terms of being clearly defined and, by virtue of what such definition entails, irresistibly desired.

First to note is the fact that John recognizes the process of "perfection" as transpiring, not within a spiritual or ethereal plane, but within the confines of the everyday, mundane and material economic realm. This is made obvious in his disclosure of the three interdependent conditions that John argues must be achieved in full for perfection to become reality: 1) just distribution of profits; 2) true responsibility, freedom, and a voice in the operation of the workplace; 3) proper economic representation at the political level.

1. Equitable Distribution of Profits

To begin, John believes that the development and success of a given nation's industrial sector must be accompanied by a similar and proportional advance within the realm of social welfare. In this sense, the true well-being of a state is hardly measured in variables strictly concerned with the growth of a state's national product. While there is nothing deviant with maximizing industrial output per se, such maximization assumes a most threatening posture as soon as it becomes the sole focus of a state's concern. For John, therefore, the overall measure of a state's health and progress can only be determined in terms of how the industrial revenue and product facilitated relates to society at large.

we take this opportunity to draw the attention of all to a strict demand of social justice, which explicitly requires that, with the growth of the economy, there occur a corresponding social development. Thus, all classes of citizens will benefit equitably from an increase in national wealth. Toward this end vigilance should be exercised and effective steps taken that class differences arising from disparity of wealth not be increased, but lessened so far as possible.¹³

In short, if the bulk of society's populus finds itself alienated from the profit and product it, through its labor, contributes towards, such a society can only be deemed unjust, and indeed, far from advanced or developed. On the other hand, if the social product and profit of society finds itself equitably

distributed throughout the populus such that social justice concurs with economic development, it can be rightfully assumed that society exhibits the desired tendencies of human advancement and progress.

a. Equitable Distribution as a Precondition for Perfection

Let one not think that John's call for a proper distribution of society's wealth is merely an end in itself. While such egalitarian measures are indeed required by a commitment to justice and, in that sense, may be perceived as an end; nevertheless, important to understand is that such justice is required as a mandatory precondition allowing the process of complete human development, perfection. While not delving as far as one might wish into the meaning of his terminology, John makes it evident that the need to possess an adequate amount of wealth, an adequate amount of security is necessary in order for the person to do something more, to achieve another state of being, to perfect one's self.

For the system whereby both the common prosperity is achieved and individuals exercise their right to use material goods, conforms full to norms laid down by God the Creator. From this it follows that the economic prosperity of any people is to be assessed not so much from the sum total of goods and wealth possessed as from the distribution of goods according to norms of justice, so that everyone in the community can develop and perfect himself. For this after all, is the end toward which all economic activity is by nature ordered.¹⁴

Though not yet certain as to the precise interpretation and

significance of the term "perfect," one discovers its inner essence, as well as beauty increasingly revealed in the following conditions.

2. Democracy in the Workplace

The second condition to be met involves the democratization of the workplace. Thus, just as it is imperative that the state demonstrate equity in the distribution of its economic fortune, it is likewise essential that the industries by which such fortune is produced be responsive to the interests and needs of all its participants - employers and employees alike. In this manner, workers are not to be "automatons," forever hierarchically instructed as to their duty and purpose without any possibility of interjecting their own ideas and innovations in the production process. On the contrary, what John is insisting upon is that within the workplace an up to now absent "freedom" be instituted and maintained. A viable "freedom" that can only help to relieve much of the alienation and distress felt by the powerless worker who presently exists, in terms of responsibility and influence, as a pawn of the workplace. In a word, rather than being managed, John insists that the worker and his colleagues begin to manage themselves on the basis of their own needs, interests, and desires. Hence, John is advocating a most radical and intimately desired freedom designed to create a parallel, a consonance between one's will and one's actions. Indeed, it is a freedom designed to allow the workers

the capacity to "perfect themselves."

Justice is to be observed not merely in the distribution of wealth but also in regard to the conditions under which men engage in productive activity....Consequently, if the organization and structure of economic life be such that the human dignity of workers is compromised, or their sense of responsibility weakened, or their freedom of action is removed, then we judge such an economic order to be unjust, even though it produces a vast amount of goods, whose distribution conforms to the norms of justice and equity....There is, in fact, an innate need of human nature requiring that men engaged in productive activity have an opportunity to assume responsibility and to perfect themselves by their efforts.¹⁶

By virtue of such a pronouncement, John has committed himself to a brand of socio-economic policy that decisively subordinates economic growth to humanistic concerns.

In order to practically and effectively establish a program of worker participation such that the principle of worker initiative and freedom, once established, would never be rendered into mere rhetoric, John felt it vital that "work agreements should in some way be modified by partnership arrangements."¹⁶ Following from the above, if the common laborer were to ever be capable of holding a position of management and experiencing the responsibility and dignity thereof, John realized it essential that the worker develop his overall business accumen through proper education. Stated thusly, "This demands of workers greater abilities and professional qualifications. Accordingly, workers should be provided with aids and time to achieve a suitable and more rounded formation..."¹⁷ Again, one cannot

help but notice how the terminology, "more rounded formation," further suggests the idea of human development and perfection - that the person is more than a creature condemned to a particular, and often, repetitive and demeaning task within the workplace. Such thought of John's is tantamount to freeing the individual, insisting that one's existence should not conform to the needs of the workplace, the needs of accumulation. On the contrary, it is the workplace, according to John, that should serve the individual, allowing and encouraging each and every laborer the chance to assert his abilities and desires, to express his will and perfect his self as best he can.

In light of the above and from previous discussions concerning capitalism's encompassing laws, what becomes increasingly evident is the fact that despite John's tremendous achievement of demanding the full development of the worker, by failing to recognize the inherent essence of the capitalist system itself, John falls victim to creating a "worker/capitalist" - a worker/capitalist that, like the capitalist, is totally confined by capitalist constraints, and hence, is perpetually influenced and coerced by the laws and tendencies of accumulation. John simply fails, as did his predecessors, to objectively and scientifically scrutinize and understand the capitalist system as a whole. In doing so, John is guilty of trying to remedy a symptom rather than the symptom's cause. In any event, as this error shall be further elaborated on in the critique section, let us conclude for now by saying that John's fateful mistake lies in his failure to recognize the competitive interaction

wherein the force and potency of capitalist laws and tendencies, and thus, industrial survival are bred.

3. Economic Representation at the Political Level

It isⁱⁿ the third condition that the idea of worker participation achieves fruition. Displaying a sensitive political awareness, John recognizes that it is the inherent nature of the state to formulate economic policy on a national and international basis. In this regard, John demands that not only should the owners and managers of the industrial sector have their requests heard by state authorities, as is presently the case, but that the workers should be likewise and equally represented. Such representation is essential in actualizing and maintaining the rights - an equitable distribution of profit and increased responsibility within the workplace - sought and hopefully achieved by labor.

Nevertheless, to decide what is more helpful to the overall economic situation is not the prerogative of individual productive enterprises, but pertains to the public authorities and to those institutions which, established either nationally or among a number of countries, function in various sectors of economic life. From this is evident the propriety or necessity of ensuring that not only managers or agents of management are represented before such authorities and institutions, but also workers or those who have the responsibility of safeguarding the rights, needs, and aspirations of workers.¹⁸

WORLD DEVELOPMENT

In his discussion of international affairs, in particular,

the plight of the Third World, one immediately notices John XXIII's keen awareness of the many *disparities* stemming from capitalist expansionism. Unfortunately, as was the case with Pius XI, the essential connection to be made between symptoms (underdevelopment, poverty, and starvation) suffered by the Third World and their diagnosis (the immutable laws of an imperialist, capitalist system), is never concretely established. However, John does, relative to Pius, employ a greater degree of scrutiny in his overall examination of international relations, resulting in final conclusions that cast suspicion on the validity of the economic foundations upon which such relations are primarily based. Specifically speaking, though not directly citing capitalist imperialism as the essential factor contributing to the economic affliction of the Third World, John nevertheless suggests that the economic order may indeed be askew and in need of structural if not systematic rectification. This innovative suggesting on John's part shall be further considered during the following discussion concerning John's analysis of the present situation characterizing the Third World as it relates to and is influenced by the capitalist West. Before starting, for one to properly comprehend John's complaints and recommendations, it is important that one first understand how John perceives the international scene in terms of the actors involved and their responsibilities and obligations towards one another.

1. Defining the Actors' Role

a. Wealthy States to be Responsibly Active

John commences his discourse on the Third World by encouraging

a sense of responsibility amongst those residing in the more developed areas stating that:

Men are so intimately associated in all parts of the world that they feel, as it were, as if they are members of one and the same household. Therefore, the nations that enjoy a sufficiency and abundance of everything may not overlook the plight of other nations whose citizens experience such domestic problems that they are all but overcome by poverty and hunger, and are not able to enjoy basic human rights.¹⁹

Under quick inspection it would at first appear that John adheres to the principle that aid and eventual development are things to be bestowed upon the deprived lands through the charity of foreign, well-to-do areas. What this means as far as the citizens located in countries characterized by poverty, repression, and a general lack of development are concerned, is that freedom from their plight is to be intigated from a source extraneous to themselves - from the developed world. John writes:

We all share responsibility for the fact that populations are undernourished....it is necessary to arouse a sense of responsibility in individuals and generally, especially those more blessed with this world's goods.²⁰

In this light, it would seem John favors the utilization of the "active/passive" scenario, initially formulated and prescribed by Leo XIII to remedy the extreme dichotomy of wealth prevalent throughout the industrializing West, at the international level. In general terms, this is to say that the wealthy, the "haves,"

are to assume an active posture in facilitating global socio-economic improvement, while the poor, the "have nots," are to passively receive and benefit from such assistance. In specific terms, by following Christian laws of justice and charity, it is the duty of the developed nations, the nations possessing the resources and technology, to aid, support, and elevate their less fortunate neighbors to a rung of similar development. Meanwhile, the very nations suffering from impoverishment are to remain silent as their transformation, their earthly salvation is to proceed from without.

From this initial position it would appear that John recognizes the delicate aura of social tranquility which precariously hovers above the Third World scene, as extremely vulnerable to ever reactionary and oppressive socio-economic conditions. It would seem that John, as Leo XIII¹ did when discussing the inequalities of the developed world, values peace and social stability over and against the potential of violent reform, even though such peace and stability rest upon, or better still, are bolstered with the spilling of blood and the reign of injustice. The reasons for this would first and foremost stem from one's ideological leanings. If one, like the popes, is of a functionalist bent and perceives the world in terms of an organic, interdependent and cohesive body, one would undoubtedly argue that non-violent change producing reform is desirable, possible, and indeed, probable. On the other hand, if one is of a Marxist orientation and recognizes class conflict to be

an inevitable phenomenon characterizing capitalism as well as all previous systems of production, one understands that it is only through battle that the repressed class has any hope of redeeming itself, of tasting the dignity that it has for so long been denied.

b. Dispossessed to become Active

From his introduction it would seem that John is setting up his tent, as his predecessors had, in the functionalist campground. Or is he? In a most decisive passage John insists, along with his plea that the developed areas exhibit moral responsibility by assisting those regions less developed, that the very citizens of the impoverished lands, those directly affected by the scourge of socio-economic injustice, should learn to help themselves, and thus, directly participate in their temporal redemption. Certainly, this is not to say that John displays Marxist tendencies or that he envisaged or desired the populus to rebel. If anything, John still believed progressive change possible without violence. However, it would appear that John is suggesting that successful change in the Third World can only proceed if it is helped along in part by the very people it, such change, is meant to affect and benefit. John writes:

They should have this goal in mind, that citizens in less developed countries - in giving attention to economic and social affairs, as well as to cultural matters - feel themselves to be the ones chiefly responsible for their own progress. For a

citizen has a sense of his own dignity when he contributes the major share to progress in his own affairs.²¹

The potential significance of such a passage must not be underestimated. For with it society loses, in part, its once paternal framework whereby those with power and wealth are held accountable for those without it. Truly, rather than being a passive dependent, John raises up throughout the world, all of the dispossessed, invigorating them with a new and profound sense of dignity. A dignity that will always be found dwelling within men possessing the reins to their own destiny. This idea shall be talked of more fully in the critique section, particularly in regards to its significance for "liberation theology."

2. Imperialism Evidenced - Suggested to be an Inherent Flaw of the Capitalist Network

Although no specific instances are mentioned or examples cited, the very fact that John cautions the economically advanced nations against involving themselves in the affairs of the less developed states with the intent of manipulating such affairs to their own advantage, is in itself testimony to the fact that such one-sided interactions between nations have and do occur. John writes:

Moreover, economically developed countries should take particular care lest, in giving aid to poorer countries, they endeavor to turn the prevailing political situation to their own advantage, and seek to dominate them. Should perchance such attempts

be made, this clearly would be but another form of colonialism, which although disguised in name, merely reflects their earlier but outdated domination...Genuine necessity, as well as justice, require that whenever countries give attention to the fostering of skills or commerce, they should aid the less developed nations without thought of domination, so that these latter eventually will be in a position to progress economically and logically on their own initiative.²²

a. Starvation versus Profit

Perhaps the most blatant of all imperialist symptoms is the reality that despite possessing the triumphant ability to produce and distribute more than enough foodstuffs to ensure that not one person of the earth go hungry, humanity's dominant socio-economic system, capitalism, ignores and banishes such ability, resulting in the perpetual anguish that can only accompany the needless deaths of starving thousands. Even today, while the starving of Africa have never been so numerous, the U.S. government pays farmers (mostly agribusinesses - huge conglomerate farms) hefty subsidies not to plow their fields in order that the market price of agricultural products remains stable and economically sound.²³ The U.S. government serves as well as one of the leading purchasers of agricultural products produced in the U.S. Once bought, such goods, rather than impart to humankind their nutritional value, are often times destroyed. Moreover, when these products are globally distributed, the plan of distribution is specifically designed to benefit the viability of the U.S. agricultural sector, often damaging

in the process the Third World markets wherein these distribution programs are implemented. This fact was made most evident in the earlier discussed Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954.

Recognizing the situation for what it was (and still is), totally barren of "justice and humanity," John argues that such selfishly motivated and insensitive measures, despite their favorable impact on western agriculture, are deplorable and not to be tolerated.

Now justice and humanity require that these richer countries come to the aid of those in need. Accordingly, to destroy entirely or to waste goods necessary for the lives of men, runs counter to our obligations in justice and humanity. We are quite well aware that to produce surpluses, especially of farm products, in excess of the needs of a country, can occasion harm to various classes of citizens. Nevertheless, it does not therefore follow that nations with surpluses have no obligation to aid the poor and hungry where some particular emergency arises.²⁴

It is in statements like the above that John, as mentioned earlier, comes ever so close to implying that the economic order is geared, is oriented to an objective that is utterly transcendent, and thus, foreign to the welfare of the human condition. While such a revelation is not, in so many words, explicitly stated, his accurate assessment and description of the present situation merits special notice. For though exceedingly necessary in terms of formulating practical and effective socio-economic change, it is but a slight step from stating the facts,

the discrepancy between the design of the economic order and human needs, and at last recognizing that the inherent laws of the prevailing mode of production serve as the very cause, the very roots ensuring that such facts and discrepancies exist and endure over time.

b. Population versus Adequate Means of Subsistence

Another instance where, if you will, the facts are stated and the cause implied, concerns John's discussion of birth control in areas of the globe where material means do not exist to sustain the lives of the many infants born. The worn out excuse of the developed nations that such tragedy is precipitated by the suffering nations themselves simply because they fail to practice effective methods of contraception, is thoroughly rejected by John. Placing the blame squarely on the shoulders of those responsible, the developed world, John contends there exists more than enough foodstuffs to ensure that not one child born perish from starvation. The problem, he asserts, is that the distribution of such foodstuffs is manipulated away from the areas of despair, and placed in situations contrary to "human reason" and man's "social nature."

Besides, God in his good and wisdom has, on the one hand, provided nature with almost inexhaustible productivity; and on the other hand, has endowed man with such ingenuity that, by using suitable means, he can apply nature's resources to the needs and requirements of existence.²⁵

God has bestowed upon humanity sufficient goods wherewith to bear with dignity the burdens associated with procreation of children. But this task will be difficult or even impossible if men, straying from the right road and with a perverse outlook, use the means mentioned above in a manner contrary to human reason or to their social nature, and hence, contrary to the directives of God himself.²⁶

Though using admittedly ambiguous terminology, John claims the resolution to the population problem depends largely upon necessary adjustments being affected in both the social and, most crucial to note, economic structures of society. Adjustments that will ensure the dignity and preservation of humankind from the needless, and indeed, senseless plight of starvation.

We judge that this question can be resolved only if economic and social advances preserve and augment the genuine welfare of individual citizens and of human society as a whole. Indeed, in a matter of this kind, first place must be accorded everything that pertains to the dignity of man as such, or to the life of individual men, than which nothing can be more precious.²⁷

The significance of this statement shall be further discussed during the critique portion of the chapter to which we now turn.

PART II - MARXIST CRITIQUE

JOHN XXIII AND KARL MARX - A COMMON HOPE1. Perfection Defined

Though John XXIII never directly explicates upon the precise meaning of perfection, it is still quite possible to extract from such a critical notion its ultimate meaning and significance on the basis of the various contexts in which the term is applied. In this regard, perhaps the most significant passage within the encyclical, and ^{one} which we have quoted, concerns John's demand that workers be allowed to "perfect" themselves within the process of labor itself.²⁸ Once stated, John immediately proceeds to elaborate upon a particular situation in which prevailing conditions are not at all suitable or conducive to "perfection" *being* achieved. Reviewing briefly, these conditions *occur* when the "human dignity of workers is compromised;" when "their sense of responsibility is weakened;" and when "their freedom of action is removed." As has been said earlier, the first thing to note is that John's concern and interest no longer revolves around a just distribution of goods, as did his predecessors. Certainly, this is not to say that social wealth was equitably divided amongst the populus. Indeed, despite the fact that by the 1950's, especially in relation to the 30's and 40's the overall standard of living increased dramatically in the West, the relative monetary disparity existing between the owners of the means of production and the dispossessed had actually increased. In any event, the point to be made and understood is the fact that the 1950's was a time period in which great wealth was

generated in the West. Wealth, though far from equitably distributed, affected the majority of lives in a more or less, prosperous sense.

Nevertheless, despite such materially favorable auspices, John was far from content with the current situation. In fact, as we have seen, his discontent was great enough for him to declare unjust any economic order that sought to compromise the "dignity, responsibility, and freedom" of the worker. In this light, it does not matter how diligently the economic order strives to ensure that the goods and profits of production were fairly distributed. Indeed, all such efforts are for nought and the economic structure as a whole condemned if the existing workplace restrains and hampers the worker from "perfecting" his self. While John, as mentioned, remains almost painfully ambiguous as to how man should proceed in quest of perfection, he nevertheless summons and relates three key terms, dignity, responsibility, and freedom, that he believes are essential components for inducing and sustaining the "perfection" of which he speaks.

a. Dignity

First, man must live and work in a dignified state of being. What is dignity? It is a mode of living that separates humankind from all other forms of life. Generally, to be dignified in any course of action is to have pride and respect in one's self. Specifically, it is to have the utmost confidence and enjoyment in one's ability and potential made manifest. Thus, dignity in

the workplace entails that the individual's "self" and "will" reflected in his actions are never subservient, never slave to another's. The assembly line worker who, for the past ten years screws on the same bolt to the same piece of machinery, exists unceasingly subjected to an imposed role, the constraints of which he/she is expected to perform within- dignity is compromised. The bank clerk who, for the last ten years has received funds, handed out funds, and has met 1000's of people on a strictly monetary basis, exists burdened by an extraneous command that he/she is to dutifully obey - dignity is compromised. There is absolutely no need to create and envision dismal work scenarios in order to demonstrate the overall absence of dignity that plagues a capitalist economic order. One need only acknowledge the fact that when an individual is hired, it is rarely a question of whether or not the job is right for the individual in the sense that the job conforms to the "self," to the "will" of the particular applicant; on the contrary, it is a matter of whether or not the individual fits the job description, whether or not the individual conforms to the "self," to the "will" of his potential employer.

b. Responsibility

This being the case, the initial step in reviving one's dignity is to first cultivate and nourish within one's self, as John says, a "sense of responsibility." Such responsibility is at first of an internal nature in that the individual becomes responsible unto his very "self." More precisely, the individual

becomes responsible unto his "self" existing through time as a human being. Hence, recognizing the fact that that which distinguishes the individual's "being" from the creature's "being" is one's "will," it is of necessity that one's "will" be acknowledged, asserted, and given priority if the distinction between the human and the animal is to prevail and endure over time. To clarify, the animal has no "will" to speak of, it is solely confined and subservient to the autonomous directives of instinct. In this regard, the makeup of the person is so special, so very unique in that it is the person and only the person who possesses the grand gift of "will." A "will" that, if allowed free expression, can lead to a degree of human fulfillment and ecstasy so rarely known. This is to say, more times than not, the inherent nature of the workplace geared to profit rather than the human condition, simply crushes the "will." Indeed, banished and discarded by the scheme of capitalism, the "will" is substituted for by a limiting, if not strangling job description that acts as capitalism's imposed, pseudo-instinctual chains. Truly, it is the imposed job description that profoundly alienates in full one's "self" from one's "will." In this light, John realized it to be of greatest import that one recognize, that one adopt a responsible attitude towards one's self that involves the affirmation of one's "will" and the dignity thereof. In short, one must admit to one's self that life is far from complete, far from fulfilled as long as conditions persist which seek to negate one's wholeness, deny one's fullness, refuse one's being inclusive of "will."

c. Freedom

From what has been said so far, it should be apparent that a fundamental precondition necessary for allowing one to be responsible for the dignity of his "will" is, as John says, "freedom of action." Crucial to note in this regard, is that John refuses to impose any restraints or limits on such freedom. In other words, not only does "freedom of action" apply to one's leisure time, it applies as well, and perhaps even more so since the statement is referring to economic matters, to the workplace. If this be the case, which indeed it seems, though not outrightly condemning the capitalist order, he nevertheless insists upon an economic structure that, by its nature, would accommodate such "freedom of action." A "freedom of action," most importantly, which is the only possible foundation upon which one can completely affirm his "will," and thus, be responsible to his "human dignity." Translated into practical terms, the inflexible, uncompromising workplace would no longer exist. Instead, the economy would be one capable of and designed to accommodate the "will" of humanity. By virtue of John's model of "perfection," the very essence of labor becomes radically transformed. The worker's will is enhanced and fulfilled as the type of labor undertaken is in complete accordance with the "will." If one desires to build, he is allowed; if one desires to fish, he is allowed; if one desires to write, he is allowed. Furthermore, no matter what form of labor an individual chooses to pursue, he is in no way condemned to that option as is the case today. but may vary his labor as and when he so desires. In short,

John envisages a society wherein humanity no longer exists to serve the operative socio-economic system, oblivious to its will, its true human "self." Instead, it is the system which is to serve humanity, allowing it the basic "dignity" of fulfilling its potential by ensuring that "will" and "action" function in harmony. Indeed, it is a society that, in all its facets, is founded upon the principles of "dignity," "responsibility," and "freedom." Principles that must prevail if humankind has any hope at all of dragging itself out of its present day mire of stagnant development, and onto the road leading to "perfection" as understood by John XXIII.

2. Marx's Alienation and John's Perfection- Similarity of Goal

Difference of Diagnosis

a. Similarity of Goal

While John elaborates upon a future social scheme, in particular, a scheme allowing humankind the ability to "perfect" itself, one finds Marx, rather than looking to the future per se, as focusing on the present situation. It is the circumstance of immediate reality towards which Marx specifically formulates and applies the term "alienation" to describe and explain the current predicament of humankind. Hence, while John examines the needs of humanity that have yet to be fulfilled, Marx, in a most concrete and objective fashion, scientifically analyzes present reality in order to ascertain the operative conditions which serve as an obstacle to such "perfection." Together, both terms, "alienation" and "perfection" complement one another in a most superb manner. Simply, alienation is reality minus

perfection, while perfection is reality minus alienation.

As far as their writings are concerned, the initial alliance of thought is found in their perceptions concerning what constitutes a just economic order. From John's point of view, as has been noted, no matter how equitable the distribution of wealth, that which finally decides the merits of any economic system is the degree to which perfection transpires, the degree to which dignity, responsibility, and freedom are left unhindered. Similarly, Marx writes on this matter stating:

A forcing-up of wages (disregarding all other difficulties, including the fact that it would only be by force, too, that the higher wages, being an anomaly, could be maintained) would therefore be nothing but better payment for the slave, and would not conquer either for the worker or for labor their human status and dignity.²⁹

Marx's condemnation of increased wages as the ultimate solution to the worker's socio-economic plight as well as his utter contempt of the great power, relative to the human being, granted unto money by the capitalist system is most evident in the following passages;

Indeed, even the equality of wages demanded by Proudhon only transforms the relationship of the present-day worker to his labour into the relationship of all men to labour. Society is then conceived as an abstract capitalist³⁰...Everything which the political economist takes from you in life and in humanity, he replaces for you in money and in wealth; and all the things which you cannot do, your money can do. It can eat and drink, go to the dance hall and the theater; it can travel, it can appropriate art, learning, the treasures

of the past, political power- all this it can appropriate for you- it can buy all this for you: it is the true endowment. Yet being all this, it is inclined to do nothing but create itself, buy itself; for everything else is after all its servant.³¹

From such explicit statements concerning the standard by which a socio-economic system is to be judged, it would appear that Marx envisages humankind as eventually achieving a similar level of "perfection"- dignity, responsibility, and freedom- as defined by John. And he does. Much in the way that John continues on to flesh out the specifics comprising a "just" economic order, the specifics of perfection, so too does Marx go on to speak of similar conditions that must prevail if the fulfillment of the worker is to be achieved. In this regard, the most potentially burdensome dimension of alienation that must be subdued involves the person's activity within the workplace as being foreign to his (the person's) desire, alien to his "will". Thus, it is only when "will" is consonant and in total accord with action, that man may fulfill, and indeed, perfect himself. In the quote to follow, the words of Marx, written more than a century ago (1844), incredibly echo and haunt the more contemporary writings of John.

First, the fact that labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his essential being; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He is at home when he is not working, and when he is working he is

not at home. His labour therefore is not voluntary, but coerced; it is forced labour. It is therefore not the satisfaction of a need; it is merely a means to satisfy needs external to it. Its alien character emerges clearly in the fact that as soon as no physical or other compulsion exists, labour is shunned like the plague. External labour, labour in which man alienates himself, is a labour of self sacrifice, of mortification. Lastly, the external character of labour for the worker appears in the fact that it is not his own, but someone else's, that it does not belong to him, that in it he belongs, not to himself, but to another.³²

In short, Marx is saying that the present relationship of the laborer to his actions within the workplace is experienced "as an alien activity not belonging to him; it is activity as suffering, strength as weakness....as an activity which is turned against him, neither depends on nor belongs to him."³³

In summarizing the common concern and hope shared by both John and Marx, Erich Fromm effectively puts forth the Johanine position of Marx saying:

The Soviet Union would not have been any more welcome to Marx than the private capitalist. He is not concerned primarily with the equalization of income. He is concerned with the liberation of man from a kind of work which destroys his individuality, which transforms him into a thing, and which makes him the slave of things....Marx was, and his criticism of capitalist society is directed not at its method of distributing income, but its mode of production, its destruction of individuality and its enslavement of man.³⁴

b. Difference of Diagnosis

With the various similarities accounted for, one notices a divergence of thought centering on the issue of why, in fact, the phenomenon of "alienation" continues to exist and successfully persist in obstructing the desired state of "perfection." In other words, why is alienation the social norm and not perfection? Starting with John, following in the well-trodden path of his predecessors, he first confirms the fact that the prevailing socio-economic system, capitalism, does indeed have its vices and flaws. However, according to John, such defects are nevertheless susceptible to methods of correction capable of being effected within the system itself. Thus, from John's perspective, the deficiencies of the capitalist order, in particular, alienation and its social consequences, are in no way inherent and insoluble defects of the system. In this regard, John goes so far as to reveal specific recommendations he believes will eradicate or at least considerably minimize the potency of alienation, and thereby allow humankind the great and deserved opportunity of "perfection."

Turning to the Marxist viewpoint, the "alienation" and lack of "perfection" so characteristic of his time as well as John's time, exist as necessary and inevitable by-products of the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, any remedy that is to practically and effectively dissipate humanity's subjugation to the alienating effects of capitalism, must undercut and subvert the entire capitalist structure, replacing it (capitalism) with a system (socialism) designed to function in

congruity with humanity's needs, including its need and right to perfect itself.

The proletariat seizes the public power, and by means of this transforms the socialized means of production, slipping from the hands of the bourgeoisie, into public property. By this act, the proletariat frees the means of production from the character of capital they have thus far borne, and gives their socialized character complete freedom to work itself out. Socialized production upon a predetermined plan becomes henceforth possible. The development of production makes the existence of different classes of society thenceforth an anachronism. In proportion as anarchy in social production vanishes, the political authority of the state dies out. Man, at last the master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time the lord over nature, his own master - free.³⁵

From earlier discussions concerning the capitalist system, it was demonstrated that such a system is constructed to respond, first and foremost, to the need of accumulation. Indeed, while changing external form and dimension through the years, its most basic and intrinsic nature, the nature of accumulation, has remained ever constant. Recognizing and establishing this fact through the study and analysis of the capitalist motif, Marx, unlike John, argued that it is virtually impossible to talk of such "perfection" as transpiring within the constraints of the capitalist network. Simply, by virtue of its inherent laws and tendencies, capitalism can serve but one master - itself, which it does and continues to do quite successfully by ensuring private ownership, competition, and the ability to

accumulate. In this context, all other social considerations, including humanity, are reduced and degraded to the lowly status of being a mere means to an end. More specifically, by capitalism adhering to the logic of accumulation, and hence, existing over time, the goals and objectives of humanity are confined, literally coerced to satiate the inhumane and barbaric appetite of the capitalist creature. In the end, by virtue of capitalism's inner essence, the human being cannot help but be beaten and transformed into nothing but, as Marx puts it, "a crippled monstrosity."

3. Flawed Reforms

As far as John's reforms are concerned, the end result, as has been noted, would ensure that capitalism's essence remains intact despite alterations to its outer appearance, most notably, in the form of the "worker/capitalist." This is to say, rather than facilitating the dignity, responsibility, and freedom sought by John for the worker, John merely elevates the status of the worker to that of an owner or co-owner. Hence, despite such elevation, the worker remains subjugated to the laws and tendencies of capitalist accumulation. Indeed, the worker/capitalist must invest his profits, his time, his efforts; in short, his very "self" in behalf of his industry in order that his product remain competitive, and thus, marketably viable. Where is the freedom, the responsibility, and the dignity associated with perfection? In this regard, Marx

realized it is simply not a matter of promoting the worker to the position of capitalist. Though the capitalist, admittedly, is materially more secure and has a less confining and more creative job description; nevertheless, he, the capitalist, exists not for his "self," but for a system of accumulation from which his duty and purpose is derived and assigned.

Instead of the worker/capitalist solution, the Marxist position contends that to effectively correct the socio-economic flaws of capitalist society, in particular, "alienation," the very core, the very being of the system must be cut out in full, removed and replaced. More specifically, the objective of accumulation which exists as the very heart of the present socio-economic system, must be banished and superseded by a new objective stressing human welfare. On the basis of earlier discussions concerning the predominance of the economic sector in relation to society as a whole, this new economic priority emphasizing humanity would, like the seed to be sown, determine and ensure that all social institutions, political and ideological, would have as their immediate and uncompromising concern the continual fulfillment of the human condition, the continual perfection of each and every human being. In practical terms, this translates into the competitive system of capitalism being supplanted by a type of cooperative socialism designed to ensure that all one's survival needs, food, clothing, shelter and health care, are instantly and perpetually met. Thus, because

the necessities of life are now guaranteed, instead of one's life and existence being motivated by the primal need to secure the means of subsistence, one may now engage in activity and labor that is true to one's "self," that is part of one's "will." To summarize the Marxist position, it is possible for humankind to achieve the "perfection" that both John and Marx so deeply desired, only if contemporary society undergoes a total overhaul and renovation. Moreover, the very key to such all-encompassing change would involve the complete disbandment of the socio-economic laws defining capitalism, in favor of those laws committed to cultivating and nourishing the truly human values of dignity, responsibility, and freedom - perfection itself.

IMPERIALISM - IGNORANCE OF DIAGNOSIS AND REALITY

1. Imperialism Reviewed

As the last chapter dealt in detail with the role and purpose of imperialism, let it be briefly stated here that the primary intent of imperialism is to create an international circumstance in which the economic infrastructure of the periphery Third World is extraneously manipulated and coerced into serving and maintaining the well-being and dominant status of the developed, capitalist world. Whether the exploited country be used as a market dump, a source of cheap labor, or as a reserve of raw materials, the end result is that it is used - not by and for itself, but by and for another. Thus, despite

all the rhetoric of "beneficial assistance" spewed forth by the developed world, the interaction of the "rich lands" with the "poor lands," as John himself hinted at, has tended to exacerbate the dichotomy, making the development gap even more pronounced. In short, far from seeking to assist the dispossessed areas with which it involves itself, the developed world seeks only to fortify and strengthen its own economic prowess and influence both at home and abroad. In this light, such manipulative interaction can only be seen as actively and directly contributing to the very process of "under" development.

2. Flawed Diagnosis

As noted, while mentioning and warning against any international agreements involving stipulations of a colonial type, John remains ignorant of the inherent laws of capitalism which inevitably necessitate imperialism. Following a firmly entrenched papal line, John simply fails to correctly and critically discern the operative tendencies of capitalist expansionism and the coinciding social effects such tendencies facilitate. In this regard, there is positively no excuse for John, or anyone for that matter commentating on international relations, to remain so very unaware of the economic underpinnings motivating such relations. John should have realized and overtly condemned any interaction between the capitalist world and the ever vulnerable periphery. For it is beyond the definition,

and hence, capacity of the capitalist state to ever generate relations of mutual benefit and equity with those areas plagued by economic backwardness. Indeed, if states utterly dependent on capitalist regimes were left isolated and unscathed from imperialist intent, a self-sufficient, community orientated economy would have undoubtedly emerged and endured. In fact, when the imperialist states restricted their economic contact with much of the Third World during the Depression and World Wars, it has been noted that numerous underdeveloped economies, particularly in Latin America, successfully initiated the beginnings of import-substitution programs (programs stressing economic independence and self sufficiency) that featured the creation of an indigenous industrial sector.³⁶

3. Specifics not Cited

John's delinquency extends far beyond his failure to adequately analyze the laws dictating capitalist expansionism and the exploitative ^{effects} thereof. Included as well is his failure to vehemently condemn specific imperialist techniques operative at his own time. Techniques well on their way to wreaking socio-economic chaos ^{upon} the underdeveloped world. Indeed, while he sedates his warnings against attempts of "colonialism" using vague generalizations, that is all he does. This is to say, John remains aloof, seemingly afraid to specifically take on and condemn blatant instances of imperialism that were, during and around the time of his pontificate, greatly in evidence. Social critic Gus Hall summarizes the economic wounds inflicted upon Latin America by imperialist predation at this time

stating:

These corporations take out from Latin America five times the rate of profit they get from their investments in Western Europe. In 1960, U.S. corporations invested 267 million dollars in Latin America. But during the same years they took out 641 million dollars. The oil sold at the port of export in Venezuela gets 800 million in oil tax, and this is more than most nations get.³⁷

The control of Venezuela's profitable oil lands reflects the imperialist trend throughout the region. In 1964, Venezuela's oil industry was controlled as follows: 73.9% was dominated by U.S. corporations, 25.4% by the British and Dutch, and a pathetic 0.7% by Venezuela. In 1963 it was estimated that U.S. control of copper production in Chile involved 90% of the entire industry, and thus, 75% of Chile's entire copper based economy.³⁸ Moreover, the exorbitant profits garnered throughout Latin America by imperialist institutions are rarely invested back into the Latin economy, but are channeled to imperialist centers for future consideration. Truly, this catering to the international economy at the expense of its own has not only precluded the possibility of development in Latin America, but has ensured a continued "backwardness and stagnation, a depletion of resources, and the prevalence of great economic injustice. We might consider this Latin America's "aid" to U.S. corporate development."³⁹

To conclude, while John does warn against the dangers involved in the developed world's manipulation of international relations, he remains far too distant from the immediate problem

and its cause. Such distance is readily verified by both his failure to condemn the numerous instances of western imperialism, as well as in his failure to grasp, understand, and write from an enlightened **comprehension** of capitalism's intrinsic laws and tendencies. This point cannot be stated enough. For it is precisely these immutable economic tenets that necessitate imperialism and its devastating socio-economic effects to be an inevitable, and indeed, destined consequence of capitalist development.

LIBERATION THEOLOGY

1. Participation of the Masses

Though a relatively brief and painfully vague passage in his commentary on Third World affairs, John's insistence that the populus of those regions afflicted by the scourge of underdevelopment learn to help themselves by directly participating in the quest for social and economic reform, exists as a most significant milestone in papal thought. For it is by virtue of such a declaration that John officially bestows upon the people of Latin America, a citizenry that amounts to half the entire Catholic population, a most innovative, and indeed, potent alternative of action. This is to say, preceding his message, Catholic social teaching maintained that the Third World poor, in regards to reform or any other facet of their lives, remain tolerant and passively obedient to the civil order. As far as the Church was concerned, it was the rich,

subscribing to Christian principles of charity and Justice, who were solely responsible for promoting and fostering the relief necessary for alleviating the poor's plight. In a word, traditional teaching clearly advocated that socio-economic justice should come from above. The poor were to remain idle, allowing the socio-economic conditions determining their very lives, their very destinies, to be manipulated and structured by sources utterly apart and foreign to themselves, and most crucial to note, utterly foreign to their interests and needs.

2. Functionalism and the Ultimate Failure of Traditional Teaching

With the poor now included in the process of their own temporal redemption, the question arises as to what specific role is the victim to assume, what specific actions and tactics are considered legitimate in the process of liberating one's self from the chains of injustice and despair. According to the Vatican, such actions and tactics are to be conducted within the constraints of Church social teaching as expressed, for instance, by Leo XIII stating:

And if any time the power of the state is rashly and tyrannically wielded by princes, the teaching of the Catholic Church does not allow insurrection...lest public order be only the more disturbed, and lest society take the greater hurt therefrom.⁴⁰

In this light, change must be facilitated within the boundaries of the existing system. Violence is relegated as an option that, under no circumstance, should be tolerated or even considered. According to the Vatican, therefore, the dispossessed

are to work and organize themselves and their efforts from a "functionalist" perspective. A functionalist perspective that interprets the organization of the social structure, society in general, as being an organic body comprised of multiple and dependent parts. Such interdependent parts, moreover, are naturally designed and destined to function in harmonious accord with one another. As far as classes are concerned, the functionalist orientation necessarily legitimizes the coinciding existence of the "haves" and "have nots." Furthermore, while Catholic social teaching does not condone the great economic disparities separating the classes, such disparities are understood to be but a virus, a temporary illness whose origin is utterly foreign to the "organic social body," and thus, with the enactment of proper remedies and solutions can be alleviated and brought under control. In this regard, as the popes have consistently suggested, such "illness" stems from an "individual" greed that can be mitigated or at least counterbalanced through governmental programs designed to guarantee a more equitable distribution of goods.

a. Liberation Theology

Presently in Latin America, the functionalist orientation is not the only frame of reference utilized to develop a world view. In fact, the Church in Latin America has itself, over the last two decades, begun to adopt the "conflict/Marxist" perspective as a means for ^{explaining} the world, in particular, Third World deprivation. Indeed, it would appear obvious that the decision to no longer patronize the functionalist explanation is its (functionalism's) inability to account for the current

socio-economic dilemma as well as its utter failure to prescribe effective, and thus, meaningful solutions for such a dilemma.

Immediately upon accepting the legitimacy of the conflict perspective, one is aware that the present situation in Latin America has its very roots in the Spanish imperialism (mercantilism) of the 1500s. A system of imperialism which, despite the changing of imperialist marauders and the resources to be exploited, has remained virtually intact to this very day. In this light, assuming the validity inherent to and interpreting the world from the vantage of understanding offered by the conflict model, the "haves" and "have nots" are revealed as distinct classes with distinct, and indeed, conflicting interests. To clarify, the "haves" are at last recognized for who and what they are at their most basic and essential level. The "haves" are not just the wealthy per se. While wealth may be a characteristic of the "haves;" nevertheless, the fundamental denominator responsible for determining the "haves" existence and their every motivation involves the fact that they are indelibly associated with the means of production. Therefore, the "haves" consist of foreign imperialist interests as well as the owners of various plantations, mining operations and refineries operating within the region. In this sense, the ranks of the "haves" include as well the political leaders of these countries in which imperialism runs rampant. Truly, as has been shown, the so-called leader's very position and status within society depends wholly on imperialist armaments and military support which, in exchange for ^{which,} these hand picked puppets repress and subjugate the masses, ensuring their vulnerability to imperialist methods.

In contrast, the "have nots" are all those who are excluded from the benefits of owning or being intimately associated with the means of production. Simply, the "have nots" are the most visibly exploited. Their miserable and downtrodden lives exist as the very key, the very window through which the inherent essence of the imperialist system is made bare for all to see, for all to know, and for all to condemn. It is a system whose essence is of accumulation, and thus, is totally void of human concern - a fact, the qualitative existence of the dispossessed is testimony to.

b. System versus Individual

The pivotal concept in the conflict model is that of "system." For it is the notion of system that completely separates the "functionalist" from the "conflict" approach. To explain, the official Catholic (functionalist) position ignores the idea of an objective "system," capitalism, which, by virtue of its competitive laws, desecrates humanity while fulfilling its objective of accumulation. Instead, Vatican teaching focuses on "individual" greed, "individual" interests as being the source of the poor's plight. In short, the traditional Catholic approach sees the part (the individual), but in the process, fails to perceive the all-encompassing mechanism (the system) which wholly defines and manipulates the part. In comparison, the conflict perspective is "system" orientated. This is to say, it recognizes capitalism as operating on a foundation of intrinsic laws and objectives that are wholly transcendent from

human motivations, needs and interests. Thus, the suffering of the "have nots" is an inevitable consequence of imperialist accumulation - imperialist accumulation as part and parcel of capitalist evolution. Moreover, and a point often overlooked, is the fact that the position and action of the "haves," capitalists, managers, and political leaders, are likewise determined by the capitalist network. Their decisions and motivations are wholly contingent upon the needs and requirements leading to effective accumulation. Thus, the greed ridden and inhumane policies enacted and implemented by the "haves" are not so much a reflection of their individual natures, as they are a requirement of the capitalist/imperialist system. Simply, the capitalist who fails to implement those policies best suited for accumulation - lower wages, longer hours, fewer safety features - will be competitively undercut by those who do, and thus, will cease to exist in an economically viable sense. Therefore, important to note from the conflict perspective is that the capitalist structure is all-pervading, all-transcending in the ultimate sense that each and every person operating within the system, the "haves" and "have nots," operate within its constraints, within its objective of accumulation. The system of capitalism exists to be served, and as such, demands the absolute subordination of human dignity, responsibility, and freedom. Understood in this way, humankind has yet to live, has yet to experience the humanity that it is, the "perfection" that has been denied since eternity.

3. Liberation Theology and the Proper Diagnosis

Truly, it is the conflict perspective that is gaining momentum throughout Latin America. Commonly referred to as "liberation theology," the Church has openly cast its lot with the poor, supporting the poor in their attempts to "liberate" both the "exploiters" and "exploited" from their capitalist imposed roles of oppressor and oppressed. Proposing and carrying forth a major break with traditional Catholic thought, the proponents of liberation theology accept as valid the Marxist/conflict interpretation of social reality. Indeed, the liberation theologian has recognized the weakness and meaninglessness of traditional Catholic Third World social teaching as stemming from a most fundamental ignorance regarding the very origins of Third World deprivation. According to liberation theology, the economic structure of capitalism, in particular, imperialism and its inherent social tendencies of human exploitation, can only be regarded as "sinful." In this light, the traditional appeal for peace and stability in Latin America is inevitably regarded by liberation theology as a direct condoning of an "evil" system. For it is exactly peace and stability that is required by the system in order to function most effectively. It is a peace and stability that, rather than associated with a society of justice and charity, exists as an integral component allowing the imperialist network to reign supreme. Therefore, rather than perpetuating a system of sin by acquiescing to papal appeals for social obedience, liberation theology subscribes to a method of action that directly confronts and

seeks to abolish the very essence of the system, and thus, the system itself. To clarify, if Christian justice and equity are to ever be established, liberation theology, operating from the vantage of Marxist theory, acknowledges the fact that the laws and tendencies of capitalism, the need and priority of constant accumulation over and against all other considerations, including humanity, must be wholly eradicated and removed. Furthermore, in their place must be erected social mandates echoing human dignity and respect, such that all of society's economic, political, and ideological trappings will exist of and for the benefit of the community of persons.

Liberation theology, utilizing John XXIII's directive that the dispossessed must participate in their economic and social renewal, has condoned the mobilization of the masses in their attempt to stifle the sins of capitalism, to recover their dignity as Sons of God, to make temporal history the starting point of God's Kingdom. Often times such mobilization has involved social disruption including violence. It is at this point, when social disruption is involved, that liberation theology decisively breaks from John's directive sanctioning popular participation. For John and his functionalist outlook, social disruption, especially violence, exists as the greatest and most dreaded of evils, threatening the supposed oneness and integrity that John perceives to be the heart of society. In contrast, the liberation perspective construes violence to be, at times, the only hope, the only effective means of subverting and cleansing

capitalist sin, clearing the way for an alternative society founded on Christian justice and human dignity. Judging by the popular response to the two alternatives, traditional and liberation, it is the diagnosis and prescription offered by the new, and indeed, radical theology that the people of the Latin continent have adopted as being in their best interest. This is easily understood considering the fact that the traditional position had been voiced for centuries in Latin America with absolutely no lasting or conclusive results. In this context, it would appear that liberation theology has reinvigorated a humanly irrelevant Church, making it meaningful and extremely viable for half the world's Catholics.

To conclude, one might say the emergence of liberation theology is an evolution and, in fact, advancement of Catholic thought founded upon enlightenment. Liberation theology shuns the ignorance of the past and desires an understanding of the present reality. An understanding that exists so exceedingly necessary if the stand taken by the Church, and the policies formulated on the basis of such a stand, are to be meaningful and effective. In this regard, liberation theology is not afraid to objectively analyze and appropriate into its program the insightful economic prognosis of Marx. Such fearlessness is testimony to its (liberation theology's) strength of faith and its dedication to doing the works of God. Likewise, liberation theology refuses to censor the works of Marx on grounds of his self-professed atheism. If anything, the emergence of

liberation theology can only be seen as a rational Catholic response to Marx's severe criticisms of the Church. Criticisms that had and still have great basis in fact. For centuries, particularly in Latin America, the Church has been associated and identified with the entrenched interests of those in power. Even today, the traditional call for peace exists to the sole advantage of the present situation and its framework of exploitation. In this way, is not the Church acting as the opiate of the people, securing and preserving a socio-economic structure of sin? To this predicament liberation theology brings the cleansing truth of prophetic criticism. Differing from the traditionalist viewpoint, the liberation theologian does not believe a thorough and complete study of economic matters is beneath him, extraneous to concerns more spiritual in nature. If anything, the liberation adherent recognizes that the spiritual and material are intimately associated. Moreover, such association generally presupposes that the spiritual is, in fact, exceedingly dependent on the material. Truly, for the majority of persons to reflect, contemplate, and live their lives according to those values deemed spiritual, it is mandatory that their material lack first be met. Certainly, it is easier and in some cases only possible to think of things heavenly, to contemplate the state of one's soul, when one's material being is free from hunger, free from nakedness, free from disease, free from physical and mental persecution, free from everything and anything that actively encourages and promotes one's non-existence.

For the liberation theologian, therefore, *being* free spiritually may be enhanced by being free physically. And to be free physically is to first understand with precision, those economic laws that wholly determine and decide one's physical circumstance. In the course of its study, liberation theology has concluded that the hope of the oppressed and downtrodden lies in a change of economic systems. The ultimate goal *is* to replace the physically and spiritually condemning evil and misery accompanying the advance of imperialist capitalism, with an economy of cooperation, an economy of humanism rationally designed to serve a worldwide community of persons by making manifest the love and justice of God. Indeed, such a redeeming, liberating, and loving development would serve as the very foundation of God's promised Kingdom on Earth, as the final and only adequate response to the prophet's ageless cry:

I hate, I despise your feasts,
and I take no delight in your
solemn assemblies.

Even though you offer me your
burnt offerings and cereal
offerings, I will not accept
them, and the peace offerings of
your fatted beasts
I will not look upon.

Take away from me the noise of
your songs;
to the melody of your harps I will
not listen.

But let justice roll down like waters,
and righteousness like an
ever-flowing stream.

(Amos 5:21-24)

CONCLUSION

What exists as perhaps the highlight of all papal social teaching is John XXIII's definition of a just economic order. Unlike his predecessors and, as shall be seen, those who follow, John perceives the term "economic justice" to involve much more than the adequate remuneration for labor done. Writing at a time of prosperity and great expectations, John felt it appropriate that humanity challenge the age, demanding from it the intended goal and purpose of human history, complete and total freedom from the environment. Freedom to ensure that the dignity and responsibility of one's will would no longer be bent and distorted by a compulsion of having to work out of necessity, but would, in fact, align the will to the action performed. In this way labor would no longer represent alienating drudgery done for the primal sake of survival. Labor would become joy, an honest expression of man's will made manifest. Humanity would at last be capable of living, of expressing itself for the first time as a wholeness, as will and desire in perfect accord. This for John, humanity's capacity to experience and express dignity, responsibility, and freedom, to, in fact, perfect itself, constituted the only foundation upon which a truly just economic order could be built.

As noted, it is this notion of "perfection" as conceived by John which resembles in detail the ultimate hope of Marx, the conquest of alienation in all its forms, in particular, the alienation of activity from will. As further noted, this mutual desire of both men represents the extent of their agreement.

Indeed, the fundamental and irreconcilable conflict of opinion dictating that their respective diagnoses and prescriptions stand in stark contrast, involves their interpretation of socio-economic reality. As made clear in John's discourse, capitalism exists for him, as it had for Leo XIII and Pius XI, as a legitimate given. Though admittedly flawed and morally inconsistent, the principle of capitalism, the right of private ownership, is proclaimed by John as valid and in need^{only} of reforming adjustments capable of being implemented within the boundaries of the system itself. From the Marxist standpoint, such reform shall meet with assured failure (i.e. the worker/capitalist). Arguing from the basis of historical materialism, Marxism scoffs at the papal tendency to grant unto the capitalist order a heavenly ordained permanence and essentiality. If history teaches us anything, it conveys the reality that socio-economic systems exist in a manner that is far from static, far from stable, far from enduring. History is only properly understood when it is defined in terms of humanity's perpetual quest to tame an unmediated environment, to achieve freedom from its confining grasp and to eventually create a world conducive to "perfection." Such quest has at the center of its being the perpetual development of the forces of production. Every socio-economic period, whether it be slavery, feudalism, or capitalism, represents an advance in terms of human freedom relative to its predecessor. In this light, capitalism exists as an essential yet temporary stage destined to evolve and actualize itself as the relations to the means of production necessarily adjust, allowing and

later prohibiting the proper development of the productive forces. To clarify, as described in chapter two, each economic system features unique relations to the forces of production - slave/master, serf/lord, worker/capitalist. The specifics defining the particular relations permit the forces of production to develop to a certain extent. This extent is reached when the entrenched relations of production begin to inhibit the continued advancement of the productive forces. Such stagnation inevitably precipitates the emergence of novel productive relations that eventually, through outbreaks of spontaneous violence, smash and replace the defunct order. These new relations, in turn, unleash and encourage the productive forces until they too (the relations) become obsolete and a hindrance to the forces' continued development. The Marxist position views the present age as being on the eve of transition, the contradictions it has fostered demanding immediate resolution. For example, the insane desire to waste horrifying amounts of resources on technology of destruction while neglecting technology capable of feeding an impoverished world, has its roots in capitalist/imperialist preservation. A preservation, moreover, founded on the most fundamental capitalist principle, the sanctity of private property.

In light of the above, the Marxist position cites the Church, by virtue of its functionalist approach, as identifying itself, as casting its lot with the entrenched interests and thereby defending as permanent a socio-economic system that, in reality, exists as but a transient stage preceding and leading to humanity's long awaited encounter with absolute freedom, with "perfection."

Apparently oblivious to the whole socio-economic ebb and flow of history, the Church seems intent on committing its recurring error of isolating itself, engrossing itself in a specific and fleeting moment of time. Whether it be the age of slavery, feudalism, or capitalism, the Church has, at one time or another, condoned all three economic systems, claiming them to be morally acceptable and ordained by God. In this way, the Church has tragically failed to perceive the purpose and goal of each system - why it was/is caused, how it was/is to contribute, and what was/is to evolve from it.

In today's world, such an anti-historical state of mind is most lethal. Recognizing the deadly power the forces of resistance, the U.S. and U.S.S.R., are capable of summoning forth in opposing the forces of progression, human liberation, it is crucial that the Church avoid identifying itself with, and thus, temporarily bolstering a failing and ever repressive opposition. Instead, it must actively seek to avoid catastrophic violence by representing the humanity it is the supposed guardian of. It must understand the linear and inevitable movement of history. It must comprehend socio-economic evolution as natural, and indeed, good. In this regard, the Church must seek to encourage such evolution to proceed peacefully, to unfold on the basis of understanding^a, rationality, and practical intelligence. In this way, perhaps the Church can prevent the violence that has accompanied all preceding socio-economic transitions. In lieu of today's arsenals, it is really not even a matter of whether

the Church can or will help - simply, it must help. It must help if we are to survive the coming passage. This point cannot be stated enough. Truly, the Church must participate in a dynamically human way if we are to ever overcome the "alienation" condemned by Marx, and achieve the state of "perfection" called forth by John XXIII and deemed essential for all the children of God..

CHAPTER V — JOHN PAUL II, 1981

INTRODUCTION1. Changed Conditions

In the twenty years following John XXIII's discourse, Christianity and Social Progress, the political and socio-economic affairs of western civilization have undergone relentless deterioration. Looking at the political arena, all too frequently political hotspots have come to a head in numerous Third World regions. Indeed, the entire globe has begun to take on the dimensions of a chess board upon which the superpowers engage in the unceasing struggle of politically fortifying their respective "spheres of influence" as well as maintaining if not instigating actual political insurrection within the other's periphery, the other's "sphere of influence." In a work, the twenty years following Christianity and Social Progress are marked by an unprecedented amount of, so to speak, specific political disruption and manipulation.

For instance, as far as the United States is concerned, the more notable tarnish on its record includes the occupation of Vietnam, the invasion of the Dominican Republic, the CIA inspired coup in Chile, as well as the more recent and ever blatant disregard of the political autonomy and human dignity of the peoples in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Philippines. Turning to the Soviets, one finds a record of similar atrocity. The 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia, the continued intolerance of the solidarity movement in Poland, the "limited" warfare raging in Afghanistan, the unrelenting persecution and oppression

of both the nationalist movements within the Soviet state itself, as well as the indigenous religious minorities, in particular, the Jews, struggling to spiritually exist, all serve as testimony to the fact that the instigation, method, and end result of contemporary Soviet foreign (and domestic) policy is very much akin to its American counterpart.

Closely associated with the process of strengthening their respective global hegemony, the twenty years since 1961 are further distinguished by a virtually unhindered and persistent increase in political tension amongst the superpowers themselves. Such tension, moreover, has given birth to a reality that functions as the nightmare of all humanity. Being referred to here, of course, is the ever deadly arms race and the prominence of the military industrial complex, both of which have and continue to grow by leaps and bounds in terms of the technology developed and the resources allocated.

Turning to the issue of socio-economic deterioration, one must first state that such deterioration is without question a partial result of the above mentioned political deterioration. This is to say, any time a government, the United States for instance, tailors its budget at a time of spending cuts so as to guarantee an annual increase in defense expenditures, it takes no great act of deduction to realize that that which is sacrificed is the social. Hence, proportionate to the increase in military spending, is the decrease in social spending. Furthermore, a direct and potent consequence stemming from such a decrease or total absence of social programs such as welfare,

family subsidies, medicare, disability and old age pensions,
is the concomitant decrease and absence of buying power.
In this regard, among the consumer industries, such decrease
and absence translates into a general production slow down, and
thus, a competitive squeeze for profits. As far as labor is
concerned, the above predicament has rendered wages and labor
benefits to be increasingly vulnerable to capitalist attack as
industries desperately try to cut back on costs in order to
remain competitive. Likewise, the principle of employment it-
self in the form of job security has become a most precarious
entity as many industries have uprooted and moved their bases
of operation to areas in the U.S. and throughout the world
where unions have yet to be established or have yet to achieve
a level of effective maturation.

To summarize, throughout the West in the last twenty years
the persisting trend of military priority in the form of unpara-
lleled rates of military spending coupled with the disbandment
of integral social assistance, has resulted in an economic
phenomenon unique unto itself. A phenomenon featuring a series
of periodic industrial recessions accompanied by high inflation
rates as well as substantial unemployment. Economists note that
in times past most economic dilemmas featured either great un-
employment or great inflation, but never, as is the case today,
the two symptoms co-existing. In this regard, economists attri-
bute this, if you will, dual predicament to the simple fact that
despite an overall increase in government spending, because
such spending is disproportionately channeled into the military

sector as opposed to the social, the impact of such monetary appropriations fails to exert any economically positive and viable effects on consumer industries.

2. Back to the Basics- Perfection Dismissed

In this light, by 1980, the economic and political optimism that typified the 50's and early 60's was strictly a thing of the past. Indeed, optimism was replaced by the intimate association of both economic and political realities of a most urgent kind. As far as papal social teaching is concerned, the theme of John Paul II's On Human Labor/Laborem Exercens, reflects this urgency in full. To clarify, by virtue of the historical period from which it emerged, On Human Labor signifies a return to the basics, to the fundamental and core demands of Catholic social teaching as earlier formulated, in particular, by Pius XI in regards to the "Common Good." Hence, the appeal put forth by John Paul II centers on the necessity that all economic activity have as its common objective the good of humanity. Simply put, the human dignity that is labor should be given priority over all other components (e.g. capital) involved in the economic order. In stating his argument, one immediately notices a refreshing economic sophistication of thought and awareness that Pius lacked. A sophistication that in all probability is attributable to John Paul's former experiences as a factory worker in Poland who was undoubtedly exposed to a Marxist analysis of capitalist mechanics. In this regard, in his discussion of labor vis-à-vis capital and of "socialization"

in which he refuses to condone the ownership of private property as being an "exclusive" and "untouchable" right, John Paul shows himself to be greatly indebted to the thought of Marx. However, just as crucial to note is the fact that such indebtedness is specifically confined to the symptoms of capitalist exploitation. This is to say, despite concurring with Marx as to the methods employed by the capitalist in the manipulation of labor, John Paul nevertheless aligns himself with the thought of Pius XI as to the exact cause, the fundamental reason why such exploitative techniques are, in fact, implemented. In this regard, while Marx emphasized the concept of objective economic laws, John Paul focuses on the subjective, "greedy" nature of the individual, in particular, the individual capitalist. This relation between John Paul and Marx shall of necessity be talked of later.

Another relation deserving attention concerns the thought of John Paul and John XXIII regarding economic justice. Despite the fact that John Paul makes notable strides in his analysis of capitalist production in terms of recognizing the critical association of labor and capital, his going "back to the basics" necessitates the dismissal of John XXIII's call for "perfection". With the onslaught of hard times, the cries for employment and decent wages began to take precedence. Such precedence, in turn, inevitably relegated the idea of "perfection" to stand-by status, forcing it to wait for another chance, another time when society is at last economically proficient, regulated in a manner capable of fulfilling humanity's sustenance needs. Truly, such proficiency exists as an essential prerequisite of any society wishing

to make manifest the ideal of "perfection" as sensitively understood and defined by John XXIII.

With this much said, the following analysis of John Paul II's On Human Labor, shall proceed in two parts. The first part shall objectively present and elucidate John Paul's reasoning concerning the rights of labor in the workplace, as well as discuss, in greater detail, the noticeable absence of "perfection" in John Paul's definition of a just economic order. The second part shall critique the objective presentation by first paying particular attention to a topic addressed in earlier chapters, the recurring issue of the "individual" versus "systematic" instigation of capitalist reality and the social effects thereof.

THE PRIORITY OF LABOR

In examining John Paul's discourse concerning the rights to be accorded labor, or better still, in presenting an evolved and more coherent restatement of Pius XI's call for the "common good" the paper shall involve itself with what appears to be three central themes comprising John Paul's thought: 1) defining the inherent essence of labor and the priority thereof; 2) John Paul's brand of "socialization;" 3) "economism" and "collectivism" as dangerous extremes.

1. Labor and the Priority Thereof: Objective versus Subjective

a. Objective Labor

John Paul initiates his discourse stating that "work" exists as an

entity

possessing two dimensions, two unique and distinct

yet interrelated facets. One he labels "objective" labor. Objective labor simply refers to the means of production, the implements utilized by labor in the processing of commodities. Whether it be the natural resources of the earth, the machinery used in extracting such resources, or the tools needed for fashioning materials into the commodities desired, the common denominator giving unity to the means of production, or as John Paul also calls it, capital, is the fact that it is subject to humanity, made to satisfy its needs.

Since the concept of capital includes not only the natural resources placed at man's disposal, but also the whole collection of means by which man appropriates natural resources and transforms them in accordance with his needs (and thus in a sense humanizes them), it must immediately be noted that all these means are the result of the historical heritage of human labor.¹

b. Subjective Labor

Co-existing with the objective side of the labor process, is the subjective. By subjective, John Paul is of course referring to the living, breathing, conscious participants in the production process- humanity itself. Once the initial distinction is made, John Paul immediately asserts the primacy of the subjective, labor, over the objective, capital, on the grounds of logical dependency and differing natures. To begin, labor is superior to capital simply because capital owes its very existence, its reason for being to the humanity of labor. It is humanity which conceives, creates, and manipulates capital

in order to fulfill its (humanity's) needs. Obviously, if this be the case, if all that exists objectively is, in the first place, contingent, in terms of its very being, on the subjective, on humankind which creates it giving it form and purpose, it is inevitable that one acknowledge the fact that subjective labor exists as the crux, the very foundation upon which the entire capitalist system rests and depends. John Paul writes:

This gigantic and powerful instrument - the whole collection of means of production that in a sense are considered synonymous with "capital" - is the result of work and bears the signs of human labor... Obviously it remains clear that every human being sharing in the production process, even if he or she is only doing the kind of work for which no special training or qualifications are required, is the real efficient subject in this production process, while the whole collection of instruments, no matter how perfect they may be in themselves, are only a mere instrument subordinate to human labor.²

Besides empirical reasons giving credence to the primacy of labor vis-à-vis capital, John Paul claims that the superior status of labor in the workplace is sanctioned as well metaphysically. This is to say, because man exists as man, in the likeness of God, he is called forth by God to assert himself, to rationally appropriate the earth for his use. As far as the factory is concerned, regardless of its objective nature, its objective mode of operations, humankind's foremost duty is to use such operations for its own benefit.

Man has to subdue the earth and dominate, because as the "image of God" he is a person, that is to say, a subjective being capable of acting in a planned and rational way...As a person, man is therefore the subject of work. As a person he works; he performs various actions belonging to the work process. Independently of their objective content, these actions must all serve to realize his humanity, to fulfill the calling to be a person that is his by reason of his very humanity ...Understood as a process whereby man and the human race subdue the earth, work corresponds to this basic biblical concept only when throughout the process man manifests himself as the one who "dominates."³

In short, the qualitative difference between the objective and subjective components of the labor process necessitates that the "subjective," the "subject," "man," should exist and work not for the "objective," the "object," "capital," but for his very self.

c. Capital's Natural Subservience Ignored

With the proper hierarchy of the workplace established, John Paul wastes little time in voicing his criticism that contemporary capitalism generally fails to comply with such ordained norms. Moreover, it is a criticism he admirably refuses to cloak in abstractions and confused terminology. This point should not be underestimated. For of all the popes studied so far, John Paul comes right to the quick, demonstrating a concreteness of language that can only and indeed does contribute meaning and relevance to his argument. To start, John Paul states that it is the particular method in which labor and

capital interact with one another that determines the operative as well as existential nature of the capitalist system. In this light, according to John Paul, the moral sanctity, the legitimacy of an economic order, in particular, capitalism, is fully dependent upon the manner in which the "subjective" and "objective" components of capitalism, labor and capital, are brought together and immersed with one another. In this regard, John Paul condemns the prevailing conditions responsible for determining if not coercing the particular type of interaction presently featured between labor and capital. John Paul contends that such interaction is wholly influenced by the capitalist desire to "objectify" the entire economic process. In other words, the capitalist appears intent on smothering the priority of labor by relegating labor to the subservient status rightly accorded to capital, the means of production. Hence, labor is rendered as nothing but an appendage of the production process, existing merely to, first and foremost, serve capital and the accumulation process as a whole.

The conflict originated in the fact that the workers put their powers at the disposal of the entrepreneurs, and these, following the principle of maximum profit, tried to establish the lowest possible wages for the work done by the employees. In addition there were other elements of exploitation connected with the lack of safeguards regarding the health and living conditions of the workers and their families.⁴

In this light, John Paul admits that there exists the reality of conflict between capital and labor. A conflict whose locus resides in the failure of an economic order to meaningfully

recognize and address within the economic structure itself, within the mode of production itself, the dignity and priority that is labor - a priority that demands the existence of those fundamental rights presently ignored or in constant peril of being drastically curtailed.

it should be recognized that the error of early capitalism can be repeated wherever man is in a way treated on the same level as the whole complex of the material means of production, as an instrument and not in accordance with the true dignity of his work - that is to say, where he is not treated as subject and maker, and for this very reason as the true purpose of the whole process of production.⁵

d. Making Amends

With this said, it becomes a simple thing to understand John Paul's method of rectification. It is strictly a matter of logic. To begin, in the above discussion it was pointed out how the objective aspect of the economy, capital, is wholly dependent for its existence and purpose on labor. Thought of in this way, capital exists extremely dependent on labor, and as such, should never be utilized or tolerated in a manner harmful to the condition of its maker, labor. On the contrary, capital should remain forever subservient to the needs of labor, such that the use of capital can only be considered legitimate when it operates within the parameters of such subservience. Accordingly, John Paul petitions for the unconditional establishment of labor's priority in the workplace.

We must emphasize and give prominence to the primacy of man in the production process, the primacy of man

over things. Everything contained in the concept of capital in the strict sense is only a collection of things. Man, as the subject of work and independent of the work he does - man alone is a person.⁶

The particulars of the social program John Paul seeks to initiate for ensuring labor's priority, shall be discussed in detail a bit later in the section dealing with John Paul's call for socialization.

e. Origin of Conflict - Individual Instigation

At this point, the question to be asked concerns John Paul's understanding of the origin of the present day conflict. This is to say, what, in fact, presupposes the conflict's existence in the first place? Following the thought established by his predecessors, John Paul makes it perfectly clear that the roots of the conflict reside in the "individual" motivation of those possessing capital, and thus, manipulating their capital into the unnatural position of dominance relative to labor. He writes:

Opposition between labor and capital does not spring from the structure of the production process...rather it originated in the whole of the social and economic practice of that time, the time of the birth and rapid development of industrialization, in which what was mainly seen was the possibility of vastly increasing material wealth, means, while the end, that is to say man, who should be served by the means was ignored.⁷

By such a pronouncement, it is apparent that John Paul desires to shy away from the historical materialism of Marx's theory which asserts the economic order of things, including the conflict

of labor and capital denounced by John Paul, as determined by objective economic laws. According to Marx, the individual capitalist, in terms of his motivations and decisions, is at all times contingent upon the transcendent laws of capitalism. More specifically, the laws of capitalism exist independent of the capitalist yet influence the capitalist to the point of determining the manner in which the workplace is run. Thus, Marxism interprets the conflict of labor and capital to be an inevitable consequence, not of a particular individual's arbitrary decision, but of a society based on and defined by the principles of a capitalist mode of production. The critical significance, if not error, of John Paul favoring the "individual" as opposed to the "systematic," shall be talked of further in the critique section.

2. John Paul II and Socialization

The bulk of John Paul's innovative concept of socialization involves the following principles: a) the proper utilization of property, capital, private or otherwise; and b) the role of the government as an "indirect employer" attempting to rationalize the economic order by initiating and maintaining through time the priority of labor.

a. Private Property

If there exists any evidence testifying to the fact that Church social teaching has evolved and matured to the point of existing as an enlightened, and hence, effective tool of

practical social reform, such evidence is to be found in John Paul II's discourse on private property. Looking back, Leo XIII, in The Condition of the Workingmen, aggressively defended the right of private property in the face of the socialist demands for expropriation. Likewise, Pius XI, despite being more flexible and compromising in his defense of private property apparent in his stipulation that there may exist limited government ownership and that all economic activity should operate for the benefit of the "common good," upheld and insisted upon the essential right of private ownership. John XXIII continued the evolving trend reaffirming Pius' call for the "common good" by granting ever greater legitimacy to the right of public ownership and regulation of those industries considered too essential for the health of the community to be left in private hands. And now there is John Paul II who, building on the ever maturing economic criticism of his predecessors as well as his own analysis concerning the interaction of labor and the means of production within a capitalist format, issues a statement on private property representing the fruition of Church teaching on the subject. In this sense, it is a fruition of negation. The once staunchly defended right of private property, a right ordained by God, is dismissed by John Paul as no longer an "untouchable dogma of economic life." Such dismissal is deemed essential by John Paul if the priority of labor is to ever be established and maintained.

Isolating these means as a separate property in order to set it up in the form of "capital" in opposition to "labor" - and even to practice exploitation

of labor - is contrary to the very nature of these means and their possession. They cannot be possessed against labor, they cannot even be possessed for possessions sake, because the only legitimate title to their possession - whether in the form of private ownership or in the form of public or collective ownership - is that they should serve labor and thus by serving labor that they should make possible the achievement of the first principle of this order, namely the universal destination of goods and the right to common use of them...From this point of view the position of "rigid" capitalism continues to remain unacceptable, namely the position that defends the exclusive right to private ownership of the means of production as an untouchable "dogma" of economic life.⁸

Believing that the initial instigation and perpetuation of labor's subordinate position relative to capital in the economic process results from the individual capitalist's desire to achieve a maximum rate of profit, John Paul argues that it is only by subverting such greed that labor may relinquish its secondary status and assert its primacy. This type of subversion can only be achieved, according to John Paul, if labor is in some way made a part of that aspect of production involving ownership and management. Important to understand at this point is that in his decision to abandon the unconditional right of private ownership, John Paul is in no way condemning private ownership per se, as he is the method by which the private owner has traditionally utilized his property (capital). A method that has coerced labor to exist as but an appendage of capital, specifically designed to serve and benefit the

capitalist's quest for profit at its (labor's) own expense.

b. Shared Property

To remedy the situation, John Paul proposes alternatives designed to replace the greed of the individual capitalist with an economic structure that would invariably, by its very nature, seek to promote the priority of labor throughout the industry in question.

In light of the above, the many proposals put forward by experts in Catholic social teaching and by the highest magisterium of the Church take on special significance: proposals for joint ownership of the means of work, sharing by the workers in the management and/or profits of businesses, so-called shareholding by labor, etc. Whether these various proposals can or cannot be applied concretely, it is clear that recognition of the proper position of labor and the worker in the production process demands various adaptations in the sphere of the right to ownership of the means of production.⁹

In short, by means of such co-ownership and profit sharing innovations, John Paul desires to establish a sense of harmony between labor and capital requiring that capital respectfully serve its creator whenever and however employed in the process of production.

To flesh out the above, whether privately owned or co-owned, John Paul puts forth a list of essential requirements, the fulfillment of which, will determine whether the particular industry, as well as the economic order in general, has resolved the conflict of labor and capital by ensuring labor's priority. These requirements, similar to those put forth by Leo XIII 90 years

earlier, include the following: the basic right of employment; proper remuneration for work done; the sanctity of unions in terms of struggling for social justice and "not for the sake of struggle;" a pledge to the disabled guaranteeing that employment alternatives be made available so that they might contribute their talents to the production process. As is evident, the unifying factor of the above requirements is that in each instance it is capital, the "object"ive component, that is made subordinate to the needs of labor, the "subject"ive component.

c. Government as Indirect Employer

Much in the way Pius XI assigned unto the state the responsibility of regulating the economic order ensuring that all economic transactions are in accord with the "common good," John Paul assigns unto the state the role of "indirect employer" whose primary and involved task is to enforce a just labor policy. Such a policy entails, of course, the satisfaction of the above mentioned requirements. However, it is the requirement of assured employment that John Paul gives highest priority to, and thus, instructs the state to *treat* as its main objective.

As we view the whole human family throughout the world, we cannot fail to be struck by a disconcerting fact of immense proportions: the fact that while conspicuous natural resources remain unused there are huge numbers of people who are unemployed and countless multitudes of people suffering from hunger.¹⁰

According to John Paul, to protect against the disease of unemployment, it is of necessity that the state interject into the economic sector a rational perspective designed to sensibly

coordinate various industries, whether they be public, private, or co-owned, in order to effect a proper availability and utilization of differentiated labor. Such a program would require the state to secure, through job training and education, a rationally determined amount of the type of labor required by the different spheres of industry.

Rational planning and the proper organization of human labor with individual societies and states should also facilitate the discovery of the right proportions between the different kinds of employment: work on the land, in industry, in the various services, white collar work and scientific and artistic work, in accordance with the capacities of individuals and for the common good of each society and of the whole of mankind. The organization of human life in accordance with the many possibilities of labor should be matched by a suitable system of instruction and education...aimed at preparing people specifically for assuming to good advantage an appropriate place in the vast and socially differentiated world of work.¹¹

Though making it perfectly clear through pronouncements like the above that the state is to actively pursue and instigate within the economic sector a policy of full-employment, John Paul nevertheless cautions the state against violating the integrity of any particular enterprise through undue and improper regulation.

In the final analysis this overall concern weighs on the shoulders of the state, but it cannot mean one-sided centralization by the public authorities. Instead, what is in question is a just and rational coordination, within the framework of which the initiative of individuals, free groups and local work centers

and complexes must be safeguarded...¹²

Continuing on, John Paul universalizes the concept of indirect employer claiming that it should never be restricted to the confines of the state in question. For just as economic agreements and transactions are exported across national borders, so must, in the name of social justice, the priority of labor be likewise exported, accompanying all international relations of an economic nature. Recognizing the imperialist tendencies of various multinational corporations to insatiably prey on the extremely vulnerable peoples, particularly of the Third World where adequate and effective labor laws are a rarity, John Paul is most adamant in his demand that an indirect employer of global stature be instituted and put in charge of securing and maintaining the priority of labor on a world-wide basis.

For instance the highly industrialized countries, and even more the businesses that direct on a large scale the means of industrial production (the companies referred to as multinational or transnational), fix the highest possible prices for their products, while trying at the same time to fix the lowest possible prices for raw materials or semi-manufactured goods. This is one of the causes of an ever increasing disproportion between national incomes...Evidently this must have an effect on local labor policy and on the worker's situation in the economically disadvantaged societies. Finding himself in a system thus conditioned, the direct employer fixes working conditions below the objective requirements of the workers, especially if he himself wishes to obtain the highest possible profits from the business which he runs...It is easy to see that this

framework of forms of dependence linked with the concept of the indirect employer is enormously extensive and complicated...it is respect for the objective rights of the worker...that must constitute the adequate and fundamental criterion for shaping the whole economy, both on the level of the individual society and state and within the whole of the world economic policy and of the systems of international relationships that derive from it.¹³

3. Economism and Collectivization: Dangerous Extremes

Returning to the domestic scene, John Paul engages in discourse similar to that of Pius XI who once defined the "common good" as an ideological and practical "middle road" between and balancing the dangerous extremes of individualism/liberalism and socialism. Though using contemporary terminology to represent the extremes to be avoided, the thematic content of such terms remains unchanged. Thus, individualism/liberalism is replaced by the more precise term of "economism." Existing as a type of materialism, John Paul contends that the suffering imposed on labor is largely the result of economic methods, in particular, the alienation of capital from labor's needs by those owning the means of production. These economic methods, moreover, are facilitated by a specific attitude, a certain state of mind known as economism that regards labor as a mere means to achieving the capitalist end of profit. Economism refers to a way of thinking that relegates "subjective" labor to an "objective" status, and thereby strips away from labor the rights and dignity that exist as an inherent and natural aspect

of all subjects, of all humankind.

This fundamental error of thought can and must be called an error of materialism, in that economism directly or indirectly includes a conviction of the primacy and superiority of the material, and directly or indirectly places the spiritual and the personal in a position of subordination to material reality.¹⁴

Recognizing the importance that capital not be alienated from labor in the sense that it (capital) supersedes the priority of labor within the economic process, John Paul further warns that in utilizing methods of correction it is equally important that the opposite extreme of "collectivism," representing a danger equivalent to that of economism, be likewise avoided. Collectivism, similar to Pius' socialism, pertains to the phenomenon currently experienced in the Eastern part of the world, in particular, the Soviet Union. Thus, what might have initially begun as a movement designed to alleviate the injustices wrought by the economism of the West, the methods employed by various governments of the East, despite involving different structures of economic organization, have nevertheless resulted in labor suffering the socio-economic symptoms similar to those of economism. According to John Paul, while in theory capital is "collectively" owned by the people, and hence, can hardly be separated and alienated from them, in actuality, such ownership is more representative of a type of state ownership whereby labor, rather than being separated and made subordinate to capital through decisions made and enacted by the private owner

as is the case with economism, is separated and made subordinate to capital by the state itself.

Thus, merely converting the means of production into state property in the collectivist systems is by no means equivalent to socializing that property. We speak of socializing only when the subject character of society is ensured, that is to say, when on the basis of his work each person is fully entitled to consider himself a part owner of the great workbench at which he is working with everyone else.¹⁵

To conclude, John Paul's discourse contemporarily updates and reverberates the 1931 theme of Pius XI. Calling for an economic order that avoids the obvious and self-proclaimed pitfalls of extremism, economism and collectivism, John Paul invokes governments to conditionally persuade the entire scheme of the economic order to reflect an ideology and actuality whose posture aligns itself and adheres to the "middle road." A middle road whose path, if followed, inevitably arrives at the common good and the priority of labor.

DEFINING A JUST ECONOMIC ORDER: PROPER RETUNERATION, NOT PERFECTION

A final point to be made concerns John Paul's criterion determining whether or not a particular socio-economic system is just, whether or not the priority of labor is instituted in the workplace. The reason for discussing John Paul's definition of economic justice is to note its deviation from the thought of John XXIII. Briefly reviewing John, of crucial importance were the demanding requirements he sought in behalf of labor

and, for that matter, society as a whole. Such requirements found their culmination in John's desire that the person be able to "perfect" himself through his labor. More specifically, the worker should, at all times and in all places, express his dignity, responsibility, and freedom, his inner will. Indeed, this expression of will fleshed in the merits of dignity, responsibility, and freedom, was interpreted by John as constituting justice in any and every aspect of human endeavor. Anything less, for instance, any economic order featuring an equitable distribution of profits and products yet compromising one's chances of perfection, is charged by John as unacceptable, and hence, unjust. He writes:

if the organization and structure of economic life be such that the human dignity of the workers is compromised, or their sense of responsibility weakened, or their freedom of action is removed, then we judge such an economic order to be unjust, even though it produces a vast amount of goods, whose distribution ¹⁶ conforms to the norms of justice and equity.

With John Paul such compromise is tolerated. While this development is indeed unfortunate for the simple fact that "perfection" is not included in John Paul's definition of "justice," it is a development that can only be properly understood in light of the socio-economic conditions marking the time in which John Paul wrote. As mentioned earlier, the economic optimism typifying the fifties and early sixties which helped fuel the grand expectations comprising John's statement had waned greatly by the time of John Paul's pontificate. So much so

that John Paul recognized that he was faced with the immediate challenge and task of securing for the worker the most basic of needs and rights that, in the twenty years following Christianity and Social Progress, had been rendered ever^{more} susceptible to capitalism's infringement. And as has been the case in the majority of the encyclicals studied thus far, the integral right and demand that John Paul centers his discussion of economic justice on concerns that of an adequate wage. He writes:

It should be noted that the justice of a socio-economic system and, in each case, its just functioning deserve in the final analysis to be evaluated by the way in which man's work is properly remunerated in the system.¹⁷

To conclude, it is best that one does not misinterpret the intention behind John Paul's, so to speak, reduced demands - demands omitting the right of perfection. For while perfection is indeed most beautiful and worthy in and of itself, it is also dependent on a socio-economic scheme capable of first securing the fundamental social needs of food, clothing, and shelter. Truly, it is only when such survival needs are met that the truly human needs, including perfection, can be attended to. In short, if anything at all, John Paul's reduced demands signify that the economic maturation of society, in particular, the relations to the means of production, have yet to progress to the point at which the ultimate liberation of the individual can occur. An ultimate liberation featuring the unification of one's actions with one's will, the unification of one's being with one's labor.

PART TWO - MARXIST CRITIQUEDIAGNOSIS: INDIVIDUAL VERSUS SYSTEM

If there exists one point in particular that the popes studied seem to be in general agreement upon, it is their position concerning the instigation of the capitalist method. In this regard, papal opinion has been unanimous in holding fast to the belief that the capitalist is completely free and autonomous in terms of formulating and enacting production policy within his particular industry. As far as John Paul II is concerned, papal scholar Gregory Baum summarizes the present pontiff's position on this issue stating:

according to the encyclical, there was nothing necessary in capital's opposition to labor. It was not the inevitable consequence of private ownership; it resulted rather from the choice of the early industrialists who, giving into greed and stupidity, organized their capital against the workers.¹⁸

In short, it is because of the capitalist's own personal "greed and stupidity" that the objectification of the workplace, an objectification that has rendered labor subordinate to capital, and hence, the priority of the former meaningless, has proceeded and continues to persist. Therefore, for basically the same reasons as in the past, one must refute John Paul's method of "individual blame," claiming it to be totally insensitive and oblivious to the systematic nature that is the capitalist mode of production.

1) Incomplete Perception

John Paul's failure to recognize the systematic intricacies defining the capitalist system is directly attributable to

the discriminating way in which he chooses to understand the economic structure as a whole. John Paul opts for a method of analysis that renders the capitalist system a non-system, as particular, as individual, totally excluding its (capitalism's) systematic essence. Throughout the encyclical, John Paul consistently discusses the subordination of labor's priority as proceeding within a specific and isolated workplace. Furthermore, as has been said, it is a subordination that, according to John Paul, is not inevitable, but is purposely intended by the capitalist himself. Is purposely intended by virtue of the capitalist's own greed and stupidity in his quest to maximize profits. Thus, by confining his method of analysis to the particular industry itself, John Paul renders the individual capitalist completely free and independent from extraneous stimuli that might possibly influence and, in fact, determine his process of policy formation and implementation. And of course, on the basis of such a narrow perspective, it is inevitable that one will conclude, as John Paul, that the degradation of labor within the workplace in question is wholly dependent on the "greed" ridden nature of the individual capitalist involved. Likewise, the rectification of such a morally intolerable dilemma depends upon either a change of heart on the part of the capitalist, or a modification of ownership as suggested by John Paul. In other words, it is crucial that either the capitalist ensure that the dignity of labor be restored in the workplace along with all the rights and benefits such dignity entails, or that labor itself ensure its rights by becoming a tangible part of the owning and managing aspect of industry.

2. The Role of Competition

John Paul's diagnosis of labor's abused status, as well as his prescription founded upon such a diagnosis, is utterly and most naively dependent upon an economic viewpoint that is too specific, too isolated, and dangerously ignorant of the coercive force intrinsic to an all encompassing, all pervading capitalist system. To start, one must recognize that the individual capitalist is in no way free in terms of formulating and implementing policy within his particular operations. On the contrary, those policies he does decide upon are greatly if not entirely influenced by an extraneous force that, while existing totally apart from each and every particular industry per se; nevertheless, serves to unite and bond all industries by ensuring that each industry's operative policies, including its policy towards labor, is wholly contingent upon the operative policies chosen and implemented by other industries. To clarify, the extraneous force referred to here is that of competition. It is competition that exists as the outstretched rope along which the capitalist system pulls itself and progresses. Such progression, moreover, is marked by innovation and automation, all in the name of marketing a competitive product capable of ensuring the accumulation of capital necessary for instituting further capital saving techniques. Truly, if anything at all, the capitalist understands that it is he who refuses to automate and cut back costs as much as possible, and thus, refuses to produce a competitive product capable of securing capital necessary for further cost-saving measures, who ceases to exist in a capitalist

sense, ~~who~~ ceases to exist in a competitive sense.

Of all the words written by Marx, it was his observations concerning the central role of competition within the capitalist network and the potent effects thereof, social as well as industrial, that have rung the most true. Indeed, the present economic system boasts of, as opposed to a century ago, fewer firms, with those firms that do exist exhibiting unprecedented size in terms of their overall industrial operations and global influence. These firms and their current status represent the end product of a process of competition that has undercut and absorbed industries failing to enact policies best suited for accumulating the capital necessary for upgrading productivity, and hence, ensuring competitiveness. ^{Moreover,} despite the liquidation of numerous, competitively inferior firms, ^{Competition} continues on at a cut-throat pace enhanced by the simple fact that the remaining industries represent the strongest breed, the most successful at the competition game. In critiquing John Paul, what is crucial to note in all this is that the reality of competition imposes upon the capitalist the responsibility to be, in fact, competitive. In this regard, it is a competitiveness that involves conceiving and enforcing within his own particular means of production, those policies and methods most conducive to realizing a competitive commodity capable of dominating the market and thereby reaping unto itself, or better still, unto its owner, the capitalist, the profits so important in terms of introducing superior technology and other cost saving devices that will serve to guarantee the continued production of com-

petitive and marketably successful commodities. In this way, the cycle is created and set in perpetual motion - capitalist competition requires an ever present and adequate source of capital necessary for implementing and installing cost cutting policies and innovations all for the sake of ensuring successful competition in the future.

a. Competition's Effect on Labor

In light of the above, one must repudiate John Paul's contention that the subordination of labor to capital within the workplace has as its origin personal motivation, the "greed and stupidity" of the individual capitalist. While from the narrow perspective of the isolated and individual industry it may well appear that the capitalist's policies have as their instigation the selfish attitude intrinsic to the capitalist himself, from the much more inclusive and comprehensive perspective of capitalism existing as a system, a system forged of competition, it becomes quite apparent that the particular nature of the capitalist has little, if anything, to do with the cost cutting policies he authorizes. The capitalist, like the laborer, is entrapped within a web of competition that, if the capitalist ever becomes lax in his attitude towards, will ensure his destruction by those industries that stay true to, and thus, fulfill the laws of successful competition. As far as labor is concerned, successful competition translates into minimizing labor costs as much as possible. Therefore, it is essential for the capitalist to keep a lid on wages, to spend as little on safety

within the workplace as possible, to limit retirement and disability pensions, to move the factory to areas where worker rights are minimal, and to eliminate labor costs outright through automation. While such policies may be interpreted as a gross injustice and hardly rational from the point of view of the human condition, they are nevertheless extremely logical from the perspective of competitive capitalism, and thus, of any industry hoping to survive.

b. Marxism: Man Lifted Up

At this point, one cannot help but notice how the Marxist position, relative to that of the popes, demonstrates great faith in humanity's essential nature. This is to say, while John Paul attributes the current conflict between capital and labor as stemming from capitalist "greed and stupidity," the Marxist position effectively contends that such "greed and stupidity" is a requirement of a socio-economic system that exists objectively, totally transcended from the needs, ambitions, and hopes of an ever desperate humankind. A socio-economic system designed to, first and foremost, serve itself by preserving its own integrity over time. To this end, humankind is necessarily relegated to the status of a means, a mere pawn, destined to serve capitalism's needs, to satiate its thirst for profit. In this sense, the capitalist is coerced into a mode of behavior, in terms of policy formation and enactment, that is opposed to the needs of his own fellowman as well as to the needs of his own self. The system of capitalism has *reduced* the capitalist

into assuming the unnatural role of oppressor. Such oppression serves to effectively alienate the capitalist in a twofold sense. First, the capitalist is inevitably alienated from that part of his nature seeking cooperation, justice, and social equity. The capitalist is alienated from his moral self. Secondly, the capitalist is alienated from his own species. As has been shown, the competitive nature of capitalism induces the capitalist to exist in opposition to labor, to desire from labor as much surplus value for as little remuneration as possible.

c. Flawed Prescription

Along with his diagnosis citing capitalist greed as the source of labor's socio-economic hardships, John Paul's prescription instructing labor to be involved in owning and managing, must also be declared invalid. For John Paul is committing the same mistake John XXIII did when he advocated the creation of the "worker/capitalist." Simply, the competitive system of capitalism is such that it is simply not a matter of replacing a heart of greed with one of charity or responsibility, as it is of understanding, and through such understanding, effectively subverting and replacing a coercive and humanly destructive system, with an alternative purposely designed with the priority of labor, the priority of humankind, as its central and constant objective. Likewise, the role of "indirect employer" John Paul envisages the state as assuming will fail for the same reasons plus XI's corporative solution, where the state exists to regulate all economic activity in behalf of the common good, was left unrealized. This is to say, the state in capitalist society functions, first and foremost, to organize, represent, and pursue

on a political level, the interests of the dominant class, the capitalist class.

To conclude, criticized has been John Paul II's method of analysing the particular workplace in terms of it existing isolated and by itself. Such method inevitably excludes the systematic dimension and dynamism that is part and parcel of the capitalist system. Truly, it is precisely this brand of systematic competition that manipulates the capitalist into enacting and fulfilling those policies best suited for accumulation. In this light, such policies, far from originating in the particular "greedy" nature of the capitalist in question, have as their essential locus the demands made by the capitalist "system" itself. Demands that must be met if the individual capitalist and his means of production are to economically succeed and endure.

UNVEILING THE TRUE CONTRADICTION AND CONFLICT

1. Conflict as Subjective

To review briefly, the so-called "greed" seemingly involved in the capitalist's decisions regarding how capital, the means of production, are to be utilized vis-à-vis labor, is not so much intrinsic to the nature of the capitalist himself, as it is extraneously motivated in terms of being a mandatory prerequisite of the capitalist system. However, even though the individual capitalist's nature may not be, when understood apart from the capitalist system and its coercive effects, inherently opposed to the nature and interests of labor; nevertheless, it is only realistic to conceive and speak of the capitalist in terms of how he existentially exists, how he ex-

ists within the confines of the capitalist system. In this regard, what shall be demonstrated in the following discussion is the fact that the "conflict" plaguing the economic realm can only be rationally defined in terms of its subjective essence, in terms of the capitalist and laborer. In other words, the systematic dimension of capitalism necessitates that there exist an inevitable "subjective" conflict intrinsic to the capitalist mode of production. At its most basic, it is a subjective conflict precipitating directly from the relations to the means of production. It is the ongoing conflict of capitalist, owner, versus labor, non-owner. Indeed, it is ^{this} essential and irrefutable conflict of subjects that John Paul minimizes and attempts to make himself oblivious to. While John Paul does indeed admit to conflict in the economic realm, he interprets the conflict to be one of object versus subject, capital versus labor. According to John Paul, the workplace exists objectified in the sense that capital reigns supreme while labor is rendered completely subordinate, destined to serve capital, and thus, the accumulation process as a whole. Of course, the question that must be raised at this point concerns why, in fact, does such objectification take place? In other words, why is capital allowed to assert priority, in terms of accumulation, over and against the neglected if not abused priority that is, or should be, natural to labor?

Stangely enough, John Paul himself answers this question stating that labor's subordinate rank is contingent on the policies and actions decided upon by the capitalist. Thus, it is by virtue of the capitalist's quest for profit, according to John Paul, that

capital receives its inappropriate priority while, at the same time, labor is relinquished to the humiliating role of serving such misplaced priority. If this be the case, John Paul's attempt to describe the existing conflict as one peculiar to capital and labor is simply untenable by his own admission. To explain, John Paul is right in arguing that capital exists objectively in terms of being absolutely apart from human concerns, needs and hopes. In this sense, capital, in and of itself, exists neither for nor against humanity. It is only when it (capital) is given method, when it is given motive that it loses its neutral standing and must assume as part of its very being and nature either a positive or negative attitude towards and influence on the human condition. Moreover, it is a method and motive, as has been shown, that is solely dependent on the capitalist class which owns the capital, and through such ownership, is able to utilize and manipulate ~~the~~ capital, placing it in a position of power and persuasion that is detrimental to the welfare of the laboring class. In short, the capitalist, by operating his capital from an intended orientation calling for profit, automatically designates capital to be at odds with the laborer - the laborer who, on the other hand, wishes to exist and function within the workplace from an orientation calling for his betterment, his dignity. In this light, to define the conflict in the economic realm as pertaining to objective capital and subjective labor is dangerously ignorant. For as it operates within the process of production, capital never exists objectively. It is always subjectively tainted and biased in the sense of existing and performing as a tool and mechanism of its owner, the capitalist. Hence, as stated at the beginning, rather than a "subjective/objective"

conflict, it is certainly more appropriate and correct to posit the conflict of the economic realm as being thoroughly "subjective" in nature. This is to say, the economic realm and the conflict thereof centers on the interaction of two distinct, subjective participants. Two subjective participants whose interests and desires necessitate that there exist and persist over time irreconcilable conflict. To clarify,

the capitalist and laborer both come to the economic arena desiring something very different. Something that *neither* can have without the other losing out. In simple terms, the capitalist wants to enact economic policy ensuring the greatest rate of profit possible, while the laborer wants, if not the greater percentage of the value he creates, at least an adequate amount of monetary compensation allowing for his economic security. In short, the inherent conflict of capitalist production involves the capitalist and laborer whose respective objectives, determined by their relations to capital, the means of production, are necessarily and always antagonistic to the other's.

CONCLUSION

John Paul's, On Human Labor, distinguishes itself from all previous papal statements by being the most analytical to date. In deciphering capitalism's flaws, John Paul delves into the particulars of the economy's inner workings and concludes that the subjective component of the labor process, labor itself, has been wrongfully made subordinate to the objective component, capital. John Paul summarizes his conclusions stating that there presently exists an intolerable conflict between capital and labor that has rendered labor's most basic needs unfulfilled (adequate employment, shelter, health care). Moreover, though not directly implicating the capitalist as a participant in the conflict, John Paul does admit that it is the capitalist who is responsible for initiating the conflict in terms of manipulating his capital in such a way as to be at odds with labor's welfare.

Aside from the above, John Paul resembles his predecessors on the most critical of issues, in particular, the issue concerning

the legitimacy of capitalism from the point of view of the human condition. This is to say, are the laws defining capitalism and a capitalist society conducive to a humanity fulfilling itself? According to John Paul, capitalism in this sense is indeed valid and in need only of limited alterations for alleviating the present conflict (i.e. "indirect employer," "worker/capitalist"). In this light, John Paul's thought, like his predecessors', is shown to be flawed when critiqued from the Marxist perspective. John Paul, though more critical in terms of investigative procedure than past popes, similarly restricts the nature and scope of his analysis to conform to his functionalist perception of reality. Thus, the Marxist insight that capitalism's systematic laws necessitate labor's subordinate status as well as ensure, on the basis of capitalist class relations to the means of production, conflict between the capitalist and laborer, is most unacceptable to John Paul. For the implications of such insight, despite being able to explain the evolution and passage of numerous socio-economic systems (slavery, feudalism, and capitalism) as well as provide hope, grounded in scientific study, that there is to come a more humane society (socialism), necessarily crumbles John Paul's belief in the overall integrity and organic wholeness of contemporary society. Sadly, the fact that John Paul's functionalist outlook is rationally unfounded, not only casts doubt on the intellectual soundness of the Church's understanding and discussion of economic matters, but, and most importantly, severely impairs the Church's ability to effectively act, in terms of its recommendations, in behalf of the humanity it is appointed and meant to serve.

CONCLUSION

1. Summary

This paper has attempted to present and contrast two diverging methods of economic analysis, papal and Marxist, with the hope of making clear the dangerous flaws accompanying papal procedure. In particular, such flaws center around the popes' insistence on conforming, if not strangling their entire investigation by subjecting it to functionalist preconceptions of social reality. It is the unyielding and quite unfounded belief of the popes studied that the structure and mechanics characterizing contemporary, or more to the point, capitalist society, are sound and consistent with humanity's welfare, and thus, are not to be investigated much less dismantled and replaced. According to the popes, though there may exist periodic defects within the system, one need not transcend the confines of the system in order to enact and realize any necessary corrective measures.

Certainly, when one endeavors to conduct an examination of the economy burdened by such preconceptions, the ensuing results are bound to be distorted and their credibility damaged. In demonstrating this point, the paper contrasts papal economic analysis with that of Marxism, or more precisely, with the method by which Marxism seeks to discern the inherent laws of capitalism and the social effects thereof. The reason for choosing Marxist theory as opposed to another resides in the fact that Marxism implements a strategy of comprehension that is the opposite of the popes'. To explain, whereas the popes approach the topic

of economy with specific preconceptions, in particular, functionalism, that invariably tamper and render impaired if not useless their analysis, and hence, their conclusions and recommendations, Marxism approaches the economy empty, in the sense of seeing and digesting the economy as it objectively exists, in its pure and unadulterated form. Such objectivity, in turn, suggests that the resultant conclusions and recommendations be valid if for no other reason than that they exist uncorrupted, derived directly from an unbiased dissection of the phenomenon itself, the phenomenon of capitalism. In any event, it is only through making apparent such opposition, in terms of investigative procedure and results yielded, that the debilitating effects wrought by preconception are adequately established and thoroughly understood.

2. Confined and Sedating Universalism

The rest of the conclusion shall be dedicated to investigating further the problem of papal preconception and its possible rectification. To begin, what is the basis, the origin of the functionalism that so heavily pervades and condemns papal economic thought to be without objectivity, to be, in fact, useless? Why do the popes fail to acknowledge the myriad of debilitating social effects as resulting from laws defining capitalism, the laws of value and accumulation? Furthermore, why do the popes fail to realize such laws themselves are derived from the property relations peculiar to capitalism? The reason is relatively simple. The relations to the means of production unique to capitalism and

from whence capitalist reality, its laws and the social consequences thereof, derives, necessitate class confrontation. Such conflict involves the capitalist who owns the means of production and is immediately ensnared within a systematic web of competition forcing him to accumulate as much capital as possible and thereby remain competitive, and the laborer who, owning only his labor power, desires to fulfill himself through his labor as well as retain unto himself the value he creates during the labor process. Thus, far from insisting that the worker enjoy his labor and hold on to the value he produces, the capitalist is intent only on manipulating and ensuring the laborer's productivity within the workplace as well as estranging, literally stealing from the worker as great a portion of the value he creates as possible. It is precisely this notion of "class conflict" that the popes so terribly dread and so emphatically deny. For the reality of class conflict rips to shreds the functionalist concept of social wholeness and integrity which the popes desperately cling to and seek to project. Following the trend set by his predecessors, in particular, Leo XIII, who believed classes were an inevitable consequence of the natural order, and thus, could well exist in perfect accord with one another, John Paul II updates and advances the traditional Church's message of, as this writer calls it, confined and sedating universalism. This concept shall now be examined in terms of both its content and initial origins, as well as how it might be remedied.

a. Confined Universalism

First of all, the popes' message is of a "confined universalism."

By avoiding the issue of class conflict, the popes attempt to confine the scope of their message within the framework of the capitalist system. Indeed, the papal argument is narrowly defined and consciously distorted such that labor's antagonist as eventually revealed is capital, or better still, the manner in which the means of production are utilized within the workplace. Thus, the extent of the papal message, while questioning the methods of capitalism per se, in particular, the methods of capital's employment, never questions the legitimacy of the system itself, whether or not the dynamics defining capitalist reality are conducive to and supportive of the human condition. This lack of curiosity and adequate investigation leading to intellectual confinement, is most apparent in the fact that the popes neglect to ask the most pertinent and revealing question concerning the reason why capital functions as it does and who, within the capitalist scheme, is responsible for bestowing on capital the priority rightfully due labor. While Pius XI and John Paul II do mention the capitalist as responsible for labor's hardships, such responsibility is always interpreted on an individual level and never as a result of the system itself, as a result of the law of accumulation. In this way, the popes minimize absolutely if not deny the actuality and relevance of the subjective conflict inherent in the capitalist system. By virtue of their functionalist analysis, the popes imprison their message within an aura of confined universality. They desire their message to offer something lucrative to all, capitalist and laborer alike. Although

that something may be more concerned with benefitting labor in the sense of redressing chronic economic injustices; nevertheless, by failing to rebuke the capitalist's systematically determined role of oppressor, they cannot help but grant unto such role certain legitimacy.

b. Sedating Universalism

Of course, by legitimizing the existence and purpose of the capitalist class, as well as classes per se, the popes' message necessarily condones the essence of the capitalist system itself. An essence saturated with and requiring perpetual class conflict as well as the suffering such conflict entails. In this manner, by avoiding the issue of class conflict, the popes sidestep a most volatile situation that threatens the disruption, if not disintegration of the economic substructure, and thus, society in all its aspects, political and ideological. Hence, the popes' message is of a sedating kind. By insisting the conflict's participants to be the victim, labor, and the cause, misappropriation of capital, the popes effectively shield and protect from criticism the victim's true antagonist, the symptom's true cause - the capitalist class operating within and according to the systematic requirements of capitalism. The upshot of such impoverished analysis is that the papal message evades the uncomfortable position, as far as traditional Christianity is concerned (since at least the fourth century), of siding with one class as opposed to another. If anything at all, the popes side with labor against the use of capital as opposed to the user of capital, the capitalist.

3. Origins of Confined and Sedating Universalism: Dismissing the Message

Ever since the time of Constantine, when Christianity was lifted from its periphery status and literally made to conform and identify with the established order of the Roman Empire, the socio-economic criticalness of the Church, so much a part of its periphery days and the Gospels, was indefinitely superseded by the reactionary nature of confined and sedating universalism. A confined and sedating universalism that saw fit to condone Roman as well as 17th century slavery, medieval feudalism, and contemporary capitalism. A confined and sedating universalism that has taken the message of the Kingdom of God as preached and taught by Jesus and has diluted if not slandered it beyond comprehension. According to the Gospels, Jesus announced the Kingdom of God to be an event that was to **progress** and liberate humankind in the here and now, in the realm of the temporal. Indeed, the words and actions of Jesus testify to the fact that the Kingdom of God involves an extensive and most thorough conversion and liberation of the world, both subjectively and objectively. Subjective in the sense that love is to assume priority in each and every individual's life. Hence, instead of being obligated to fulfill an alien and imperfect code of law, through the words of Jesus man is liberated to fulfill the supreme law, the unqualified law of love. Love, that by its very nature, is neither alien from man, as it exists part and parcel of his very heart and being, nor imperfect, as it is the very essence of God himself. Objective in the sense that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom of God in terms of the institutions

and orders of the day being pervaded and infected with all the justice and righteousness professed by the prophets. Truly, the Kingdom of God was to entail a social rebirth in which the hungry were to be fed, the naked to be clothed, the rich to be sent away empty handed. The foundation of the old order was/is to crumble as those "who are first will be last, and the last first (Mt. 18:4); the humble shall be masters (MT. 5:5) and the oppressed shall be freed (Lk. 4:18)." Indeed, "the dispersed elect will be reunited (Lk. 13:27), where all hunger and thirst will be satiated and the joyful laughter of the time of liberty will overflow (Lk. 6:21)."

a. From the Message to the Person

In light of the above, in light of the Gospel message itself, it is hard to deny that through the ages the Church has lost and hidden away the socially challenging if not threatening message expressed by Jesus, replacing it with a belief in Jesus. To clarify, despite never preaching of himself, the Church exhibits an unnatural, and indeed, unhealthy preoccupation with concocting abstract and highly intricate Christological dogma and tenets designed to define and explain the personage of Jesus. It is a preoccupation that has led the Church to base the entire faith around the individual Jesus and the appropriate attitude and beliefs concerning Jesus that the so-called Christian should adhere to. In this way, the Church has effectively obscured the Kingdom of God initiated by and emerging through the words and actions of Jesus, abstracting it into another realm, another dimension

completely apart from human reality, and thus, completely apart from the joy and suffering, the dreams and anguish such reality entails. All this the Church has done despite the fact that the human predicament can never be minimized if for no other reason than that God, incarnate as Christ, saw fit to live and experience it, to render unto^{it} the greatest of meaning. As Karl Barth argues, "Because God became man, man is the measure of all things."

In concluding, by virtue of its association with and most comfortable if not secure position as a part of the established order, the Church has severed humankind from the change evoking message of Christ. In doing so, what the Church has done is analagous to a man dying of hunger attributing greater value to the bowl (the person Jesus) than to the life sustaining nourishment (the message he brought) contained within.

4. Method of Correction

a. Elimination of Confined - Return to the Message

If one were to effectively correct the Church's method of confined and sedating universalism, one must first be rid of the confined aspect. Such riddance would serve to liberate the Church from its blinding relationship with that of the prevailing order. Blinding in the sense that for such a relationship to exist at all, the Church must limit its understanding, its knowledge and perception of the world and all its processes. This partial understanding is most apparent in the Church's inability and failure to condemn outright an economic system of sin. An economic system that, as demonstrated throughout the paper, enslaves humanity to the method and purpose of profit. In this light, it is necessary

that the Church first shed its self-imposed scales from its eyes by disposing of its functionalist preconceptions and methodology and at last recognizing and denouncing the inherent evil that is the capitalist system, that is the system that demands from the capitalist a nature and attitude that are, more times than not, indifferent if not totally opposed to the welfare of the human condition. Secondly, acting in behalf of the humanity of which God has set it in charge, the Church would then proceed to encourage a system of production founded upon and reflecting the principles of human priority, rationality, and association. Far from being dictated by humanly alienating laws, in particular, the law of competition, such a system of production would have as its objective the fulfillment of humanity's material needs. Moreover, such fulfillment could not help but enhance the satisfaction of humanity's other and equally important needs - spirituality, morality, and fraternity.

b. Return to the Message

Needless to say, the Church's initial recognition and condemnation of the capitalist order leading to the above socio-economic alternative, will undoubtedly cast the Church from its secure position of sitting at the right hand of the established order. A casting off that will entail challenge, hardship, and even persecution in search of truth. A casting off that, in the ultimate sense, will result in the absolute rebirth of the Church. For in loosening its ties with an order that has seen fit to relegate all of humanity as its servant, the Church can only

be reborn unto the purpose and message of God's Kingdom as taught by Jesus. A volatile and life-giving message of truth and hope in the here and now that rendered the very existence of Jesus to be most uncertain. An uncertainty, however, because its instigation stemmed from Jesus' loving desire to liberate humanity's hearts and lives from the alienating constraints of society, possessed the greatest of meaning - meaning derived directly from the fact that Jesus' life, his teachings and actions, were in full and perfect accord with the will of God from whence there can be found no greater purpose or truth. If this be the case, must not the Church follow? Must not the Church wrench itself free from its established position of privilege, and thereby, lose itself in order to find itself? In this critical time of national and international urgency, an urgency so many have all too easily reconciled themselves to, should not the Church shake these people and their determining institutions with the challenge and hope offered by Christ? Should not the Church take up the cross and follow the path of meaning and purpose as forged by Christ? Indeed, what other institution on earth is more qualified, in the sense of its authority, and therefore, more capable of acting as a light unto the world, independent of the established order, relying only on the meaning and purpose designated by God for his humanity.

c. Elimination of Sedating - Questioning the Socio-Economic Order

By virtue of the Church re-identifying itself with the challenge

and hope intrinsic to Christ's message, it is impossible for the stance of the Church, in terms of its analysis and directives, to be restricted within the parameters set by the capitalist system, or better still, set by the capitalist substructure which exists as the societal foundation determining the whole of social reality, the political and ideological. To explain, earlier it was discussed how the economic realm, in particular, the capitalist mode of production exists as the roots, the very seed from whence the rest of capitalist society, the political and ideological superstructure, springs forth and is determined. In this regard, for the past 1500 years or so, the Church has acted, in word and deed, within the ideological constraints of the current socio-economic order. Moreover, it can safely be said that the times of greatest conflict between the Church and the established order were generally confined to the superstructure itself, the ideological and the political, the Church and the state. Hence, not only was it a conflict that excluded, and thereby, represented no threat to the economic seed, the very foundation of society, it was as well, in terms of the degree to which the conflict's eventual resolution affected society's rank and file, a conflict of triviality. This is to say, the issues precipitating friction never threatened to disrupt the socio-economic base of society; rather, such issues were legitimate and valid in that their content and possible outcomes were conducive to and wholly compatible with the particular socio-economic order operating at the time in question. For example, more times than not, the limited themes generating conflict amongst the components of the superstructure, the state

and Church, were confined to the expropriation of Church land by the state during various waves of nationalism that periodically swept the continent, as well as the general power struggle concerning who possesses what authority in terms of legislating laws and establishing courts.

Of course, the above is not to suggest that the economic substructure remained completely unscathed from religious (ideological) criticism. Indeed, the encyclicals studied testify to this fact. However, and worthy of being stated again, while religion, or more specifically, the popes, do criticize capitalist economics in terms of the social deprivation facilitated, the moral validity, the very essence of capitalism existing as the substructure, the primal determinant of society, is never questioned nor considered. It is precisely this lack of investigation which serves to guarantee the system's integrity and unhindered evolution over time. For example, the popes' individualistic brand of analysis responsible for the Church's ignorance regarding the systematic necessity that labor remain in bondage to the needs of capital, has rendered contemporary capitalism utterly immune to effective papal criticism. Effective in the sense of correctly revealing the capitalist system for what it is and how it operates, totally indifferent to and apart from the human condition, as well as allowing for the commencement of capitalism's planned eradication and replacement of with a more rational and humanistic alternative.

In this light, once breaking from the established order by virtue of returning to Jesus' message concerning the Kingdom of God, no longer will the Church perceive reality from the same eyes as the establishment. Rather, it will don new eyes

critical in terms of both truth and justice. As such, these eyes will at last recognize the capitalist system for what it is - a system of sin totally oblivious to the needs and concerns of humanity. A **s**ystem of sin that, as this paper has shown, exists as the foremost instigator of some of the most pathetic human tragedies (*e.g.* the arms race, imperialism, alienation). In this way, the Church will at last be free to objectively comprehend and critique the reality that is the capitalist system. To this end, the message of the Church shall be far from **sedating**. Indeed, the hard cold truth of present reality can only be understood as existing in great contrast to the Kingdom of God as announced by Jesus. A contrast that the Church must recognize and at last begin to rectify. In this regard, the **process** of rectification is obviously not going to magically occur, but will require much work, much struggle, and above all, much love. A challenge of work, struggle, and love that Jesus invites all to joyously share and participate in. A challenge Jesus warns will entail many hardships as well as the ultimate reward of living and experiencing the love that is God, and thus, finding one's true purpose, fulfillment and meaning. "He who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake will find it (Mt. 10:38-39); for what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life?(Mt. 16:26)."

Truly, far from **being sedating**, the message of the Church grounded in a comprehensive understanding and grasp of societal mechanics, shall be most disrupting. Disrupting in the sense that

while the message of the Church shall seek to liberate all of humankind, the capitalist and the laborer, from their systematically imposed and dehumanizing roles of oppressor and oppressed, resistance and opposition to such a message is bound to exist. This is to say, the Church's universal message calling for a conversion of love in both the heart and the social institutions mediating human behavior will unquestionably be resisted by those occupying positions of privilege and ^{status} within the system. Indeed, capitalism features a group of persons who benefit, relative to others, from their position in society. Whether it be the capitalist, the politician, the general, or even the religious leader, many of these individuals have and will continue to indelibly identify their interests if not their very selves with the existing order. Thus, while being ignored if not hated and actively despised by those wishing to honor and preserve their entangling alliances and involvement with the present order, the message of the Church shall be readily accepted by the poor and lowly who exist marginalized, as the exploited periphery. As far as the privileged are concerned, Jesus is most aware of their unenviable affiliation with the established order. "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon (Mt. 6:24); "One thing you still lack. Sell all that you have and distribute to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come follow me," but when he heard this he became sad, for he was very rich. Jesus looking at him said, "How hard it is for those who have riches to enter

the Kingdom of God!" (Lk. 18-24).

In closing, the message of the Church must cater to the will of God, the purpose of God as expressed by and made manifest in the Kingdom of God. A Kingdom that, far from being removed, penetrates the here and now, the lives and affairs of all human-kind. Thus, unlike the encyclicals, the message of the Church must never be confined and sedated to the point of implicitly legitimizing a socio-economic order of sin. Truly, in remaining oblivious to the moral depravity intrinsic to the capitalist system, a system which allows a few to materially benefit while others suffer great misery and humiliation, are not the popes failing in their purpose as defined by the Word of God expressed through Jesus? In this regard, would it not be better for the popes to redefine the Church's message, making it, as was Jesus', one of uncompromising and direct provocation? "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth, I have not come to bring peace, but a sword (Mt. 10:34)." Direct provocation forcing each and every person into the unpleasant predicament of doubting and questioning all that he is and the reality of which he is surrounded. Introspection of this type must necessarily proceed if true purpose, **meaning and** eventual human renewal are to be realized and had. Understood in this way, it is most certain that such doubting and questioning has as its very instigation, as its very essence, the love that is demanded by God in his Kingdom.

¹Edward Gargon, Leo XIII and the Modern World (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), p. 22.

²Evils of Society, n. 3. Cf. Joseph Husslein, ed., Social Wellsprings Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Co., 1940), p. 3. Original Text - Acta Leonis, 1; 44-58; Acta Sanctae Sedis, 10; 585-92 (1878).

³Carlo Cippola, ed., The Fontana Economic History of Europe (Glasgow: William Collins Sons and Co., 1980), p. 474.

⁴Karl Marx, Capital (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 663 (Vol. 1).

⁵Gargon, op. cit., p. 17.

⁶Lillian Wallace, Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism (Duke: Duke Univ. Press, 1966), p. 71.

⁷The Socialists, n. 1. Cf. Husslein, op. cit., p. 14. Original Text - Acta Leonis, 1: 170-83; Acta Sanctae Sedis 11: 372-79.

⁸Ibid., Cf. Husslein, p. 15.

⁹The Condition of the Workingmen, n. 13. Cf. Husslein, p. 176.

¹⁰The Socialists, n. 1. Cf. Husslein, p. 14.

¹¹Ibid., n. 6. Cf. Husslein, p. 18.

¹²Ibid., n. 10. Cf. Husslein, p. 22.

¹³Ibid., n. 11. Cf. Husslein, p. 22.

¹⁴Ibid., n. 9. Cf. Husslein, p. 21.

¹⁵Ibid., n. 6. Cf. Husslein, pp. 18-19.

¹⁶Ibid., n. 7. Cf. Husslein, p. 19.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., n. 9. Cf. Husslein, p. 21.

¹⁹Ibid., n. 11. Cf. Husslein, pp. 22-23.

²⁰John Eaton, Political Economy (New York: International Publishers, 1966), p. 74.

²¹Marx, op. cit., p. 209.

²²Ibid.

²³L.S. Stavrianos, Global Rift (New York: William Morrow, 1981), p. 707.

²⁴Los Angeles Times (Nov. 28, 1980).

²⁵Howard Selsam, David Goldway, and Harry Martel, eds., Dynamics of Social Change (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 242.

²⁶Isaiah Berlin, Karl Marx (Oxford Univ. Press, 1963), p. 125.

²⁷The Socialists, n. 11. Cf. Husslein, op. cit., p. 23.

²⁸Robert Freedman ed., Marxist Social Thought (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), p. 230.

Chapter Two - Footnotes

¹Carlo Cipolla, ed., The Fontana Economic History of Europe (Glasgow: William Collins Sons and Co., 1980), p. 445.

²Original Text - Acta Leonis, 11:97-144; Acta Sancta Sedis, 23: 641-670; May 15, 1891.

³The Condition of the Workingmen, n. 2. Cf. Joseph Husslein, ed., Social Wellsprings Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Co., 1940), p. 168.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., n. 4. Cf. Husslein, pp. 169-70.

⁶Ibid., n. 10. Cf. Husslein, p. 173.

⁷Isaiah Berlin, Karl Marx (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963), p. 74.

⁸The Condition of the Workingmen, n. 11. Cf. Husslein, op. cit., p. 174.

⁹Ibid., n. 12. Cf. Husslein, p. 175.

¹⁰Ibid., n. 13. Cf. Husslein, p. 175.

¹¹Ibid., n. 22. Cf. Husslein, p. 183.

¹²Ibid., n. 14. Cf. Husslein, p. 176.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., n. 15. Cf. Husslein, p. 177.

¹⁵Ibid., n. 16. Cf. Husslein, p. 177.

¹⁶Ibid., n. 16, Cf. Husslein, p. 178.

¹⁷Ibid., n. 17. Cf. Husslein, p. 178.

¹⁸Ibid., n. 18. Cf. Husslein, pp. 180-81.

¹⁹Ibid., n. 22. Cf. Husslein, p. 182.

²⁰Ibid., n. 20. Cf. Husslein, p. 180.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid., n. 18. Cf. Husslein, p. 179.

²³Ibid., n. 30. Cf. Husslein, p. 189.

²⁴Ibid., n. 27. Cf. Husslein, p. 187.

²⁵Ibid., n. 29. Cf. Husslein, p. 189.

²⁶Ibid., n. 34. Cf. Husslein, p. 193.

²⁷Ibid., n. 35. Cf. Husslein, pp. 194-95.

²⁸Ibid., nn. 32-33. Cf. Husslein, p. 191.

²⁹Ibid., n. 33. Cf. Husslein, p.192.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid., n. 37. Cf. Husslein, p. 196.

³²Ibid., n. 39. Cf. Husslein, p. 198.

³³Ibid., n. 42. Cf. Husslein, p. 201.

³⁴Ibid., n. 45. Cf. Husslein, p. 203.

³⁵Ibid., n. 45. Cf. Husslein, pp. 203-04.

³⁶Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophic^d Manuscripts of 1844, Cf. Eugene Kamenka, ed., The Portable Karl Marx (New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1983); pp. 136-42.

³⁷John Eaton, Political Economy (New York: International Publishers, 1966), p. 11.

³⁸Maurice Cornforth, Historical Materialism (New York: International Publishers, 1962), p. 56.

³⁹Frederick Engels, Origin of the Family, Private Property and State, Cf. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels - Selected Works (New York: International Publishers, 1980), pp. 586-87.

⁴⁰Ibid., Cf. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels - Selected Works, pp. 578-79.

⁴¹Cornforth, op. cit., pp. 79-88.

⁴²Karl Marx, Capital (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 177.

- ⁴³Cornforth, op. cit., pp. 60-63.
- ⁴⁴L.S. Stavrianos, Global Rift (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1981), p. 47.
- ⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 47-48
- ⁴⁶Eaton, op. cit., p. 16.
- ⁴⁷Maurice Dobb, Studies in the Development of Capitalism (New York: International Publishers, 1963), pp. 36-37.
- ⁴⁸Eaton, op. cit., p. 15.
- ⁴⁹Cornforth, op. cit., p. 63.
- ⁵⁰Dobb, op. cit., p. 45.
- ⁵¹Ibid., p. 42.
- ⁵²Ibid., p. 43.
- ⁵³Ibid., p. 37.
- ⁵⁴Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 48.
- ⁵⁵Charles Anderson, The Political Economy of Social Class (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966), pp. 267-69.
- ⁵⁶Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 563.
- ⁵⁷The Citizen (Ottawa: Nov. 7, 1985), p. A5.
- ⁵⁸The Citizen (Ottawa: Nov. 5, 1985), p. D3.
- ⁵⁹Cornforth, op. cit., p. 140.
- ⁶⁰Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 471.
- ⁶¹Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, Cf. Kamenka, op. cit., p. 137.
- ⁶²Cornforth, op. cit., pp. 136-42.
- ⁶³William Domhoff, The Powers that Be (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), pp. 9-13.
- ⁶⁴James Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), pp. 169-70.
- ⁶⁵Ralph Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969), p. 102.

Chapter Three - Footnotes

¹David Gordon, Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich, Segmented Work, Divided Workers (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 176-78.

²James Green, The World of the Worker (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), pp. 174-78.

³Original Text - Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 23:177-228, June 1, 1931.

⁴On Reconstructing the Social Order, n. 136. Cf. Joseph Husslein, ed., Social Wellsprings Eighteen Encyclicals of Social Reconstruction by Pope Pius XI (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1942), p. 228.

⁵Ibid., n. 112. Cf. Husslein, p. 218.

⁶Ibid., nn. 113-114. Cf. Husslein, p. 219.

⁷Ibid., n. 118. Cf. Husslein, p. 221.

⁸Ibid., n. 54. Cf. Husslein, p. 197.

⁹Ibid., n. 10. Cf. Husslein, p. 181.

¹⁰Ibid., n. 47. Cf. Husslein, p. 194.

¹¹Ibid., n. 46. Cf. Husslein, p. 193.

¹²Ibid., n. 88. Cf. Husslein, p. 211.

¹³Ibid., n. 88. Cf. Husslein, p. 212.

¹⁴Ibid., n. 49. Cf. Husslein, pp. 194-95.

¹⁵Ibid., n. 114. Cf. Husslein, p. 220.

¹⁶Ibid., nn. 103-04. Cf. Husslein, pp. 215-16.

¹⁷Ibid., n. 107. Cf. Husslein, p. 216.

¹⁸Ibid., n. 106. Cf. Husslein, p. 216.

¹⁹Ibid., n. 108. Cf. Husslein, p. 216.

²⁰Ibid., n. 22. Cf. Husslein, p. 184.

²¹L.S. Stavrianos, Global Rift (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1981), p. 680.

²²Steel Facts, July 1970, p. 3.

²³Gus Hall, Imperialism Today (New York: International Publishers, 1972), p. 57.

- ²⁴E.R. Wolf and E.C. Hansen, The Human Condition in Latin America (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), p. 148
- ²⁵Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 682.
- ²⁶Ibid.
- ²⁷Ibid., p. 685
- ²⁸David Rockefeller, "What Private Enterprise Means to Latin America," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 44 (April 1966), p. 408
- ²⁹Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 686.
- ³⁰Ibid., p. 687.
- ³¹Ibid., p. 468.
- ³²Cited by J. Stein, "Grad School for Juntas," Nation (May 21, 1977), p. 622.
- ³³Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 468.
- ³⁴Ibid., p. 682.
- ³⁵Ibid., p. 443.
- ³⁶Ibid., p. 442.
- ³⁷Ibid.
- ³⁸Cited by R. Burbach and P. Flynn, Agribusiness in the Americas (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1980), p. 67.
- ³⁹Washington Post (Dec. 24, 1980).
- ⁴⁰R.J. Barnet and R.E. Muller, Global Reach (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), p. 154.
- ⁴¹Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 684.
- ⁴²Ibid.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 691.
- ⁴⁴Ibid.
- ⁴⁵Ibid.
- ⁴⁶Ibid., p. 693.
- ⁴⁷Hall, op. cit., p. 131.
- ⁴⁸Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 447.
- ⁴⁹Ibid.
- ⁵⁰Ibid p. 761.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 762.

⁵²William Domhoff, The Powers that Be (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), pp. 64-65.

⁵³Ibid., p. 65.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Stavrianos, op. cit., p. 459.

⁵⁶Domhoff, op. cit., p. 66.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 66-67.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 67.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 68-69.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 76.

⁶²Ibid., p. 78.

⁶³Ibid., p. 89.

Chapter Four - Footnotes

¹Original Text - Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 53 (1961), 401-64.

²Mater et Magistra - Encyclical Letter of John XXIII (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), n. 50., p. 22.

³Ibid.

⁴Ralph Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1969), p. 108.

⁵Mater et Magistra, op. cit., n. 54., p. 24.

⁶Ibid., nn. 57-58., pp. 24-25.

⁷Ibid., n. 59., p. 25.

⁸Ibid., n. 62, p. 26.

⁹Ibid., n. 68, p. 28.

¹⁰Ibid., n. 70, p. 28.

¹¹Ibid., n. 71, p. 28.

¹²Ibid.

- ¹³Ibid., n. 73, pp. 29-30.
- ¹⁴Ibid., n. 74, p. 30.
- ¹⁵Ibid., nn. 82-83, p. 32.
- ¹⁶Ibid., n. 84, p. 32.
- ¹⁷Ibid., n. 94, p. 35.
- ¹⁸Ibid., n. 99, p. 36.
- ¹⁹Ibid., n. 157, p. 53.
- ²⁰Ibid., n. 158, p. 53.
- ²¹Ibid., n. 151, pp. 51-52.
- ²²Ibid., nn. 171-73, p. 56.
- ²³The Economist, January 17, 1986, pp. 23-24.
- ²⁴Mater et Magistra, op. cit., nn. 161-62, p. 54.
- ²⁵Ibid., n. 189, p. 60.
- ²⁶Ibid., n. 199, p. 63.
- ²⁷Ibid., n. 192, p. 61.
- ²⁸Ibid., nn. 82-83, p. 32.
- ²⁹Karl Marx, Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts. Cf. Robert Freedman, ed., Marxist Social Thought (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1968), p. 78.
- ³⁰Ibid., Cf. Freedman, p. 79.
- ³¹Ibid., Cf. Freedman, p. 91.
- ³²Ibid., Cf. Freedman, pp. 71-72.
- ³³Ibid., Cf. Freedman, p. 72.
- ³⁴Erich Fromm, Marx's Concept of Man (New York: Frederick Ungar Co., 1961), p. 49.
- ³⁵Freedman, op. cit., pp. 296-97.
- ³⁶L.S. Stavrianos, Global Rift (William Morrow Inc., 1981), pp. 574-75.
- ³⁷Gus Hall, Imperialism Today (New York: International Publishers, 1973), p. 210.

38. James Petras, Politics and Social Structures in Latin America (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), p. 234.

39 Ibid.

40 The Socialists, n. 7, Cf. Joseph Husslein, ed., Social Wellsprings Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1940), p. 168.

Chapter Five - Footnotes

¹Laborem Exercens, n. 12. Cf. Gregory Baum, The Priority of Labor (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), p. 118.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., n. 6. Cf. Baum, pp. 104-105.

⁴Ibid., n. 11. Cf. Baum, p. 115.

⁵Ibid., n. 7. Cf. Baum, pp. 107-108.

⁶Ibid., n. 12. Cf. Baum, p. 119.

⁷Ibid., n. 13. Cf. Baum, p. 119.

⁸Ibid., n. 14. Cf. Baum, p. 123.

⁹Ibid., n. 14. Cf. Baum, pp. 123-24.

¹⁰Ibid., n. 18. Cf. Baum, p. 132.

¹¹Ibid., n. 18. Cf. Baum, p. 131.

¹²Ibid., n. 18. Cf. Baum, p. 130.

¹³Ibid., n. 17. Cf. Baum, pp. 128-29.

¹⁴Ibid., n. 13. Cf. Baum, p. 120.

¹⁵Ibid., n. 14. Cf. Baum, p. 124.

¹⁶John XXIII, Mater et Magistra (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), p. 32.

¹⁷Laborem Exercens n. 19. Cf. Baum, op. cit., p. 132.

¹⁸Gregory Baum, The Priority of Labor (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), p. 27

Bibliography:

- Anderson, Charles. The Political Economy of Social Class. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Barnet, R.J. Global Reach. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.
- Baum, Gregory. The Priority of Labor. New York: Paulist Press, 1982.
- Berlin, Isaiah. Karl Marx. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Boff, Leonardo. Jesus Christ Liberator. New York: Orbis Books, 1978.
- Burbach, R. Agribusiness in the Americas. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1980.
- Cipolla, Carlo. ed. The Fontana Economic History of Europe. Glasgow: William Collins Sons and Co., 1980.
- Cornforth, Maurice. Historical Materialism. New York: International Publishers, 1962.
- Dobb, Maurice. Studies in the Development of Capitalism. New York: International Publishers, 1963.
- Domhoff, William. The Powers that Be. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Eaton, John. Political Economy. New York: International Publishers, 1966.
- Freedman, Robert. ed. Marxist Social Thought. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1968.
- Fromm, Erich. Marx's Concept of Man. New York: Frederick Ungar Co., 1961.
- Gargan, Edward. Leo XIII and the Modern World. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Gordon, David. Segmented Work, Divided Workers. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Green, James. The World of the Worker. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. A Theology of Liberation. New York: Orbis Books, 1973.
- Hall, Gus. Imperialism Today. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Husslein, Joseph. ed. Social Wellsprings Eighteen Encyclicals of Social Reconstruction by Pope Pius XI. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1942.

- Husslein, Joseph. ed. Social Wellsprings Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1940.
- Kamenka, Eugene. ed., The Portable Karl Marx. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1983.
- Karl Marx and Frederick Engels-Selected Works. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- Los Angeles Times. (Nov. 28, 1980).
- Marx, Karl. Capital (3 Volumes). New York: International Publishers, 1967.
- Marx, Karl. The German Ideology. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
- Marx, Karl. Value, Price and Profit. New York: International Publishers, 1935.
- Marx, Karl. Wage-Labour and Capital. New York: International Publishers, 1933.
- Mater et Magistra. Encyclical Letter of Pope John XXIII - New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- Miliband, Ralph. The State in Capitalist Society. New York: Basic Books, 1969.
- Petras, James. Politics and Social Structure in Latin America. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.
- Rockefeller, David. "What Private Enterprise Means to Latin America" Foreign Affairs. Vol. 44 (April 1966).
- Selsam, Howard. Dynamics of Social Change. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
- Stavrianos, L.S. Global Rift. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1981.
- Stein, J. "Grad School for Juntas" Nation. May 21, 1977.
- The Citizen. Ottawa: November, 5,6,1985.
- The Economist. January 17, 1986.
- Washington Post. December 24, 1980.
- Wallace, Lillian. Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism. Duke: Duke University Press, 1966.

Wolf, E.R. The Human Condition in Latin America. London: Oxford
University Press, 1972.