

## **MORE FROM FRANCIS AND JOHN PAUL II ON ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

**Edward J. O’Boyle, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate  
Mayo Research Institute  
www.mayoresearch.com  
[edoboyle737@gmail.com](mailto:edoboyle737@gmail.com)**

**July 2016**

We first became acquainted with Pope Francis’s views on economic affairs with the publication of his apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*. Our comments, which were derived entirely from that document, revolved around seven subjects: economic gain vs. goodness, inequality, profits, freedom, the market, private property, and subsidiarity.<sup>1</sup>

In that commentary, we asserted that problems with every one of these topics originate with an inadequate understanding of basic economics that American Jesuit economists Thomas Divine and Bernard Dempsey warned about years ago. This problem might have been avoided had Francis leaned on the scholarly work of Pope John Paul II notably in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Centesimus Annus*.

In the following our remarks regarding Francis and economic affairs derive principally from *Laudato Si’* and his comments at the Second World Meeting of Popular Movements in Santa Cruz Bolivia and are centered on the following seven topics drawn from a much wider set: self-love (self-interest), the common good, justice and charity, community and individuality, human action and human personality, the natural environment, and land, lodging, and labor. Self-interest, economic gain, and land, lodging and labor, were addressed at the October 2015 ITEST conference “Economic Justice in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century”: Myth or Reality? A Christian Perspective” [O’Boyle 2015]. We found it necessary, however, to make revisions to all three of those topics in this essay.

We have a particular interest in Francis’s remarks on the natural environment and his three “Ls” – land, lodging, and labor – that he asserted with great emphasis in Santa Cruz last year. In this regard, we call attention to his omission of a fourth “L” – liberty

---

<sup>1</sup> See O’Boyle, *ITEST Bulletin*, 2014, summer and fall issues.

(freedom)<sup>2</sup> that John Paul addressed in the most positive terms. By re-affirming the three “Ls” in his address at the United Nations on September 25, Francis’s remarks at Santa Cruz provide important insights into his thinking on economic affairs not just in Latin America but across the entire world. Consequently, *our* remarks on *these* two vitally important subjects are more extensive than on the other five subjects

As to John Paul’s views on economic affairs, we rely heavily on his *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Centesimus Annus*.

Two matters require addressing before we move on. First, economic development requires the transformation of resources into goods and services, thereby introducing waste in the form of discharge into the environment. The more vigorous and advanced the economic development the greater the discharge though over time improvements in the process of production and a change in the kinds of goods and services produced can reduce that discharge. Thus, developed countries typically discharge more waste than developing countries. Unless production is shut down entirely, there is no such thing as an economy free of all environmental discharge.

Second, in every instance we used the Vatican website for the English-language version of every papal document cited or quoted herein. At times we have quoted our sources at length in order to remove any personal interpretation as much as possible.

## 1. SELF-LOVE (SELF-INTEREST)

As an Argentinian, Francis expresses the anger and despair of the barrio. His remarks in Santa Cruz and in *Laudato Si'* relate to environmental concerns. It is clear to him, however, that such concerns originate in excessive self-interest. Indeed, one could read into his comments that the problem is not self-interest that is excessive but pure and simple self-interest.

Our freedom fades when it is handed over to the blind forces of the unconscious, of immediate needs, of self-interest, and of violence. [Francis 2015a, §105].

By learning to see and appreciate beauty, we learn to reject self-interested pragmatism. [Francis 2015a, §215].

---

<sup>2</sup> Liberty and freedom typically are used as synonyms. O’Brien, however, argues forcefully that they are decidedly different. Liberty means “to be free of external restraint...” In contrast “Through real freedom, all the discordant and centrifugal elements of one’s nature are brought together in harmony, as the idiosyncratic natures of the orchestra’s instruments are united to sing the symphony.” [O’Brien n.d., pp. 1, 3]. We exercise some license in using liberty as one of the 4 L’s when in truth we really mean freedom as defined by O’Brien.

**Once capital becomes an idol and guides people's decisions, once greed for money presides over the entire socioeconomic system, it ruins society, it condemns and enslaves men and women, it destroys human fraternity, it sets people against one another and ... it even puts at risk our common home, sister and mother earth. [Francis 2015b, pp.2-3].**

**As a Pole who suffered under Nazi and Soviet regimes, John Paul also knew from personal experience the oppressive powers of a state that crush self-interest. His remedy is not to juxtaposition self-interest and interests of society as a whole. It is to find ways to reconcile the two.**

**Man tends toward good, but he is also capable of evil. He can transcend his immediate interest and still remain bound to it. The social order will be all the more stable, the more it takes this fact into account and does not place in opposition personal interest and the interests of society as a whole, but rather seeks ways to bring them into fruitful harmony. In fact, where self-interest is violently suppressed, it is replaced by a burdensome system of bureaucratic control which dries up the wellsprings of initiative and creativity. [John Paul 1991, §25].**

**Even though Christ Himself is the ultimate model of self-sacrifice, Christian charity does not demand that Christians uproot all self-interest and replace it with self-sacrifice. Rather, Christians are obliged to temper self-interest with generosity, to give to the poor from their abundance. [Leo XIII 1891, §22].**

**Self-love *per se* is not the problem. Indeed self-love is both legitimate and necessary. The problem arises from self-love in the service of evil ends and thus the need for a limit that originates in an awareness of and respect for the well-being of others and the practical virtue of moderation.**

## **2. COMMON GOOD**

**By the common good we mean the general welfare. [Dempsey 1958, p.218]. Because human beings live in community they have certain needs that are common to everyone and can be met only by everyone acting together. The common good is promoted through the practice of virtue [Dempsey 1958, p.369] and for that reason the common good is connected not to the *homo economicus* of mainstream economics but to the *person of action* of personalist economics who by acting virtuously enhances his/her personal development and by acting viciously diminishes that development.**

John Paul agrees specifically with regard to the virtue of solidarity [John Paul 1987a, §38], and re-affirms the principle of the universal destination of the earth's goods that states that the material goods of this world are intended for the use of all humankind and are not governed and protected absolutely in their use by the right of private property.

How then does one reconcile the right of private property and the right of all humankind to the material goods of this world? The right of private ownership, according to John Paul, is subordinate to the universal destination of material goods.

... the only legitimate title to .... [the possession of material goods] -- 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 principles of this order, namely, the universal destination of goods and the right to common use of them. [John Paul 1981, §14; emphasis in the original].

Francis makes numerous references to the common good and to Earth as our common home in his comments at 2015 meeting in Santa Cruz and in *Laudato Si'*. In Santa Cruz he connected the common good to solidarity and subsidiarity. [Francis 2015b, p.6]. The connection to solidarity is found years before with John Paul and even though Francis calls attention to other virtues such as humility, justice, courage, and perseverance, he only hints at the connection between men and women of virtue and the common good.

Among his many references to the common good in *Laudato Si'* we have selected two: the climate as a common good and his reflections on the principle of the common good. We turn first to the principle of the common good wherein Francis defines it as “the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment.” [Francis 2015a, §156]. His source is *Gaudium et Spes*.

To Francis the foundation of the common good is respect for all human beings. The common good relates, he says, to the general welfare, the development of intermediate groups, and calls for social peace, stability, and security that depend on distributive justice. In a world inflicted with injustices that impoverish multitudes of human beings, the common good is a summons to solidarity and the preferential option for the poor. In that regard he is on the same page as John Paul.

To our knowledge, Francis is the first Holy Father to identify the climate as a common good (see Francis 2015a, §§23-26). After identifying it thusly Francis proceeds to engage in climate science and policy recommendations that derive from his understanding of that science with few citations from the climate science literature. Here his passion for the earth

as our common home leads him to drift outside the boundaries of his professional specialization.

### 3. JUSTICE AND CHARITY

Pesch refers to charity as the guardian of justice and both virtues together as the bulwark of human welfare. [Mulcahy 1951, p.68]. Pius XI in *Quadragesimo Anno* insists that justice alone is insufficient, that charity is required for a union of hearts and minds. [Pius XI 1931, §137]. Later in *Divini Redemptoris* he states that charity is to be practiced after justice has been taken into account because the worker is not to receive in the form of alms that which he is owed in justice. [Pius XI 1937, §9].

In that encyclical Pius XI refers to Christian charity as "... this precious mark of the identification left by Christ to His true disciples..." [Pius XI 1937, §47]. In *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* [§40] John Paul refers to charity in similar language: "the distinguishing mark of Christ's disciples."

The origins of charity in the Holy Scriptures are many. A widely cited passage is: "As long as you did it for one of My least brethren you did it to Me." While justice can be and frequently is enforced by law, Leo XIII insists that Christian charity cannot be enforced by those means. [Leo XIII 1891, §22].

The Christian worker is more than just fair-minded. He/she routinely exceeds the demands imposed by the principle of equivalence and gives this additional value-added voluntarily. The diligent worker's gift is prompted by genuine love for his/her fellow worker, employer, and customer. This excess value-added can be seized entirely by the employer in the form of a higher margin of profit. John Paul warns about the "all-consuming desire for profit" and "the thirst for power" both of which are "indissolubly united" and which he labels a "double attitude of sin" [John Paul 1987a, §37] or it can be given freely in full or in part, to the customer. If the excess value-added is given freely to the customer and is accepted graciously and lovingly by that customer who explicitly acknowledges the bargain received,<sup>3</sup> the excess value-added in effect is freely given back to its source. In this manner, the Christian customer creates or enhances the real though intangible business asset known as goodwill. In contrast, the ungracious and unloving customer who accepts the gift but refuses or neglects to affirm the giver in effect loses an opportunity to contribute to this asset. The tragedy is that, with this holding back, nothing is kept, nothing is gained.

---

<sup>3</sup> Which, in this instance, flows from a seller who freely gives more than the principle of equivalence demands rather than from an undervaluation on the part of the seller.

In the workplace, the Christian worker's gift creates a sense of solidarity or community, a oneness that some call "family" only when the employer responds in similar fashion by giving it freely to the customer in the form of a bargain and the buyer responds by returning the excess value-added in the form of goodwill. Thus, as long as the excess value-added is freely given, it produces goodwill for the employer, a sense of belonging for the worker, and an authentic bargain for the buyer. If it is hoarded, it becomes sterile and its fruits wither or never blossom at all.

Charity has a positive-sum constitution. The three value-added, goodwill, workplace solidarity, and the true bargain ) are the products of Christian charity. In that sense, charity is an authentic economic resource. Uniquely among resources and goods, charity *is not used up* in the process of production or consumption. Rather, it produces solidarity in the workplace, the real bargain in the marketplace, and goodwill throughout the economic order *only when it is given freely*.

We found little mention of Christian charity in Francis' *Laudato Si'* or in his address to the Second World Meeting of Popular Movements though it could be intended in his frequent references to love. With regard to love, Francis attempts to break new ground by connecting it to the environment. He calls it social love that "...moves us to devise larger strategies to halt environmental degradation and to encourage a 'culture of care' which permeates all of society." [Francis 2015a, §231].

By insisting that love involves a living, breathing human being in terms of the one who loves and the one who is loved, Francis in his remarks at the Second World Meeting of Popular Movements Francis seems to back away from social love: "We do not love concepts or ideas; no one loves a concept or an idea. We love people ..." [Francis 2015b, p.4].

What we see in *Laudato Si'* and his comments in Santa Cruz is a man from the southern hemisphere who is angry.

Colonialism, both old and new, which reduces poor countries to mere providers of raw materials and cheap labor, engenders violence, poverty, forced migrations and all the evils which go hand in hand with these ... [Francis 2015b, p.7].

Francis is a man who dwells on the injustices perpetuated by the market system.

[The culture of relativism] is also the mindset of those who say: Let us allow the invisible forces of the market to regulate the economy, and consider their impact on society and nature as collateral damage. [Francis 2015, §123].

John Paul warns us that economic development is above all a human problem that cannot be remediated by individual self-interest and the impersonal forces of the market system. The virtue of justice for sure is required, but justice alone will not do. Preference in development is to be given to the growing numbers of the poor worldwide, not just in developing countries but in advanced countries as well. John Paul sees this option as an exercise in Christian charity, and to underscore its connection to that virtue refers to it as “this love of preference for the poor.”

John Paul does not condemn the market system out of hand. If, however, that system continues to prove unable to provision the material needs of the world’s poor as in the southern hemisphere, it is certain that he would not hesitate to denounce that performance as unacceptable. In that regard John Paul and Francis are in agreement.

#### 4. COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUALITY

In *Laudato Si'* and in Santa Cruz Francis central concern is not with community and individuality but with the environment, how it is being destroyed by an economic system that is driven by the “bondage of individualism” and “unfettered pursuit of money” [Francis 2015b, p.2], and the changes needed to halt and reverse that destruction. He rejects the “magical concept of the market” [Francis 2015a, §190] which we take to mean the invisible hand doctrine of mainstream economics which claims that pursuing self-interest the individual at the same time serves the common good. We too reject the invisible hand doctrine on grounds that it truly is magical thinking but we do not reject the entire market system.

Economic decision-making can be organized in two ways. It can be concentrated in the hands of a central authority or it can be assigned to millions of different persons and private organizations. The first puts control in the hands of the *One*. The second puts it in the hands of the *Many*. Our strong preference is for the latter because it applies the democratic principle to economic affairs. When the market fails our strong preference is not to turn to the *One* for a remedy due to the imperfections of those who rule. Rather it is to turn to intermediary bodies between the *One* and the *Many* because those bodies are a tangible expression of the principle subsidiarity that helps avert the problem of the imperfections of those who rule.

We are persuaded that Francis rejects the *Many* and seems to embrace the *One* for two reasons. First, he mentions subsidiarity only twice in *Laudato Si'* (see §§157 and 196). Second, he has a lengthy section in the encyclical on international community (see §§164-175) that to us transfers decision-making to a level beyond the national *One*: “Enforceable international agreements are urgently needed, since local authorities are not always capable of effective intervention.” [Francis 2015a, §173].

**Ironically, at the very same time Francis demands greater globalization of decision-making in environmental matters he condemns the effects of financial globalization (see, for instance, Francis 2015a, §56). One could conclude that financial globalization is bad because it is in the hands of the few who are imperfect but good in environmental matters because it would be placed in the hands of the few who are not imperfect.**

**John Paul in *Centesimus Annus* examines community and individuality at length and for that reason we are not able to fully represent his remarks herein. The ones we have selected are to us the most significant or instructive. We contend that there is more clarity with John Paul than with Francis.**

**The business firm, according to John Paul, is not simply an instrument for generating profits. It is a community of persons whose purpose is to satisfy their fundamental human needs. [John Paul 1991, §35]. Further, John Paul condemns socialism because it is destructive of human individuality and by extension human community. It “makes it much more difficult for [a person] to recognize his dignity as a person, and hinders progress toward building up of an authentic human community. [John Paul 1991, §13].**

**Grisez and Shaw [1974, p.42] assert that the conflict between community and individuality is the tension between altruism and egoism. Following John Paul, the key to reconciling community and individuality is found in intermediary groups, those private organizations that stand between the individual and the state. [John Paul 1991, §§13, 49].**

## **5. HUMAN ACTION AND HUMAN PERSONALITY**

**We are puzzled with Francis’s assertion in *Laudato Si’* [§6] that “man does not create himself” for three reasons. First, there is a mismatch between the words Francis uses and the words in the original document. Second we do not understand the meaning Francis is trying to convey in “man is not only a freedom which he creates for himself.” Third, Francis seems to be in conflict with John Paul who insists that man is “a subjective being capable of acting in a planned and rational way, capable of deciding upon himself, and with a tendency to self-realization.” [John Paul 1981, §6]. Through work man “*achieves fulfillment* as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes ‘more a human being.’” [John Paul 1981, §9; emphasis in the original].**

**Francis also is at odds with fellow Jesuits Dempsey and Divine: “... the basic purpose of the society can not [sic] be other than the basic purpose of the real persons who compose it, that is, their perfection.” [Dempsey 1958, p.273]. “... the final and ultimate goal of economic life is the development and perfection of the human personality insofar as that lies within the sphere of economic activity.” [Divine 1960, chapter 33, p.4].**

## 6. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Sustainable development is “...economic enhancement that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” [Carroll & Stanfield 2001, p.470]. Sustainable development depends on production and production, in turn, depends on the economic agent as its efficient cause. In that sense, sustainable development is properly considered contingent being and as with all contingent being is constituted by an actuating principle and a limiting principle. [Renard 1957, pp.7-15, and Joseph Becker 1961, p.11]. Mainstream economics identifies the actuating principle as human wants, and the limiting principle as the resources available to satisfy those wants. The two converge in the market system.

Personalist economics identifies the actuating principle as the needs and wants of the human body and spirit, and the limiting principle as the resources available to meet those needs and satisfy those wants subject to the secondary limit that those resources are utilized in ways that minimize their depletion and any damage to the natural environment. The two principles converge in the market system that may be constrained by whatever economic *institutions* are required to assure that everything possible is done to meet human needs and satisfy human wants adequately and to use resources wisely. In its strict libertarian form, mainstream economics argues that the *law of nature* alone sets secondary limits through the invisible hand; economic institutions are unnecessary.

*Actuating Principle: Positive Effects.* The needs of the body include sustenance and rest. The needs of the spirit include a need to know and understand truth, goodness, and beauty, and a need for opportunities to develop and use one’s creative talents, skills, and energies. Humans also need to associate with like-minded others, to experience a sense of being included, of being valued by the group(s) to which they belong. All of these needs are met importantly through the three human activities most closely linked to economic affairs: work, consumption, and leisure. Whether human need is met individually or collectively, and notwithstanding mainstream doctrine about restricting economic analysis to the means that are employed to achieve certain ends in economic affairs but not the ends themselves, sustainable development obviously is a matter of meeting that need.

Though important, the needs of future generations are clearly secondary in the sense that the present generation consists of living human beings whose basic needs cannot be subordinated to the needs of future generations that at the moment consist of humans not yet alive. To do otherwise means subordinating human actualities to human potentialities, putting the supposed and uncertain needs of the future ahead of the real and certain needs of the present. In the extreme, doing otherwise means starving the present to feed the future.

***Limiting Principle: Negative Effects.*** Only humans are capable of setting limits in support of sustainable development. Some of these limits are necessary for survival. Personalist economics defends the imposition of limits on the use of toxins and asbestos, for example, because left to the market alone human bodily health and well being are not adequately protected. Other limits justified by personalist economics may relate more directly to a need of the human spirit such as limiting residential development in order to protect a pristine natural view. Critical values must be developed that render in measurable form the need to be addressed and therefore where the limits are to be drawn. Setting and enforcing those criteria, especially as regards to discharging pollutants into the air, water, and soil, are at the very core of the work of environmental protection. Those criteria will change with greater human understanding and therefore cannot be fixed once for all.

The problem of developing, setting, and enforcing limits is an aspect of the *One-Many* dichotomy. Should we act as *Many* through the market system or as *One* through groups? If we decide to act as *One*, should it be through private groups such as cooperatives or through public agencies? And if we decide to act as the public *One*, should it be through local, state, regional, or national governing bodies?

The duty to set limits originates in the principle of contributive justice. As members of the human family, every human being has a duty in contributive justice to maintain and support a life-giving, life-sustaining environment. To ignore or dismiss this duty threatens all living things and in the end is self-destructive. Thus from the perspective of its own limiting principle sustainable development is a moral issue.

In like manner, utilization of natural resources especially vital nonrenewable resources to meet the needs of the current generation has to be constrained in order to provide adequately for the needs of future generations, *even when the carrying-capacity limit has been respected*. Here sustainable development is not a matter of threatening human survival but of acting as a responsible steward.

Setting and abiding environmental limits in terms of depletion and environmental contamination other limits must be imposed on the demand for consumer goods and services, capital goods and services, and public goods and services. This in turn means that economic agents must *act* according to the virtue of moderation, assuring that they use goods and services as means to meeting their needs and satisfying their wants but not as ends in themselves. Agents who act instead on the vice of self-indulgence or blissful ignorance make the problem of resource depletion and environmental contamination even worse.

Until Francis and *Laudato Si'*, John Paul was largely responsible for shaping Catholic social teaching on sustainable development. In the 15-page chapter on safeguarding the

environment in the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Centesimus Annus* are cited nine times each. Further, John Paul is cited 60 times in that section, whereas only two other papal documents are referenced, both by Paul VI.

John Paul recognizes the dangers to the natural environment from consumption and identifies its root cause. Extravagant regard for one's own material existence, that increasingly characterizes contemporary western culture, "... consumes the resources of the earth and [one's] own life in an excessive and disordered way...man sets himself up in place of God and thus ends up provoking a rebellion on the part of nature, which is more tyrannized than governed by him." [John Paul 1991, §37]. The danger is that consumption, carried to an extreme, reduces the consumer to a mere material being. Instead of *having* more, which modern economies celebrate and conventional economics tacitly affirms, John Paul urges men and women *to be* more, to develop the full potential of their personalities, to be a complete human person, and not just a self-absorbed individual.

As to special considerations regarding nature in the development process, John Paul focuses on three constraints. First, developers must protect and preserve the ecological balance in the natural environment. Second, they must operate within the limits imposed by natural resources, notably those that are nonrenewable, and take into account the needs of future generations. Third, developers must avoid "haphazard industrialization" that is dangerous to human physical well-being. [John Paul 1987a, §34].

In *Laudato Si'* Francis has drawn much-anticipated interest in his remarks regarding climate change from both sides of the argument. Some say that he should mind his own business and not meddle in complex scientific affairs that are above his pay grade. Others counter with the statement that he's on the right side of the science, which they insist is entirely settled, and ought to be applauded for his courageous stance.

We have no intention in the following to engage directly in the climate-science controversy because climate science is largely outside the domain of economics. Rather we take up the research methods employed in the encyclical. Specifically, do they measure up to research that is well-grounded and supportive of the claims and assertions Francis makes?

Francis makes many bold statements regarding the environment in *Laudato Si'*. However, in 34 of the 45 sections of Chapter One of the encyclical, *What is Happening to our Common Home*, there is no documentation. In the three sections under the heading *pollution, waste, throwaway culture* in that chapter, there is not a single source document cited. In like manner, in the four sections under *climate as a common good*, there is not a single source document cited. There are five sections in the encyclical's *the issues of water*. There is no

documentation in the first four; the last section has only one. In just two of the 11 sections under *loss of diversity* are source documents cited.

In 16 of the 36 sections in Chapter Three, *The Human Roots of the Ecological Crisis* there is no documentation. In 17 of the 26 sections of Chapter Four, *Integral Ecology*, no documents are cited.

An established authority in climate science can speak without detailed documentation. In *Laudato Si'* Francis makes two fundamental mistakes. First, he presents himself as if he were an established authority figure in climate science. Second, he intimates that the science is settled. Men and women trained in the scientific method know that nothing in science is completely settled because those who do science are imperfect human beings.

## 7. LAND, LODGING, LABOR, AND LIBERTY

In his remarks at the Second World Meeting of Popular Movements in Santa Cruz, Francis underscored the importance of land, lodging, and labor. [Francis 2015b, p.3].

At the end of his comments, Francis stated his vision for the future of humankind.

No family without lodging, no rural worker without land, no laborer without rights, no people without sovereignty, no individual without dignity, no child without childhood, no young person without a future, no elderly person without a venerable old age. [Francis 2015b, p.9].

Beyond that Francis had little of substance to offer.

... it is not so easy to define the content of change – in other words, a social program which can embody this project of fraternity and justice which we are seeking. It is not easy to define it. *So don't expect a recipe from this Pope.* [Francis 2015b, p.5; emphasis added].

Missing from Francis's three "L's" is a fourth – liberty (freedom).<sup>4</sup>

Referring to America on the occasion of his visit in 1987, John Paul said the following about liberty (freedom).

---

<sup>4</sup> Francis mentions "freedom" several times in *Laudato Si'*: §§6, 53, 78, 79, 105, 108, 112, 118, 140, 142, 196, 205, and 219. He uses or implies "economic freedom" in §§129 and 203. He uses "liberty" once in §71 and then only in quoting someone else.

She is called to exercise it in such a way that it will also benefit the cause of freedom in other nations and among other peoples. The only true freedom, the only freedom that can truly satisfy, is the freedom to do what we ought as human beings created by God according to his plan. It is *the freedom to live the truth of what we are and who we are* before God, the truth of our identity as children of God, as brothers and sisters in common humanity. [John Paul 1987b, §3; emphasis in the original].

In *Laudato Si'* [§129] Francis calls for restraints that are imposed occasionally on the economic freedom of “those possessing greater resources and financial power”. He seems to argue that economic freedom must be restrained when it interferes with job creation. Put differently, economic freedom is welcome as long as it contributes to job creation.

To Francis, it appears, jobs are an end in themselves. [Francis 2015a, §128].

We argue that integral human development is the ultimate economic objective (see Dempsey 1958, pp.271, 273; Divine 1960, Chapter 24, pp.7-8) of which human material need is an essential dimension. From that perspective jobs are a means to meeting that need and contributing to that development.

Francis [2015a, §203] laments that today’s dominant culture conditions human beings to identify freedom with the “freedom to consume.” This freedom we construe in a wider context as freedom to do as one pleases. He follows immediately with “... those really free are the minority who wield economic and financial power,” a claim that seems to contradict what he said in §129.

Clearly Francis condemns freedom to consume and by implication freedom to do as one pleases and accepts economic freedom with the qualifier that it not interfere with job creation. He adds a second qualifier: economic freedom is acceptable when access to it is not restricted to the few who wield economic and financial power. [Francis 2015a, §§129, 203]. Francis recommends two ways to expand economic freedom. First, civil authorities are duty bound to “adopt clear and firm measures in support of small producers and differentiated production” to assure that small landowners are not destroyed by the economies-of-scale logic and their inability to access regional and global markets. [Francis 2015a, §129]. Second, to change the power structure he suggests boycotting the products of companies until “a change in lifestyle [brings] healthy pressure to bear on those who wield political, economic and social power.” [Francis 2015a, §206].

John Paul sees economic freedom differently. In *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* John Paul identified two fundamental human rights: religious freedom and freedom of economic

initiative [John Paul 1987a, §42] and voiced his concern about the way in which economic affairs are organized.

*... a society of free work, of enterprise and of participation ... is not directed against the market, but demands that the market be appropriately controlled by the forces of society and by the State, so as to guarantee that the basic needs of the whole of society are satisfied. [John Paul 1991, §35; emphasis in the original].*

Four years prior to *Centesimus Annus* John Paul stated the following in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*.

*... humanity today is in a new and more difficult phase of its genuine development. It needs a greater degree of international ordering, at the services of the societies, economies and cultures of the whole world. [John Paul 1987a, §43].*

John Paul recommends of four areas in need of reform: the international trade system; the world monetary and financial system; technological exchanges; the structure of existing international organizations in the context of an international juridical order. [John Paul 1987a, §43].

Three questions remain. First, when it becomes accessible to the many, how is their economic and financial power to be expressed? Through a market economy or command economy?

Second, when and to what extent is freedom to be sacrificed to the 3 “L’s” of land, labor and lodging?

Third, does Francis embrace John Paul’s freedom of economic initiative even when that freedom results in the creation of new economic structures and the destruction of old ones as, for example, in the case of airline travel destroying passenger liners and big box stores wiping out family-owned businesses?

See John Paul’s 1995 address to the United Nations for much more on the freedom of individuals and nations in which he declares that the “... universal longing for freedom is truly one of the distinguishing marks of our time.” [John Paul 1995, §2].

## FINAL WORDS

Finally, what can be said about Francis and John Paul as human beings?

- Francis is a populist; John Paul is a personalist.
- Francis is impassioned; John Paul is scholarly.
- Francis advocates for change in economic affairs with no clear roadmap for directing that change.
- John Paul helped bring about change in economic affairs in Eastern and Central Europe by emphasizing solidarity and freedom of economic initiative.
- Francis supports globalization in environmental affairs at the same time he finds fault with globalization in financial affairs.
- John Paul is more favorably inclined toward local governance of economic affairs notably through intermediary groups.
- Francis tends to define economic affairs in the language of injustice and sees little role for Christian charity in those affairs. John Paul looks at economic affairs from a more positive perspective, emphasizing justice and embracing Christian charity.
- Francis and John Paul are in general agreement regarding solidarity and common good, but not self-interest.

There seems to be a remarkable resemblance between Francis and Thomas Merton who along with three other Americans Francis chose to highlight in his address to the United States Congress on September 24.

There is also the non-ecology, the destructive unbalance of nature, poisoned and unsettled by bombs, by fallout, by exploitation: the land ruined, the waters contaminated, the soil charged with chemicals, ravaged by machinery, the houses of farmers falling apart because everybody goes to the city and stays there ... there is no poverty so great as that of the prosperous, no wretchedness so dismal as affluence. Wealth is poison. There is no misery to compare with that which exists where technology has been a total success. ... Full bellies have not brought peace and satisfaction but dementia, and in any case not all the bellies are full either. But the dementia is the same for all. [Merton 2003, p. 171].

**John Paul has been shaped and formed by the Holocaust.**

**... as we celebrate the memory of [Edith Stein aka Saint Teresa Benedicta of the Cross] we must also remember the Shoah, that cruel plan to exterminate a people – a plan to which millions of our Jewish brothers and sisters fell victim ...**

**St. Teresa Benedicta of the Cross was able to understand that the love of Christ and human freedom are intertwined, because *love and truth have an intrinsic relationship*. The quest for truth and its expression in love did not seem at odds to her; on the contrary she realized that they call for one another. [John Paul 1998, §§4, 6; emphasis in the original].**

**Francis and John Paul agree on the importance of protecting the natural environment and that the common good is based on the virtue of solidarity and the preferential option for the poor.**

**However, there are differences between Francis and John Paul on self-interest, the *One-Many* dichotomy, and the market system. Those differences appear to be even deeper with regard to self-realization through human action in economic affairs and economic freedom.**

**There is more agreement between Francis and John Paul on the topics covered herein than we expected to find. Even so, the differences are serious and likely to be confusing to the laity as to where the Church stands on economic affairs and divisive in that different factions within the Church will find in Francis or John Paul arguments to support their divergent claims. Who will reconcile those differences?**

## References

- Becker, Joseph (1961), *The Adequacy of the Benefit Amount in Unemployment Insurance*, Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, May 1961.
- Carroll, Michael and Stanfield, James Ronald, (2001) Sustainable Regional Economic Development, *Journal of Economic Issues*, 35(2): 469-476.
- Dempsey, Bernard (1958). *The Functional Economy*, Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Divine, Thomas (c. 1960). *Economic Principles and Social Policy*, unpublished text available at Raynor Memorial Libraries, Marquette University, Milwaukee WI.
- Grisez, Germain and Russell Shaw (1974). *Beyond the New Morality*, Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Merton, Thomas (2003). *When the Trees Say Nothing: Writings on Nature*, edited with an introduction by Kathleen Deignan; illustrated by John Giuliani, Notre Dame: Sorin Books.
- Mulcahy, Richard (1951). "Economic Freedom in Pesch: His System Demands, But Restrains, Freedom," *Social Order*, April.
- O'Boyle, Edward (2015). "Francis and John Paul II on Economic Affairs," paper presented at the October 2015 ITEST conference "Economic Justice in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century": Myth or Reality? A Christian Perspective," Saint Louis, Missouri.
- O'Boyle, Edward (2014a). "A Commentary on *Evangelii Gaudium*: Part I of II Parts," *ITEST Bulletin*, Volume 45, Number 3, Summer, pp. 9-14, available at [http://www.faithscience.org/Bulletin\\_pdfs/Bltns2014/ITEST%20Bltn%2045-3%20web.pdf](http://www.faithscience.org/Bulletin_pdfs/Bltns2014/ITEST%20Bltn%2045-3%20web.pdf) (accessed December 9, 2015).
- O'Boyle, Edward (2014b). "A Commentary on *Evangelii Gaudium*: Part II of II Parts," *ITEST Bulletin*, Volume 45, Number 4, Fall, pp. 3-7, available at [http://www.faithscience.org/Bulletin\\_pdfs/Bltns2014/ITEST%20Bltn%2045-4%20web.pdf](http://www.faithscience.org/Bulletin_pdfs/Bltns2014/ITEST%20Bltn%2045-4%20web.pdf) (accessed December 9, 2015).
- O'Brien, Cornelius (n.d.). "Liberty and Freedom," available at [http://www.catholicprimer.org/obrien/liberty\\_and\\_freedom.htm](http://www.catholicprimer.org/obrien/liberty_and_freedom.htm) (accessed September 25, 2015). Originally published in *The Lincacre Quarterly*, Volume 46, Number 4, November 1979.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (2005). *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, Washington: USCCB Publishing.

Pope Francis (2015a). *Laudato Si'*, available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco\\_20150524\\_enciclica-laudato-si.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html) (accessed July 13, 2015).

Pope Francis (2015b). “Participation at the Second World Meeting of Popular Movements: Address of the Holy Father,” Santa Cruz de la Sierra (Bolivia), July 9, available at [https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2015/july/documents/papa-francesco\\_20150709\\_bolivia-movimenti-popolari.html](https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2015/july/documents/papa-francesco_20150709_bolivia-movimenti-popolari.html) (accessed July 13, 2015).

Pope John Paul II (1995). “Address of His Holiness John Paul II,” United Nations, New York, October 5, available at [https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1995/october/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_spe\\_05101995\\_address-to-uno.html](https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1995/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_05101995_address-to-uno.html) (accessed September 26, 2015).

Pope John Paul II (1991). *Centesimus Annus*, available at [www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_01051991\\_centesimus-annus\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html) (accessed January 25, 2013).

Pope John Paul II (1998). “Homily of John Paul II for the Canonization of Edith Stein,” available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/homilies/1998/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_hom\\_11101998\\_stein.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/homilies/1998/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_11101998_stein.html) (accessed September 23, 2015).

Pope John Paul II (1981). *Laborem Exercens*, available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_enc\\_14091981\\_laborem-exercens.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091981_laborem-exercens.html) (accessed September 6, 2015).

Pope John Paul II (1987b). “Meeting with the President of the United States of America Mr. Ronald Reagan, Address of his Holiness John Paul II,” Vizcaya Museum, Miami, September 10, available at [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/speeches/1987/september/document\\_s/hf\\_jp-ii\\_spe\\_19870910\\_reagan-museo\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/1987/september/document_s/hf_jp-ii_spe_19870910_reagan-museo_en.html) (accessed December 24, 2012).

Pope John Paul II (1987a). *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, available at [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_jpii\\_enc\\_30121987\\_sollicitudo-rei-socialis\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jpii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis_en.html) (accessed February 14, 2013).

Pope Leo XIII (1891). *Rerum Novarum*, available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_15051891\\_rerum-novarum.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum.html) (accessed September 22, 2015).

Pope Pius XI (1931). *Quadragesimo Anno*, available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19310515\\_quadragesimo-anno.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno.html) (accessed September 22, 2015).

Pope Pius XI (1937). *Divini Redemptoris*, available at [http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19031937\\_divini-redemptoris.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19031937_divini-redemptoris.html) (accessed September 22, 2015).

Renard, Henri (1957). *The Philosophy of Being*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company.