



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The social and economic message of Benedict XVI's *Caritas in Veritate* in the perspective of the Roman Catholic social doctrine

Puggioni, R.

Citation

Puggioni, R. (2013, June 25). *The social and economic message of Benedict XVI's Caritas in Veritate in the perspective of the Roman Catholic social doctrine*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/21021>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/21021>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/21021> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Puggioni, Roberto

Title: The social and economic message of Benedict XVI's Caritas in Veritate in the perspective of Roman Catholic social doctrine

Issue Date: 2013-06-25

Chapter V – Human labour in Roman Catholic social teaching

1. Introduction

A large part of the individual's economic life is dedicated to human work. That is why an investigation on social doctrine's principles about economic life would be incomplete if not treating this topic. In this chapter I will analyse what the Roman Catholic Church' social teaching believes is the value and position of human labour in social and economic life. In the *Compendium of the social doctrine of the Church* work and workers do receive attention due to the view that social thought proposes, for which workers are at the core of the production process.

I will start with an explanation of the Bible on labour in the framework of Roman Catholic theology. Then, there will be also the occasion to present the actual character of *Rerum novarum* (1891) regarding capital and labour. Indeed, about the worker's condition, *Rerum* is seen in social teaching as a forerunner of the teachings of the Second Vatican Council as well as of later thinking.²¹³

2. Biblical aspects. Old Testament and Gospel

Within the theological framework of Roman Catholic social thought to start with the Old Testament means to start from the beginning. The Old Testament would give a first understanding of why human beings have to work, and how they have to work. This inquiry, in such a perspective, may shed some light upon the meaning that the social doctrine gives to human labour, and the specific implications in the whole social thought.

The social teaching of the RCC, as just said regarding other topics,²¹⁴ strongly relies on the Old Testament, in this way legitimizing its theological foundation. In the specific case of developing a doctrine of work, the whole discourse starts from the theological interpretation of the human being as created in God's image.²¹⁵ From this, it follows that human beings, through their work, are also creators, as God is. Close to this view it has been pointed how from a religious biblical perspective that the human being is a worker as also God is a worker.²¹⁶

Such reading of the creation in God's image gives the possibility for a theology of labour in the RCC:²¹⁷

²¹³ See G. FROSINI, *L'attività umana. Per una teologia del lavoro*. Milano: Edizioni San Paolo, 1994. 130.

²¹⁴ See above I, 2.

²¹⁵ See also UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, The Christian vision of economic life, in J. HEINE, C. BROOKE, eds., *A worker justice reader. Essential writings on religion and labor*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010. 80.

²¹⁶ See M. D. MEEK, God and work, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 126 – 137.

²¹⁷ See M. D. CHENU, *Pour une théologie du travail*. Paris: Seuil 1955. 16 – 20; A. M. BAGGIO, *Lavoro e dottrina sociale cristiana. Dalle origini al Novecento*. Roma: Città Nuova, 2005. 58 – 60; FROSINI, *L'attività umana*, 156 – 162.

*The Old Testament presents God as the omnipotent Creator (see Gen 2: 2; Job 38 - 4; Ps 104, 147) who fashions man in his image and invites him to work the soil (see Gen 2: 5 - 6), and cultivate and care for the garden of Eden in which he has placed him (see Gen 2:15). [...] The dominion exercised by man over other living creatures, however, is not to be despotic or reckless; on the contrary he is to 'cultivate and care for' (Gen 2: 15) the goods created by God. [...] Work is part of the original state of man and precedes his fall; it is therefore not a punishment or curse.*²¹⁸

According to social thought, human beings are responsible for something that they find as already given and have not created. This interpretation is not without consequences in the social doctrine.

The human being is considered the full administrator of everything there is in the created world, because creation itself is a good thing that God wants to give freely to human beings. Human responsibility for the created world descends from God's will to put the human beings in a privileged position in such a creation. Thus to work in such a creation for using its goods becomes primarily a human duty assigned by God.²¹⁹

Nevertheless, in social teaching this duty is not intended as a burden for humankind, or as something that oppresses human beings, or something extraneous to human nature. Quite the opposite, labour represents an opportunity that God gives to human beings for their fulfilment. More generally, in Roman Catholic theology working is considered a natural human activity and concerns both the full realization of being human according to God's plan and a concrete contribution to God's creative work.²²⁰

Within social thought's understanding of the biblical message, it is also relevant to put some light on an apparent contradiction. This could arise about the fact that God gives freely to humanity all that is necessary to live, while at the same time, human beings still must work and struggle to have from such a raw creation the goods they need, as not everything they need is ready in nature.

Moving to the Gospel then, the figure of Jesus is presented as a worker. Jesus, in social thought's theology, is the God who makes himself human, and as a human being he had to work too. Moreover his work was manual labour. He was obedient to his father Joseph (see *Lk* 2: 51) and with his dutifulness he was condemning the attitude of a lazy servant hiding his talent (see *Mt* 25: 14 – 30). Moreover Jesus often refers to his mission in this world as a work he has to accomplish for his Father.²²¹ Obviously the implications of this latter sort of 'work' are different from the social aspects of the work that mostly interest us in this research.

In presenting Jesus the carpenter, social teaching ascribes a real meaning to labour and exposes the errors we should avoid in considering the human work:

²¹⁸ *Compendium*, 255 – 256.

²¹⁹ See *Compendium*, 264.

²²⁰ See FROSINI, *L'attività umana*, 264; G. THILS, *Théologie des réalités terrestres*. Bruges – Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968. 4, V; A. AUER, *Weltoffener Christ*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1960. 3, VIII; J. ROZIER, *L'homme au travail. L'encyclique Laborem exercens de Jean-Paul II. Présentation, texte, commentaires*. Paris: Éditions du Centurion, 1982. 100 – 103.

²²¹ *Compendium*, 259.

*In his preaching, Jesus teaches man not to be enslaved by work. Before all else, he must be concerned about his soul; gaining the whole world is not the purpose of his life (see Mk 8: 36). [...] When people are worried and upset about many things, they run the risk of neglecting the Kingdom of God and His righteousness (see Mt 6: 33), which they truly need. [...] Work represents a fundamental dimension of human existence as participation not only in the act of creation but also in that of redemption. [...] Understood in this way, work is an expression of man's full humanity, in his historical condition and his eschatological orientation.*²²²

In this passage the risk that work can procure with its absolutization is stressed. Social teaching warns against a mentality that puts labour above all other activities. It is an error to regard labour an absolute value. These aspects have been especially underlined in *Laborem exercens* by John Paul II.²²³

Jesus' labour, within social teaching's proposal, should also represent for the individual believer a way of salvation. With their everyday work, human beings participate in the toil for redemption. Labour, in RC social thought, can be seen as the cross each one has to carry daily in imitating Jesus Christ. This perspective is also a concrete call for lay people in their everyday duty of bringing their work to fulfilment honestly and without laziness. Labour becomes in *Compendium's* theology, a sort of privileged means to reach our full humanity while co-operating with the Lord.

In the end, work is seen as something belonging to our human nature. It is a basic human activity. Therefore it should be considered together with those elements concurring to the realization of the self, such as freedom, respect, dignity, charity, etc.

Notwithstanding this basic human trait of the working activity, there is something that transcends work's deeper meaning. This consideration derives from the fact that work is intended in its relation with the creative action of God. In fact, through labour human beings can imitate God in the act of creation. Then, the toil that human work brings, it is seen as one of the inheritances of original sin. Nevertheless this can correspond to a way for sharing Jesus suffering, participating in his sacrifice in our everyday life, and thus finding also through the daily work a way of redemption.²²⁴

3. The subjective and objective side of human labour. Labour and capital

In introducing the discourse about the dignity of the worker we could say that according to social thought there is a very simple syllogism to consider. The premises of the syllogism are: first, the human person has the highest possible dignity as he is a transcendental being, and second, the worker is a person.

²²² *Compendium*, 260, 263

²²³ See J-Y. CALVEZ, *Nécessité di travail. Disparition d'une valeur ou redefinition?* Paris: Les Éditions de l'Atelier / Éditions Ouvrières, 1997. 108.

²²⁴ See S. MOSSO, *La Chiesa e il lavoro*. Roma: Edizioni Lavoro, 1982. 57 – 72; UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *The Christian vision of economic life*, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 83.

Conclusion: the worker has the same dignity, the highest, as the person. Keeping in mind this would perhaps help us to go through topics like the relationship between labour and capital and work and private property.

Primarily inspired by *Laborem*,²²⁵ the *Compendium* distinguishes between an objective and a subjective dimension in human work.²²⁶ We need to refer to this distinction because it determines what interests the Roman Catholic Church within the discourse about human work. In fact, this interest is mostly directed towards the subjective side of human work, which is identified with the human person as a worker. The objective aspect of labour, then, regards the whole set of tools, resources and instruments, including technology and economics, which give to human beings the possibility, of subjugating the world, and to draw from the earth what humans need to live. The objective side of labour is characterized by a certain instability. It mutates with time, as means of development change according to different epochs. In other words, with the objective side we are speaking of the framework the humans have built for gaining from their natural environment things to satisfy their needs.

The subjective side of human work coincides, in social thought's view, with the personal and spontaneous character of human beings. It regards the possibility of each human being to act for the realization of the self. As the subjective side of work concerns the human person, it represents the stable aspect of the two. Because even if we can say that workers' personalities change through time, or that they evolve, still they are considered always persons.

The human person is the subject always concerned in labour and the constant element that needs the highest attention. Remarkably, in social teaching's perspective neither production nor profits are the most relevant elements in the process of human work.²²⁷ The subjective side is the element from which originates the dignity that social teaching recognizes to the human labour. In other words, when we speak of the dignity of labour in general, or in the working environments, we are in the end speaking about the worker's dignity.

The *Compendium* stresses that the worker is the central element of labour activity, and also that he cannot be anything but the end of any working process, in the sense that work is made by human beings for the human being. To work is a duty, but it is a duty carried on to fulfil a human end.²²⁸ The activity of work can be defined as an activity at the service of the human being.

In social teaching, the occasion from which the subjective side of labour emerges is exactly the working process. Here, social thought takes into consideration the role of human work in relation to capital and all other elements involved in the production process. More specifically, according to this theology of labour, capital, the objective side of work, represents only a means in the hands of people. Capital's growth should not be the ultimate end of the worker's efforts, nor should it be the ultimate end of the entrepreneur. These considerations find also confirmation in the general attitude that social teaching has towards profits in the world of the enterprise.²²⁹

²²⁵ ROZIER, *L'homme au travail*, 40 – 46.

²²⁶ *Compendium*, 270; *Laborem*, 5 – 6.

²²⁷ See *Compendium*, 270.

²²⁸ See *Compendium*, 272; ROZIER, *L'homme au travail*, 45 – 46.

²²⁹ See above I, 3.

The RCC's social teaching firmly points out that these two elements, labour and capital, are interwoven and they need each other. Capital alone is unworthy, while workers without capital investments in resources and infrastructures are out of place. This assertion comes from Leo XIII's *Rerum*. The *Compendium* says that the claim that labour and capital need each other derives from observing the process of production in typical Western economies, in which the two elements are constantly interacting. Labour and capital are both human expressions, but social teaching states the superiority of labour among all other productive factors:

Work, because of its subjective or personal character, is superior to every other factor connected with productivity; this principle applies, in particular, with regard to capital. [...] Labour has an intrinsic priority over capital. 'This principle directly concerns the process of production: in this process labour is always a primary efficient cause, while capital, the whole collection of means of production, remains a mere instrument or instrumental cause. This principle is an evident truth that emerges from the whole of man's historical experience' (Laborem, 12).²³⁰

While affirming the ontological superiority of labour in the work/capital relationship, social teaching also underlines the inescapability of this bond. The tie between labour and capital evolves, calls for new paths able to avoid clashes and improve collaboration. And indeed in this perspective social thought understands trade unions.²³¹ It is probably the case that these two elements composing the modern way of production are supposed to be in tension. But in such a situation, social thought calls for the recognition of the primary relevance of the human element represented by the worker over the materiality of the capital, even if not denying the basic role of this latter. Capital is supposed to be always a means to human's service. In other words, in the capitalist economic system, as here understood, the exploitation of capital is in the service of human workers, and not vice versa, that is workers in the service of capitals.²³²

4. Right to work and rights of the workers

Social thought states that work is a fundamental right and a good thing for humankind.²³³ It is a right because it contributes to fulfilling one's ambitions in the sense that it is necessary to work for building and sustaining a family, having some rights of propriety over things, and for generally contributing to global development.²³⁴ Furthermore social thought considers a high unemployment a huge

²³⁰ *Compendium*, 276 – 277.

²³¹ See *Compendium*, 305 – 307. For a general religious perspective on trade unions see also INTERFAITH WORKER JUSTICE, *Why unions matter*, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 12 – 19. By the same author, focussed on the United States, see *Historic highlights of the religion-labor movement*, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 34 – 37.

²³² See ROZIER, *L'homme au travail*, 62 – 65; MOSSO, *La Chiesa e il lavoro*, 111 – 117.

²³³ See *Compendium*, 287; *Gaudium*, 26; *Laborem*, 9; JOHN PAUL II, *Address to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences*, 3. 1997; JOHN PAUL II, *Message for the 32nd World Day of Peace 1999*. AAS 91, 1998. 382 – 383.

²³⁴ *Compendium*, 287.

failure of society and sets the end of full employment as an objective that cannot be renounced.²³⁵ In fact social teaching recognizes a right to work for each human being. A right to work exists because through labour human beings can build their life.

In the intention of the social doctrine labour's dignity must be heightened to the rank of a human right legally recognized by today's legislations.²³⁶

Together with the right to work, there are the rights of the worker. It might be possible to point out, after what we have seen so far, that social thought sets a list of rights individuated by the theological interpretation of Biblical passages regarding workers.²³⁷ They are: the right to a just wage, the right to rest, the right to a healthy working environment, the right to have personal dignity respected while working, the right to have some type of social security, the right to a pension and insurance, the right to social protection during maternity, the right to have assemblies and representation.²³⁸

Social teaching considers the right to have a just wage the most important one. This is a right linked with social justice and to the general welfare of a country. In this view, we should put at the centre of our attention how goods are produced, more than the quantity and quality of such goods. If the quantity in the production is emphasized, one might become worried about how workers are employed, or until which extent their rights are respected in regard, for instance, to their productivity. Furthermore, these issues become particularly relevant in the globalized world. In this context they are related with the outsourcing of productive factors,²³⁹ as we will see also in *Caritas*.²⁴⁰

What we are facing is social thought's proposal for inviting reflection or re-thinking the human element in labour, as that which should be the most relevant element:

Remuneration is the most important means for achieving justice in work relationships (see Laborem, 19). [...] They commit grave injustice who refuse to pay a just wage or who do not give it in due time and in proportion to the work done (see Lv 19: 13; Dt 24: 14 - 15; Jas 5: 4). [...] The simple agreement between employee and employer with regard to the amount of pay to be received is not sufficient for the agreed-upon salary to qualify as a 'just wage', because a just wage 'must not be below the level of subsistence' (Rerum, Acta 11. 131) of the worker: natural justice precedes and is above the freedom of the contract. The economic well-being of a country is not measured exclusively by the quantity of goods it produces but also by taking into account the manner in which they are produced and the level of equity in the distribution of income, which should allow everyone access to what is necessary for their personal development and perfection [...].²⁴¹

²³⁵ *Compendium*, 288.

²³⁶ See *Compendium*, 287 – 293.

²³⁷ See FROSINI, *L'attività umana*, 156 – 202.

²³⁸ See *Compendium*, 301.

²³⁹ See also P. K. BRUBAKER *Globalization and its impact on labor*, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 20 – 25.

²⁴⁰ See below, VII, 1.2.

²⁴¹ *Compendium*, 302 – 303.

It might be noticed how, in the first part of this quote, social teaching expressly puts the natural right to have a just wage above freedom of contracting. Following this reasoning this statement might be the first concrete step in wealth redistribution. Maintaining the definition of *Rerum novarum* (1891), a ‘just wage’ is considered that that is not beneath the level of subsistence.

The implicit question is: how could a public institution guarantee a decent redistributive task when it is not giving in the first place legal assurances on a decent level of retribution? It might be interpreted as a call for protecting a minimum level of retribution that, according to different contexts and situations, allows workers to plan and build their life, and eventually a family life. Without such intentions towards workers we would face not freedom of contracting, but the risk of a concrete way of exploitation of the employee by the employer.

Most probably, here the problem does not regard uniquely the governments, but also individual actors not acting effectively for the common good. If the intention is to exploit a situation that is economically favourable only in the short-term, there is the risk of having social damage in the mid and long-term. In this regard, also *Caritas* will point out again how short-term views in the economic decisions of the individual can cause imbalances.²⁴²

5. Res novae. *The ‘new things’ in the world of labour and some concluding words on social doctrine in a globalized world*

There are some recent changes that are, in one way or another, to a greater or lesser degree, affecting our own Western, economic and social arrangements. This is due to the fact that the world is more interdependent,²⁴³ so that a modification in one part of the globe may have consequences in another part. Indeed, interdependence as we are experiencing it in contemporary times is itself a new thing unknown before modernity.

The ‘new things’ that social teaching is considering mainly regard new technological developments, for which new jobs arise and others disappear. In developed countries the service sector and information technology constitute new directions in working activity. In the view of social teaching, these new sort of jobs partially but consistently take over manual work as the need for immaterial services grows.²⁴⁴ Another relevant implication of this phase is observed by social thought in the passage towards less conventional forms of work, like all kinds of temporary or unstable occupations. This phenomenon is partially an answer to higher needs of flexibility that the global markets ask for. At the same time the *Compendium* does not forget to underline how these same types of work produce instability, insecurity and create barriers to long-term projects in individual lives.²⁴⁵

Social thought understands these market modifications not as the cause of instabilities. On the opposite, those instabilities and insecurities in the market are an

²⁴² See, for instance, VII, 4, 5.

²⁴³ See BRUBAKER, Globalization and its impact on labor, in HEINE, BROOKE, *A worker justice reader*, 20.

²⁴⁴ *Compendium*, 313.

²⁴⁵ *Compendium*, 313 – 314.

effect, and not a cause, of previous alterations of labour conditions.²⁴⁶ In this way social teaching rejects a deterministic interpretation of the labour markets. It would mean, in other words, that behind the needs of today's labour market there is not an implicit force, but there are determinate choices of different economic and political actors involved in the process of regulating the labour markets. All actors, from the individual labourer to trade unions, from the small local employee to the CEO of the biggest multi-national corporation and all the public institutions, are involved in the process which gives to labour the shape it has. When such economic actors forget that the end of work is not profit itself, but the human-subject-worker, we experience the risk of having human beings exploited by others. Determinism is seen by social teaching as not sufficient in clearing up the reason behind current concrete situations. Generally speaking, such doctrines clash with the inner freedom of the will that human beings have according to RC theology. This freedom regards workers as well as all the other actors involved in the labour process.²⁴⁷

This is the point of view affirmed by social teaching:

*Given these impressive 'new things' in the world of work, the Church's social doctrine recommends first of all to avoid the error of insisting that the current changes take place in a deterministic manner. The decisive factor and 'referee' of this complex phase of change is once more the human person, who must remain the true protagonist of his work. He can and must take on in a creative and responsible fashion the present innovations and re-organizations, so that they lead to the growth of the person, the family, society and the entire human family (see *Laborem*, 10). Enlightenment for all can be found in the appeal of the subjective dimension of work, which according to the teaching of the Church's social doctrine must be given due priority, because human work 'proceeds directly from persons created in the image of God and called to prolong the work of creation by subduing the earth' (*Catechism*, 2427).²⁴⁸*

Social teaching looks for a deeper explication of the market processes related to labour. The *Compendium* sees that the human-subjective dimension of labour, namely the human beings, should be considered the relevant part in all the working process.

In this regard, Roman Catholic social thought interprets some recent criticism of neoclassical economic theories. Such a criticism is seen as attempting to detach from utilitarian positions the economic interpretation of life. To have a more humane economic development means to put the human being at the centre of the process, as the most important thing. In this way are interpreted the efforts of thinkers and economists like Amartya K. Sen, John Rawls and Joseph Stiglitz.²⁴⁹ Authors such as Sen propose a scientific outlook which combines ethics and economics, as well as suggest practicable paths for realizing a concrete social justice.²⁵⁰ Economists such

²⁴⁶ In fact the *Compendium* states that '[...] the changes in the labour market are often an effect of the change to which work has been subjected, and not one of its causes.' *Compendium*, 312.

²⁴⁷ See *Compendium*, 318.

²⁴⁸ *Compendium*, 317.

²⁴⁹ See G. SCANAGATTA A. PASETTO, *Sviluppo e bene comune. Per un'economia non separata dall'etica e per un'etica fondata sull'inviolabile dignità dell'uomo*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. 2012. 138.

²⁵⁰ See, for instance A. K. SEN, *The idea of justice*. London: Allen Lane, 2009; A. K. SEN,

as Stiglitz recognize the relevance of rethinking our mental categories regarding the market economy, financial institutions and the role of social relationships, not disregarding the theoretical help that comes from the study in the field of anthropological economics.²⁵¹ In the end, it seems that they are all guided by the necessity of repositioning the human being in the economic process. Or better, to reposition the economic process itself, and let it be a helpful tool in the progress of the whole humanity.

The big novelty among all the changes and developments that modernity has faced is the recent explosion of the globalization of production and consumption. This means also a globalization of work activity. This phenomenon presents some peculiar characteristics, which the *Compendium* tries to enlighten. For instance we see how in a multinational corporation, the ownership is nowadays usually detached from the place where the material productive chain is. That is a fact known as delocalization or outsourcing. This arrangement allows multi-national corporations to take the advantages of having their manufacturing process in a country where labour is usually cheaper. The reason why it is cheaper is usually due to the critical absence of labour rights, namely no, or very limited, taxes for social security. In this perspective, where the corporations only focus on their instant profits and forget about the contribution they could give to those countries in developing human rights and social securities, social thought proposes an enlargement of labour rights to a global scale parallel to the globalization of trade markets and companies:

*The phenomenon of globalization is one of the most important causes of the current change in the organization of work. This phenomenon brings about new forms of production where plants are located away from where strategies are decided and far from the markets where the goods are consumed. There are two primary factors driving this phenomenon: the extraordinary speed of communication [...], and the relative ease with which merchandise and people are transported from one part of the world to another. This entails a fundamental consequence for processes of production, as property is ever further removed and often indifferent to the social effects of the decisions made. On the other hand, if it is true that globalization is neither good nor bad in itself, but depends on how it is used (see JOHN PAUL II, *Address to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences*. 2, AAS 93, 2001. 599), it must be affirmed that a globalization of safeguards, minimum essential rights and equity is necessary.²⁵²*

Improvements in communication and transportation are seen as the two main causes of such economic globalization. Given the neutral character of globalization in the perspective of social teaching, some actors may exploit their position. In this sense goes the statement that a globalization of possibilities in trade, production and labour, should go parallel with a globalization of guarantees for everybody.

Development as freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999; A. K. SEN *On ethics and economics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1987, where the author, starting from the re-interpretation of Adam Smith's thought, argues about a re-definition of the relationship between ethics and economics involving a re-sizing of the too narrow traditional concept of self-interest.

²⁵¹ J. E. STIGLITZ, Preface, in K. POLANYI, *The great transformation. The political and economic origins of our time*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001. viii – x; J. E. STIGLITZ, *The roaring Nineties. A new history of the world's most prosperous decade*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003. 281 – 319.

²⁵² *Compendium*, 310.

Concluding words

In this section I have tried to analyse the main points in social thought regarding today's labour. globalization remains an aspect that cannot be left apart in such a discourse. All questions must be addressed with the greatest awareness about the fact that we live in an epoch in which human issues are human exactly because they regard all of humanity, in this sense we speak of global issues.²⁵³ Roman Catholic Church's social teaching, in this context of increasing social risks and opportunities, asks for a correct interpretation of the position workers should have within the globalization process.²⁵⁴ We might conclude that social teaching while recognizing some major changes affecting the world of labour nowadays, claims that there are elements in the socio-economic perspective of labour that are still always more important than others. This regards the fact that workers are human beings, therefore their safety should be considered before any other economic reason of whatever developmental argument.

Paraphrasing these ideas, we can say that the RCC's vision of labour proposes a new anthropology of labour. This is parallel to the perspective outlined in a theology of labour that gives sense to the interpretation of labour as a unifying force in the world, in the sense that labour creates fraternity among human beings. Indeed, the theology of labour has been interpreted in this way by pope Paul VI.²⁵⁵ For its part, the anthropological perspective gives sense to all previous considerations because it maintains as crucial the fact that the worker is a human person.²⁵⁶ globalization is seen as a positive force when it could enhance solidarity and propensity to establish relationships that are themselves already present in human nature. globalization, especially regarding labour, is not considered by itself as absolutely good or bad, but it is interpreted as a phenomenon that, to a certain extent, brings the consequences of particular choices. That is why it requires to be handled and directed in the proper manner for having good results shared globally and not particularly. Indeed, the same perspective is adopted by Stiglitz who recognizes how in East-Asian countries globalization has brought huge improvements, while not bringing the same advantages in other parts of the world.²⁵⁷

We may observe now that the perspective that social doctrine brings forth, namely that people are to be considered part of the human family,²⁵⁸ has relevant reflections on the view in which these 'new things' are interpreted. globalization, and specifically the globalization of labour, is therefore not only a major trait of our epoch, that may pass away as time goes by. globalization is essentially an expression springing from understanding humanity as a family. globalization is the expression of that human condition that links together all human beings just because they are human beings in the same world. Human work is, in social thought, inscribed in this framework and it should be possible thus to extend to labour the possible positive consequences of a globalization of information, culture, and rights.

²⁵³ See A. GIDDENS, *Runaway world. How globalization is re-shaping our lives*. London: Profile Books, 1999. I.

²⁵⁴ See *Compendium*, 319, 321.

²⁵⁵ See *Populorum*, 27.

²⁵⁶ See *Compendium*, 322.

²⁵⁷ See J. E. STIGLITZ, *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002. 3 – 22.

²⁵⁸ See above IV, 5.