

DEALING WITH POVERTY AND GLOBALIZATION WITHIN THE BUSINESS SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Gerald Cavanagh, Jeanne David and Si Hendry, *Business Environmental and Workplace Reporting and Activities and Catholic Social Teaching*
Brian Toyne, Zaida Martinez and James Ball, *Globalization: A Connecting Theme for Catholic Business Education*

A RESPONSE BY DR. JOSÉ SOLS
IQS, University of Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain

I have worked as a volunteer in Barcelona (Spain) and Paris (France) prisons for several years, teaching Politics and Theology to prisoners. Some of them belonged to international mafias that operated with drugs, robberies, prostitution and so on. They spoke to me about these mafias as organizations that didn't seem to be at all chaotic. Quite to the contrary, they appeared to be very well organized, and to have some very strict "ethical" principles. The members of these mafias understood perfectly well what was "good" and what was "bad", what was "moral" and what was "immoral". I was really surprised! They didn't think about the immorality of the mafia as a system. They just accepted the mafia as a reality, as a system, and that was it!

Then I understood that social, economical, and political ethics cannot analyze what is good or what is bad in a system without a very thorough analysis of the principles and practices of such a system.

The first paper that has been presented in this session (Gerald Cavanagh, Jeanne David and Si Hendry, *Business Environmental and Workplace Reporting and Activities and Catholic Social Teaching*), in my opinion, has both great value and incurs in a great mistake:

1/ The great value resides in the fact that the authors teach us a very practical, and well-implemented program. They show us a model to identify firms' activities (and their corresponding social principles) and to find out how they are articulated, or not, with catholic social thought.

2/ The great mistake: They don't mention that these corporations' activities exist within a global system, which has to be analyzed and criticized from a human, ethical reason and catholic social thought perspective. Two examples:

a) The analysis of Wal-Mart and Costco, and the analysis of Royal Dutch Shell and Exxon Mobil don't say anything about the economical system in which these four firms act. Are these four firms the problem? It's not at all enough to draw up a three-column table: 1) catholic principles, 2) positive points, 3) negative points. First of all, the system must be analyzed and criticized from a catholic social thought perspective. And, we have to teach our students how to do that.

b) The analysis of General Dynamics and Northrop-Grumman says nothing about the catholic position about peace and war. The catholic faith is against violence and against war. Some authors justify war in extreme situations, within special conditions, but the position of the Church, under normal circumstances, is against war. The latest documents of the Church reiterate this fact. How may we analyze General Dynamics and Northrop-Grumman without criticizing war?

That's why I find the second paper presented in this session (Brian Toyne, Zaida Martinez and James Ball, *Globalization: A Connecting Theme for Catholic Business Education*) to be very interesting. There, it is said that the first thing that must be done is to study how Globalization impacts the economy and business. The first approach must be holistic, and within this approach we may analyze several things. This is the Christian method! First of all we must consider Anthropology, afterwards, Social Morality.

The six impacts exposed in the second paper seem correct to me. The Infusion Model is a good one, but the Holistic Model is even better. We must work to achieve the threefold educational responsibility of Catholic universities, namely, to provide students with a deeper understanding of the fundamental themes or principles of Catholic Social Thought: universal common good, human dignity, and solidarity. And, we must be critical when speaking about Globalization as the context in which firms must be analyzed.

I conclude with two questions:

1/ To the authors of the first paper: please, take into consideration the second paper's thesis.

2/ To the authors of the second paper: please, try to work more and more in practical ways, as the authors of the first paper do.

Please, work together!