

**Business as a Vocation:
Implications for Catholic Legal Education**

**By: George E. Garvey
The Catholic University of America
Columbus School of Law
E-mail: garvey@law.edu**

***Abstract:** The business culture and laws of the United States stress the obligation of corporate managers to maximize the profits of the firm's shareholders. An excessive focus on profits, however, can deny managers any meaningful sense of vocation. It reduces the role of managers, and those who they manage, to "things" in the productive processes of their firms. Managers informed by the Catholic social tradition can exercise their responsibilities with a sense of vocation. They would recognize that sound business decisions contribute to the material well being of society and, therefore, enhance the common good. Conversely, they would understand that their choices, if unwise or unjust, may detract from the common good. Sound management requires recognition of, and support for, the dignity of every person involved in and affected by the firm's production processes. The need to foster justice in the workplace and in the market should trump the profit-maximizing norm when necessary. Catholic professional schools, including particularly law schools, should foster the sense of vocation in graduates by teaching the fundamental principles of Catholic social teaching early in the curriculum and inviting students to apply these principles throughout their studies.*

The notion that conducting the business of business, to use a popular American expression, involves a "vocation" in the same sense as the pursuit of a religious or family life, would likely strike contemporary Americans as peculiar. Professionals historically associated with public service, such as teachers, social workers, physicians and nurses, have been identified in the public mind with a calling or vocation. By contrast, managing the productive enterprises that build the goods and provide the services sought by consumers lacks the aura of public service that is often associated with a vocation. As a result, what many individuals spend considerable time doing throughout their productive lives seems divorced from transcendent meaning. One is "called" to serve the poor, teach the young, and minister to the needs of the sick, but not to make safe, efficient and affordable products. Consumers, capital markets, bureaucrats, organized labor, and the law discipline businesses. Business managers,¹ as well as the work forces that build and distribute material goods, satisfy the demands of consumers and make investors wealthy, but they seem to have little more to do with society's well-being. They have professions, careers, or perhaps they just work, but they are not "called" to what they do. The sense of vocation is missing.

The laws regulating business organizations throughout the U.S. tend to reinforce the idea that business managers should focus on the economic bottom line. Modern corporate law allows some charitable giving,² and several states permit business managers to consider the interests of constituencies other than shareholders,³ but the general rule is that officers and directors must enhance the value of the business for the benefit of shareholders.⁴ In economic terms, corporate law as it relates to managers' duties of care and loyalty is primarily intended to address the so-

called agency problem, i.e., a problem arising from the separation of ownership and control. Managers and those who advise them are committed to anticipating, and perhaps manipulating, consumer preferences in favor of their wares or services and then meeting the resulting demand at competitive prices.⁵ The resulting good from such a crass business environment seems limited to the promotion of allocative efficiency,⁶ which, while surely desirable, captures only one aspect of the common good.

These observations regarding the nature of business organization and its management in the United States suggest a business ethos that cannot be readily reconciled with teachings of the Catholic Church about the social value of human enterprise. In a way, the existing order establishes a form of institutionalized selfishness. The “owners” of productive resources have no direct control over the employment of their property, while managers, who do control the use of the resources, must maximize the owners’ financial returns. The result, if carried to an extreme, largely frees both owners and managers from responsibility for the moral and social implications of their decisions.

From the perspective of the Catholic social tradition, an excessively consumer- and profit-oriented business economy will have serious adverse social consequences. While social welfare as economists generally use that term may be enhanced, over time the common good can only be diminished by a business culture that fosters morally or ethically indifferent decision-making. The perverse consequences will be experienced by the managers directing the enterprise, as well as those working under their direction and, surely in the aggregate, by the broader society. It may seem counterintuitive in modern society, but even the most successful manager who spends her productive life engaged in activities that have little apparent relationship to the well being of society will, in the Holy Father’s view, experience a sense of alienation.⁷ The human person, the Pope teaches and contrary to the presumption of neoclassical economics, has an innate desire to be self-giving, to contribute to the common good.⁸ If the prevailing business culture equates the value of work, including the work of managers, solely with the satisfaction of consumer demand and the returns to investors, there will be a void in the managers’ lives. Although the individual need to contribute to the common good may be satisfied outside of the workplace, society is surely poorer when those who control so many resources are conditioned by the prevailing business culture to confine their efforts to an extremely narrow conception of the good.

Managers constrained by a shortsighted, profit-maximizing business ethos, are likely to employ productive physical and human resources in ways that diminish the dignity of all who work in the enterprise. Inevitably, workers become mere things—factors of production—to be used in the profit-seeking venture. In some respects, a deep-seated aversion to treating human persons as objects captures the essence of modern Catholic social teaching. From the time of *Rerum Novarum*, the Church has been struggling with the loss of personal dignity in the context of the work environment. During the social upheaval of the early industrial era, Pope Leo stated that “it is shameful and inhuman to treat men like chattels to make money by, or to look upon them merely as so much muscle or physical power.”⁹ John Paul II further developed this theme many decades later: “[I]t 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.”¹⁰ A manager compelled to focus exclusively on profits will be hard pressed to maintain an environment in which the firm’s workers can grow as human persons while contributing to the success of the business.

The nature and role of the human person dominates any Catholic analysis of socioeconomic issues. When human persons are viewed as consuming things, to be manipulated and satiated for profit, society suffers from the “phenomenon of consumerism... a style of life which is presumed to be better when it is directed toward *having* rather than *being*, and which wants to have more, not in order to be more but in order to spend life in enjoyment as an end in itself.”¹¹ Avaricious consumers surely contribute to the phenomenon of consumerism, but the social dilemma cannot be explained or dismissed as a “greedy consumer” problem. This characterization overstates the individual culpability of consumers and minimizes the pervasive, corrosive nature of the desire to have and consume more and more things in developed societies.

In sum, the modern consumer- and profit-oriented economy fosters a vicious cycle of sorts. The development of extremely large business concerns in the late nineteenth century created new forms of ownership and new types of labor. The new industries needed a large force of more-or-less fungible workers, people who lacked value to the firm once their physical strength was sapped. The “worker problem” was thus created and has been a primary focus of Catholic social thought ever since. The social problem, as it relates to the management of business also arose in the nascent industrial era. The new industrialists needed very large amounts of money to build the plants and machines needed by industry. How could the financial resources be accumulated, however, if those who had the needed capital would have to turn control over to others? Business convention and the law provided a workable answer in the form of a fiduciary duty imposed on managers to maximize the returns to the investors.

Enlightenment thinkers, most notably Adam Smith, had provided a moral foundation for the emerging commercial society. Smith’s “invisible hand” of the market would direct resources to uses desired by the consuming public. Given appropriate structures and constraints, the market would enhance the wealth of all in society. Self-interest would foster the common good. The neoclassical spin on what Adam Smith began with his magisterial *Wealth of Nations*¹² lost some of Smith’s moral sensitivities. The more extreme commitment to *laissez-faire* would largely rely on consumers to mediate moral concerns. That is, consumers would determine what was “good” through their buying decisions. The successful business would identify these goods and provide them at the best prices. The problem, of course, is that this system posits moral responsibility in agents – consumers – who are not likely to appreciate this responsibility, know how their purchasing decisions affect the lives of others, or be held accountable for their faulty moral judgments. As already noted, the Pope teaches that humans have an innate need to contribute to the common good. Adam Smith believed that individuals sought the approbation of their fellows, not just the maximization of their material wants, which fosters the virtues of prudence and civility in a market economy. Neoclassical economic reasoning tends to reduce human desires to the satisfaction of material desires. In the context of the firm, this means profits.

This brief abstraction from the complexities of both economic theory and the practice of business ignores many complicating factors. Agency issues, for example, are real and they continue to plague businesses. Recent corporate scandals raise significant concerns about the extent of managerial self-dealing. The shareholder profit-maximizing norm does address this issue of agency costs. Moral decisions regarding the allocation of resources, moreover, are not left solely to consumers. In all but the marginal business firm, managers likely can and do make many decisions that incorporate values other than the maximization of profits. Government also prohibits or regulates the production of unhealthy or immoral products, and ensures that certain minimal standards are met in the employment relationship. Finally, this simplistic model ignores the influence that the modern media gives producers over the appetites of consumers. The model does, however, provide a workable basis for analyzing managerial behavior. The generalization that managers are primarily committed to maximizing profits is sound as a matter of both fact and policy.

This conference explores business as a “calling” or “vocation.” These terms, however, are slippery. In a sense, whatever we do with our lives is our calling or vocation. To say that managing business is a manager’s vocation is a reasonable use of the term. The statement, however, is tautological. Managing is a manager’s vocation because that is what she does. As already suggested, however, “vocation” should suggest a “higher” calling. When understood in this way and applied categorically, it may be difficult to list the managers of profit-making organizations among those who have vocations.

This paper follows the lead of the U.S. Bishops and distinguishes between a “career” and a “vocation,”¹³ although the distinction is arbitrary. The words are often used interchangeably. “Career,” however, does not carry the connotation of public service that frequently applies to “vocation.” A career, therefore, as I am using the term, identifies work that is instrumental. A vocation, by contrast, involves human effort that is integral to the person. Stated more concretely, a career is a way to make money or achieve status and power, while a vocation is a contribution of oneself to something of value to society. This does not suggest that there is something wrong per se with having a career. We all have to make a living. The difference, moreover, between the terms is highly subjective and reflects the attitude of the actor rather than the nature of the function. Accordingly, a career becomes a vocation when the actor approaches the position as a free, moral person wishing to contribute to the common good.

For reasons previously discussed, a purely “careerist” approach to the management of business is likely to impose costs on society. The common good is subordinated to the bottom line. Maximizing profits becomes the *summum bonum* for business proprietors, officers and managers. Moral sensitivities may come to play in their “private” lives, but seldom in their business decisions. Ethical standards, however, at least those rooted in religious tradition, call for more. Catholic social teaching provides one particularly rich source for any businessman or woman wishing to better understand the moral and social implications of business. It invites those who direct business ventures to approach their jobs as a vocation, and that calls for more than generating profits.

What then does the Church have to say to the business professional? Theology naturally informs the Catholic conception of vocation. Pope John Paul II recently asked the rhetorical

question: “*What is the vocation of a Christian?*” The answer [the Pope said] is demanding, but clear: *The vocation of a Christian is holiness.*”¹⁴ The Holy Father, who has contributed so much to the Church’s teaching about the value and dignity of human work, has elsewhere identified a vocation to serve,¹⁵ a vocation to freedom,¹⁶ and a vocation to love.¹⁷ The Pope, I believe, is here referring to a spiritual imperative that applies to every Christian in every aspect of his or her life. The business professional, as well as the line worker, should freely approach every task with a sense of service and love. Every Catholic must take these papal missives to heart. How do they apply, however, to people making their living in the world of business at the end of the Modern era?

The U.S. Catholic Bishops have addressed this issue directly. The Pastoral teaching, *Economic Justice for All*, states:

The economy’s success in fulfilling the demands of justice will depend on how its vast resources and wealth are managed. Property owners, managers, and investors of financial capital must all contribute to creating a more just society. Securing economic justice depends heavily on the leadership of men and women in business.... Pope John Paul II has pointed out, ‘The degree of well-being which society today enjoys would be unthinkable without the dynamic figure of the business person, whose function consists of organizing human labor and the means of production so as to give rise to the goods and services necessary for the prosperity and progress of the community.’

* * * *

Persons in management face many hard choices each day, choices on which the well-being of many others depends. Commitment to the public good and not simply the private good of their firms is at the heart of what it means to call their work a vocation and not simply a career or a job.¹⁸

This extensive quote captures the Church’s appreciation for the beneficial role that businessmen and women play in society, but it also recognizes the challenges they face when exercising their responsibilities. A commitment to the “public good” is the essence of the vocation of management.

Catholic social teaching addresses the mundane and profane, as well as the profound and spiritual. It is intended to provide guidance for men and women wishing to live their faith in the workplace. In Catholic teaching, virtually any human enterprise that advances the common good merits the appellation “vocation” in its most elevated usage, and that includes the work of business managers and related professionals. A key to understanding this lies in the Church’s teachings about the nature and dignity of work.¹⁹ Work, properly understood, is the way that human persons develop as individuals, becoming “more human,” and also contribute to the common good. The challenge for Catholic educators is to deliver the Church’s message in a way that has utility for the next generation of business leaders. Overly broad exhortations to holiness and to establish economic justice will have little meaning to the business or law student. Students will properly want to know how a holy or virtuous life relates to the decisions they will

have to make in the “real world” of business, law or finance. They must be prepared to face complex, troublesome issues in a business environment where only some Christian virtues are appreciated. This will require the businessperson to approach his or her job as a vocation, again with the connotation of higher calling.

At the outset, students must understand that Catholic social teaching provides no precise formulas. It does not offer a single acceptable answer for each of the vexing issues business people must address on a regular basis. Moreover, it is difficult for many reasons to put the Church’s social teachings into application. Pope John XXIII taught, “If it is indeed difficult to apply teaching of any sort to concrete situations, it is even more so when one tries to put into practice the teachings of the Catholic Church regarding social affairs.”²⁰ Catholic social doctrine, Pope John concluded, should be applied by: (1) examining the actual situation presented to the decision-maker; (2) evaluating the situation carefully in the light of Catholic teachings; and (3) deciding what is the right thing to do.²¹ The Holy Father summarized this instruction with the slogan: “*observe, judge, act.*”²²

The U.S. bishops have made it explicitly clear that Catholic educators must bring the message of the Church’s social doctrine to bear as they fulfill their teaching mission.

[T]he Church must incorporate into all levels of her educational system the teaching of social justice and the biblical and ethical principles that support it. We call on our universities, in particular, to make Catholic social teaching, and the social encyclicals of the popes a part of their curriculum, especially for those whose vocation will call them to an active role in U.S. economic and political decision making. Faith and technological progress are not opposed one to another, but this progress must not be channeled and directed by greed, self-indulgence, or novelty for its own sake, but by values that respect human dignity and foster social solidarity.²³

The bishops’ instruction to Catholic universities poses quite a challenge. How do those involved in the education of business professionals instill an appreciation for Catholic teachings while preparing students for the demands of modern business? Professionals trained at Catholic universities should know the critical Catholic principles applicable to all economic decision-making. Moreover, the instruction at Catholic professional schools must demonstrate that economic success and the common good are not irreconcilable. To be sure, a manager or an attorney seeking to live within the bounds of Catholic teaching, or any other ethical construct, may have to remove herself from a desired position at times. Managers are not free to participate in evil or injustice, even if the prevailing business environment and law would tolerate the action. The Church, however, values the work of managers and has never suggested that one cannot manage a business well and be true to Catholic social doctrine. Over the long-term, firms that promote the common good—each in their own distinctive ways—should prove to be as successful as those that are driven solely by the maximization of profits.

Given the author’s expertise, this paper focuses on the training of lawyers. Attorneys are so intimately involved in the operation of business enterprises that suggestions applicable to law schools should have relevance to the education of business professionals generally. The notion

of management after all encompasses the many disciplines involved in the organization and direction of business enterprises. Management, business, and law schools likely share pedagogical styles, such as case and problem analysis.

The business lawyer, like anyone else involved in the management of a business, should approach his duties with a sense of vocation.²⁴ How can legal educators at a Catholic law school influence the attitudes of students in ways that foster a sense of vocation? Catholic social teaching provides the basis for distinguishing between a Catholic professional education and that which is provided by non-Catholic institutions. Catholic universities are repositories of this rich teaching, which can help students to understand how the work-a-day world they will enter fits into a broader moral and social matrix. The task, I suggest, should be approached in a threefold manner. First, law students should be exposed to the core of the Catholic social canon; i.e., they must be introduced to the principles that will inform their decisions when representing and counseling business clients. Second, law students should understand how these Catholic principles relate to their personal lives and their responsibilities as attorneys. Finally, students should be challenged to apply these principles to complex real or simulated problems, and to do so in a context that is relevant to legal analysis. A critical part of all legal education is the preparation of students to analyze and resolve complex problems. The unique contribution of lawyers to the resolution of problems is, of course, an understanding of the legal consequences of alternative outcomes. The well-trained, mature lawyer, however, will appreciate the economic and human consequences of decisions.

The first goal in this pedagogical paradigm is critical. The business-oriented student should be taught the core principles of Catholic social teaching, particularly those that inform economic decision-making. A complete explication of these principles is beyond the scope of this paper, but principles of note for business men and women include the right to private property and the legitimacy of profits, on the one hand, and the universal destination of goods (a limitation to private property rights) and the aversion to consumerism or economism (limitations on the quest for profits), on the other. Ideally, law students at Catholic schools should be introduced to the core principles in their first year of studies.²⁵

To elaborate, graduates of Catholic schools should particularly appreciate what the Church teaches about the dignity of the human person and the promotion of the common good. The notion of business as a calling or vocation is rooted, I believe, in these first principles. Those who organize and direct human and physical resources have a special opportunity, for better or for worse, to affect the dignity of persons and to enhance or detract from the common weal. Conditions in the workplace first prompted the development of the Church's modern social teaching. The social question was originally the worker question. In the Leonine era, the humiliating working conditions of the emerging industrial order violated the dignity of the working classes. In the mid-Twentieth century, the focus shifted to the indignity caused by unemployment, inadequate training, and widespread poverty in the undeveloped and underdeveloped nations of the world. Economic development was considered essential to both economic justice and peace. Pope John Paul II has developed a more comprehensive vision of the requisites of human dignity. The poor and working classes are not the only victims of indignity in the modern economy. Rather, a pervasive materialistic and hedonistic culture diminishes the dignity of persons in many capacities, e.g., workers, consumers, and managers.

The ultimate indignity occurs when human persons become objects, things that work and consume. As already noted, the Church associates this social condition with the phenomena of economism and consumerism.

Those who manage businesses obviously influence the prevailing business culture. They may treat workers, suppliers, the natural environment, and consumers alike as things to be used to generate profits. By contrast, managers may run their firms in ways that recognize the inherent value of workers, permitting them to participate in a process producing desirable products, which in turn contribute to the common good. The well-managed firm, as measured by Catholic teaching, would also provide consumers with a good product or service, honest information, and a fair price. The firm conducting its business within the bounds of Catholic social teaching would not likely suffer in the market place. A business with satisfied customers and workers who share an interest with managers and equity holders in the success of a firm, as well as the quality of its products, is likely to be quite successful. The Church has no aversion to profitability. Catholic teaching recognizes that profits provide a reasonable return for the risks of investing and also provide a basis for measuring the success of a business venture.²⁶

The introduction to Catholic social thought should also emphasize the Church's teachings about private property, solidarity and subsidiarity. The right to private property is essential to Catholic teaching, but responsibility attaches to that right. Property must be employed in ways that foster the good of society. Solidarity, which the Holy Father identifies as a "virtue," demands much of Catholics. "[It] is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary, it is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all."²⁷ John Paul II, applying the principle of subsidiarity to the state, indicates that reserving decision making to the lowest appropriate social unit will "create favourable conditions for the free exercise of economic activity, which will lead to abundant opportunities for employment and sources of wealth."²⁸ This principle applies to economic organizations, particularly very large ones, as well as governments. Economic performance would likely be enhanced by fostering greater participation among a firm's workers and by fixing responsibility where it can most properly be exercised.

The second pedagogical goal is to demonstrate how Catholic principles relate specifically to the legal professionals the students aspire to be. The Church's teaching about the dignity of the person includes the self. Every worker, regardless of the nature of the calling, should appreciate the significance of her own work. Work, at least when it contributes to the common good, is dignified because it is the labor of a human person. The fact that a task is mundane and lacks social significance does not diminish its dignity. And, naturally, the fact that a person holds a position of some status does not as such enhance the dignity of that person. As the Holy Father has taught so well, the dignity of labor inheres in the subject of the work, a person. Every person shares a common "vocation" to help make the resources of the earth useful to themselves, their families and the human community generally. Internalizing this conception of the value of self and of the contributions one makes to society through labor should foster a sense of vocation.

A person, however, can employ his labor and physical or financial resources in ways that detract from his own dignity. From the perspective of Catholic social teaching, violating the dignity of another will never lessen the dignity of the victim. The person who subjects others to indignity, or engages in work that diminishes the common good, however, will diminish himself. He will have failed in his Christian vocation to become “more human.” The Church makes it clear that every person -- manager, investor, worker and consumer -- is responsible for the moral consequences of their choices. Graduates of Catholic professional schools should understand this responsibility and also the consequences of failing to incorporate the Catholic notion of vocation into their professional lives.

Finally, Catholic law schools should invite students to apply this moral teaching throughout their years of legal studies. As already noted, the Church does not offer precise formulas or concrete solutions to complex economic and social questions. She offers “principles for reflection, criteria for judgment and directives for action.”²⁹ The vocation of the business person is to apply these principles in their areas of expertise and responsibility. Every person is “called” to contribute to the common good. For most people, that is done through the employment of their physical, mental or material resources. In the course of legal studies, students should learn to value the critical role that business organizations and legal regulations play in modern society. Those who are destined to represent management, become part of management, or even to oppose management as lawyers should recognize the power of sound business organization to exploit and efficiently allocate the world’s limited resources. The business-oriented lawyer must understand the nature of the firm, the role played by various inputs, including capital, labor, technology and know-how, and the competing claims to the profits of the enterprise. A successful, i.e., profitable, firm provides jobs for workers and desired, often essential, goods for consumers. But, the quest for profits can cross lines that are unacceptable in Catholic social teaching. Students in appropriate courses can be challenged to begin the reflective process that can turn the management of business into a vocation. The cases and problems of legal studies provide many opportunities for reflective application of the Church’s social thought.

In conclusion, management, business and law schools affiliated with Catholic universities must train business leaders who can strive for efficiency and profitability without losing their moral and social balance. Graduates of American law schools in recent decades have brought a heightened level of economic sophistication to the practice of law.³⁰ As an important part of any management team, it is appropriate for a business lawyer to bring sound economic sense to the table when business decisions are made. They should also, however, appreciate the human dimension of business decisions. Catholic social teaching provides a solid foundation for a humanistic approach to the organization and management of business. It reminds the business professional that a business firm is a community of persons working together to promote the common good.

Catholic social teaching surely poses a challenge for business managers and their legal advisors – it is rooted in the Gospel, which is a perpetual challenge to humankind -- but a business ethic informed by Catholic teaching is not at war with sound business practices. The Catholic Church’s rich social doctrine places economic production and development within a sound ethical framework. The Church, moreover, should and does expect Catholic educational

institutions to be committed to delivering the Church's social vision. If the job is done well, those of us who are called to train professionals will produce a generation of business leaders who also see their task as a vocation. They will understand that their goal is not simply to make a profit, but rather to do so in ways that promote the common good. Managers trained in the Catholic social tradition will know that human persons were not created to serve the firm – regardless of the person's relationship to the firm – but that the firm exists to serve people. As stated by the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council:

In the economic and social realms, too, the dignity and complete vocation of the human person and the welfare of society as a whole are to be respected and promoted. For man is the source, the center, and the purpose of all economic and social life.³¹

¹ This essay uses the term “business manager” in a rough, functional manner. It will generally include all those who participate in the organization, direction or control of a business organization, including the highest echelon executives, so-called “middle” management, and in-house or outside legal and financial advisors. The focus of this analysis is on decision-making regarding the employment of human and physical resources, rather than the creation or transformation of goods.

² See Model Bus. Corp. Act (1984) ' 3.02 (13)

³ See ALI Principles of Corporate Governance: Analysis and Recommendations (1994) ' 2.01.

⁴ See *Dodge v. Ford Motor Co.*, 204 Mich 159, 170 N.W. 668 (1919).

⁵ I am assuming that profits are maximized by producing the best goods and services for the lowest prices. It is also likely, although ethically and legally problematic, that those who manage business may seek to enhance a monopolistic position and take monopoly rents. The former furthers the economic and social good of allocative efficiency. The latter results in the inefficient allocation of resources.

⁶ A leading economics text defines “allocative efficiency” as “[a] situation in which no reorganization or trade could raise the utility or satisfaction of one individual without lowering the utility or satisfaction of another individual. Under certain limited conditions, perfect competition leads to allocative efficiency.” Paul A. Samuelson and William D. Nordhaus, *Microeconomics*, 16th Ed. (Boston: Irwin, McGraw-Hill, 1998) 436.

⁷ Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus* 41.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum* 16.

¹⁰ Pope John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens* 7.

¹¹ *Centesimus Annus* 36.

¹² Smith's classic work is entitled “

¹³ See quotation referenced in note 17, *infra*.

¹⁴ Homily of John Paul II, Osijek, Croatia, June 7, 2003.

¹⁵ Pope John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis* 21.

¹⁶ Pope John Paul II, *Veritatis Splendor* 17.

¹⁷ *Veritatis Splendor* 18.

¹⁸ National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* 110-111. The quotation from Pope John Paul II is from Address to Business Men and Economic Managers (Milan, May 22, 1983) in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly edition in English (June 20, 1983) 9:1.

¹⁹ See generally, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Work as Key to the Social Question* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002).

²⁰ Pope John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra*, 229.

²¹ *Mater et Magistra*, 236.

²² *Mater et Magistra*, 236.

²³ *Economic Justice for All*, 342.

²⁴ Given the nature of this conference, this paper focuses on the preparation of law students for the world of business. The lessons of Catholic social teaching, however, have application across the broad range of activities

engaged in by attorneys. They should bring the notion of vocation to whatever type of practice they encounter.

²⁵ Dean Douglas Kmiec of the Catholic University Law School, for example, introduced a mandatory, first year course on Catholic Social Teaching beginning in the 2002-03 school year. Dean Kmiec is leaving CUA, but the course remains in the first year curriculum. This writer will teach one of the sections in the coming year and plans to apply the pedagogical suggestions presented in this paper.

²⁶ *Centesimus Annus*, 35.

²⁷ Pope John Paul II, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 38.

²⁸ *Centesimus Annus*, 15.

²⁹ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *The Social Agenda* 18 (Vatican City, 2000)

³⁰ The law and economics movement has had a pervasive impact on the way the law is taught, practiced and interpreted in the United States. The tools of neoclassical economics are now regularly employed in the analysis of law. Some fields of law, particularly antitrust law, have been transformed by the insights of economists.

³¹ Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes: Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World*, 63 (1965).