

THE ‘GOOD COMPANY’ AND FINANCIALISATION: CORPORATE CHOICES, INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT, AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL THOUGHT

GianDemetrio Marangoni and Stefano Solari

Department of Economics, University of Padua ()*

gd.marangoni@unipd.it - stefano.solari@unipd.it

The attempt to introduce *corporate social responsibility* (CSR) takes place in a new and different economic context increasingly dominated by finance and, above all, by an increasingly diffused ‘financial way of thinking’ on economic issues. Deregulation and globalisation have had a significant impact on the way we generally conceive economic problems. Besides the effects on structural change, we may understand this change as a shift in both rules and morality, which legitimised the adoption of a strict monetary calculation over the many immaterial and social issues implied in economic choices. Such question is particularly evident in and relevant for corporate governance.

This situation is at odds with Catholic social teaching (CST). As a consequence, we will analyse financialisation in the light of CST to single out the specific difficulties. We will look in particular at the issues centred in corporate governance and at the impact that the priority of *shareholder value* poses for achieving ethical outcomes in economic interactions. We will argue that problems induced by financialisation cannot be solved by relying on individual initiative alone. Some form of collective action by ethically oriented persons is required to find a new coherence between rules and ethics. As a consequence, the institutional configuration of the economy is important in determining successful initiatives in corporate social responsibility (CSR).

1. Financialisation and Firm behaviour

Financialisation, by which we mean the ever greater importance of strictly financial considerations in economic affairs, is of special concern to persons who turn to Catholic social teaching for guidance in everyday activities such as working, spending, and investing. This term has been introduced to highlight a process in which financial values «*become leading institutional and organisational design criteria*» (Froud et al., 2000:104). It is also reflected in a rise in both financial assets and liabilities of (non financial) companies and households as well as an increased share in value added by sectors connected to financial intermediation and rent. Toporowski (2000) lamented a transformation of entrepreneurial capitalism into “rentier” capitalism. Boyer (2000) envisaged a new “finance-led accumulation regime”.

At the microeconomic level financialisation engenders three main negative effects:

1. a progressive separation of economic activities from social norms – economic behaviour is more and more conceived in terms of monetary variables and when social ties are not seen as means, they simply are interpreted as inefficient constraints;

* The authors are indebted to Prof. Edward O’Boyle for comments on an earlier version.

2. a loosening of moral values in economic decisions deriving from a systematic subordination of ethical principles to profit maximization – ethical ends are seen as costs when they do not coincide with short term profit strategies;
3. a dominance of financial gains over other economic considerations, such as meeting basic human material needs, providing jobs that pay a living wage, protecting the environment.

The firm is one of the main carriers of this transformation. In the 1990s, the diffusion of the ideology of *shareholder value* emphasised the primacy of value creation over other issues in organizational governance, shifting power to shareholders and changing management priorities.¹ An increasing attention to financial gain over standard operating income is the main effect of this change.

The firm is also a victim, in the sense that it undergoes a process of deconstruction relative to relocation and is downsizing its labour force and fragmenting production processes. The firm as a unitary coordinating structure is replaced by a fragmented network connecting modular dispersed units where only the financial and marketing function define the unity of the enterprise.

Building an organisation that creates products conforming to consumer preferences has been replaced by pursuing short term opportunities for financial gain. Management is less and less concerned with the problem of production. The short term perspective induces economic actors to take production capabilities as given. The result, therefore, is a reduced effort in building long term knowledge assets and in modifying organisational routines to achieve higher productivity. Many companies tend to make profits out of large investments in knowledge made in the past² without renewing such capital because that is what financial markets demand (Lazonick, 2005).

There are many factors contributing to the financialisation of the economy. We enumerate three.

1. Globalisation and institutional reforms oriented to deregulation have assured that financial capital has an unprecedented freedom of movement, which at the same time for a number of reasons is not assured for labour and other sorts of capital. Capital has been released from several ties and has become more and more liquid and mobile.
2. Institutional investors have become the managers of huge financial resources and are quite influential in corporate governance.
3. A strict financial logic has spread from the proper sphere of financial markets to all economic activities due to an erosion of the humanities, and liberal arts in general educational curriculum and a materialist cultural change (Lissack and Richardson, 2003), that, in turn, leads to a breakdown in ethics in economic affairs. Formal education is not effective in replacing ethical values: business schools teach trading off ethical values for financial gain.

The financialisation of the economy has induced a dominance of finance over production and a weakening of labour and community interests relative to capital. Moreover, the negative effects also are visible in small companies and in industrial districts, which, up to

¹ See Williams (2000), Lazonick and O’Sullivan (2000), Stockhammer (2004), Engelen (2002), Froud et al. (2006).

² We may even say that they are winding up such investments.

now, have been the centre of a ‘humane economy.’³ Much of the original ideas of the Catholic Social Teaching (CST) on the desirability of small enterprises and capital-labour collaboration is lost and difficult to reconcile with the new economic reality.

As a consequence, some form of collective action is urgently needed to strengthen economic institutions in order to promote ethical behaviour. Internal company initiatives in social responsibility need to be complemented by external institutional effort. To contribute to a deeper understanding of the issues surrounding financialisation we refer to the original works on political economy by neo-Thomists.

2. CST and the importance of rules and rights

We begin with the following questions. What is the impact of financialisation on society and on the human person? Is this new situation respectful of the basic principles expressed over the years by CST? How much is a society that is working more and more around purely financial variables able to assure the basic dignity of human beings? In particular, is financial rent becoming a ‘measure’ in contemporary society compatible with CST?

A general answer to these questions is that CST considers wealth as a means to achieve ethical ends and not as an end in itself. Consequently, efficiency should not conflict with ethics. That, however, introduces complex issues concerning the social dimension of economic action and the role of *solidarity*. It therefore requires the study of the interaction between the moral and formal constraints to economic processes, between freedom and coercion. To address these questions we refer to the concept of *solidarity* at two levels.

First, at the actual *action-level*, solidarity consists of economic choices – taken within a given set of rules – in accordance with ethical ends: to act (or to refrain from acting) in a way that achieves the common good which, if we trade-off social norms and institutions for short-term financial gain, inevitably will be endangered.

Second, at the *rule-level*, solidarity consists of cooperation oriented to fostering *rights* and *rules*, and aims at assuring a sound institutional environment for economic activities. Rule-level solidarity is a precondition for any truly efficient economic choice in the sense that it rules out economic choices that are destructive of the very institutions we depend on for our well-being.

Here, we would like to focus on the rule-level solidarity. Following Heinrich Pesch (1905 vol.1:225), we assume that the economy displays solidaristic characteristics because institutions relate the individual to the whole community. Our interest therefore is in the ethical outcomes driven by the *economic order*, in the sense that rules help achieve sound ethical results (Taparelli, 1854:257).⁴

However, ethical principles cannot easily or directly be detected in the economic structure: they require interpretation. Taparelli, Liberatore, Pesch, Brants and the many contributors to CST affirm that economics is a *practical science*, oriented to practical wisdom, that is to discovering the best ways of acting. It adopts a substantive view of the economy relating it to man’s needs and society’s order. The classical natural law states the inseparability of

³ See Roepke (1960); Toniolo (1952); Solari (2006); Marangoni and Solari (2006).

⁴ Taparelli also proposes a *duty of sociability and cooperation* according to the *natural order*, in which society remains a means (against idealist thought) not an end. The law is ‘*the moral force, according to reason, binding one to the will of others*’.

morals and institutions, and those institutions therefore should be judged for what they help produce (Caloia, 2006).

Many free-market theorists presently are reclaiming ethics, acknowledging the defect in the unfettered market economy in achieving good social and economic results. However, ethics cannot be only considered in relation to the individual person's choices, it also concerns the order of institutions. On the one hand, there is a recognition of the limits of the positivistic separation between fact and value, or of the 'value free technical nature' of economics. On the other hand, ethics cannot be used instrumentally to compensate for market failures without any concern for the epistemological implications of an ethical perspective in economic theorizing. Inserting ethics in economics inevitably leads to consider the role of institutions and, therefore, to an increase in the complexity of economic analysis.

3. Does financialisation lead to an ethical order?

Financialisation already has been explicitly studied and denounced as a danger by many Catholic (Toniolo), institutionalist (Veblen, Galbraith) and Marxist economists (Hilferding, Tawney) in the first part of 20th century. Such scholars faced the first flush of financialisation: the birth of giant corporations, the separation between ownership and control of enterprises, the accumulation and management of large financial wealth more and more allocated by the stock exchange. Galbraith (1975), following the Keynesian tradition, especially addressed the instability of the monetary economy.

Catholic economist Giuseppe Toniolo (1905; 1913) feared the loss of bourgeois values, of commitment and responsibility and of the substantive dimension of the economy.⁵ He particularly saw a danger in financialisation for the weak incentive it provides for labor-management collaboration. The problem was to balance financial gains against other economic factors. Toniolo (1913) warned against the transformation of capital from an auxiliary and instrumental factor into a dominating and pervasive force able to conform any institution to its logic. In particular, he warned against disembedded capital which would have made any economic relationship precarious by not participating in the risk of production. That would lead to a separation between economic practice and moral principles (Toniolo, 1913:250). The solution to this problem was conceived in the participation to the dialogue between capital and labour, favoured by the appropriate institutions: corporations, associations, collective negotiations.

Today we are facing a second and more pervasive financialisation thanks to the lowering of barriers to the movement of capital, to the diffusion of socialised saving, to the increased role of institutional investors, to the diffusion of the rhetoric of mass stock-holding (Williams, 2000).

Financialisation theoretically is justified by the neoclassical global conception of the automatic stabilizing role of competition and mobility of resources. Any other source of economic order is not significant and it is seen as an obstacle to a good market order.⁶ Corporate governance is the fundamental aspect of capitalist organisation and the institutions which frame it are crucial in determining the quality of economic processes. Neoclassical theory argues that on the one hand, corporate governance is exposed to strong

⁵ Actually, also Tawney (1921) keeps a special concern on the crisis of social values.

⁶ For example, codetermination in Germany, which owes much to von Nell-Browning (1957), and which delivered good results, is presently endangered by financialisation and by the demand of institutional investors to cancel it.

forces to adapt to the logic of financial markets and short term profit. On the other hand, as the main objective of the corporation shareholder value contributes to the efficiency of the general order and to the increase of the shareholder class.

However, reality is quite different. Shareholder value, taken as a measure for strategic management, tends to weaken the role of stakeholders, labour in particular, and to extract excess profits unrelated to basic performance of the firm. Shareholder value requires no impediments on corporate governance, it considers any form of stakeholder participation in decisions as inefficient. The only problem from that perspective is the fidelity of managers to shareholders (intended as an abstract homogeneous and non conflicting class), which causes the astonishing increase in executive pay of the last 30 years.⁷ In this way any rule, right or ethical element at stake in corporations is traded-off for short term profit. The latter becomes a sort of *rent*⁸ because much of entrepreneurial risk is shifted to stakeholders.

The situation worsens when institutional investors own companies for the following reasons:

1. institutional investors tend to manage organisations as if they were financial assets to be maximized, not communities of persons;
2. these investors put profit ahead of all other issues because of their social role of managing diffused saving;
3. they legitimise the managerial function to reduce costs without any social or personal constraint and reward managers financially for assuring compliance in cutting other costs.

As a consequence, the new financialised order presents *rent* at a critical and pivotal point. CST justifies rent as property income from productive assets as well as interest taking. Concerning the latter, most of the reasons for rent given by economist have been accepted by the Church. Pesch argued that '*We accept...interest in this modern era as the recompense for a service whose value is measurable, i.e., in terms of the opportunity to make a profit being provided with a sum of money*' (Pesch, 1905:199 vol.5/2).

However, Ratzinger (1881) was more cautious and differentiated lending for production purposes from lending for consumption purposes. In the latter case interest is less morally acceptable because it is oriented toward exploiting human weakness and misery. This indicates that rent should not be accepted as an abstract category but for its practical consequences. Thus, justice-based arguments have to inquire into the merit of specific institutional arrangements. The legitimacy of rent is not questioned. The issue is its position in the distribution of value, that is whether it should assume a primary or secondary role.

4. The place of finance in the economy

Finance has an important role in the economy: it reallocates capital from savers to productive activities and helps in reallocating risk. Transparency is a fundamental characteristic to assure the effective functioning of markets and the respect of all participants to this game (Boatright, 1999; Lyons and Orłowski, 2006). Moreover, the fundamental point is that neoclassical economists attribute to finance also a regulating role

⁷ Johnston (2005) focuses on the fiduciary duty deriving from natural law. The fact is, however, that manager compensation increases as an incentive for short term profit.

⁸ We intend *rent* in the classical notion of income deriving from property and not from productive activities.

for the whole economy. In fact, in a capitalist system capital bears (or enjoys) the role of deciding on the allocation of rewards. However, we should not forget that:

1. a good regulation of economic processes requires a steady and long term perspective (the opposite evidence emerges from financial capital investment behaviour);
2. the high speed of financial capital mobility contrasts with the low speed of change in investment and labour market;
3. the differential in velocity increases the opportunity of short term capital gains by speculative behaviour – that favours group self-referentiality (herd behaviour) which fuels instability.
4. the differential in velocity impairs the position of factors of production when they agree on the acceptable conditions of their participation to production.

As a *first* consequence, the financial instability motive – today endorsed by post-Keynesians only – still remains valid. In fact, generalised rent supremacy over returns to other factors of production, especially labour, tends to be a technically questionable situation. The self-referentiality of financial markets and the quest for capital gain tend to produce bubbles and to transmit a crisis to the rest of the economy (Toporowski, 2000). Then macroeconomic instability inevitably reduces collective well being.

Second, high speed of capital and the different velocity of adjustment of complementary assets is not in accordance with human needs and expectations. From the perspective of the enterprise, real economic investment, organizational capabilities, knowledge and commitment are the most important factors to produce wealth. Incentives are needed to make the whole work. From this point of view, financial capital mobility represents a strong incentive based on exit opportunity. However, this constitutes a threat, an unconditional menace which from the CST view badly fits with human nature. People need stability to make plans for their own future. The incentive for labour-management to cooperate in order to increase productivity is not strengthened by threatening these workplace partners. Active collaboration requires trust, confidence, respect, mutual acknowledgement of rights and duties, and a medium-long term action horizon.

Third, the company – seen as an organisation – is also a political entity.⁹ The management function calls for more than just allocating resources. It is a complex activity of conceiving and enforcing routines, which require legitimisation from the bottom of the hierarchy. Consequently, managers define duties, rights, entitlements, decide incentives and, at the same time, control participants' expectations to stimulate and organize cooperative work. Though work is organized around superiors and subordinates, the workplace cannot function effectively when one partner imposes its will on the other. Some dialogue is needed to sort through workplace conflicts to find what works best for all parties involved. Dialogue is almost fruitless when taking place between parties with non commensurable bargaining powers and the mobility differential of capital relative to other factors impairs bargaining power in such a process. That leads to a distorted distribution of value added and to a worsening of entitlements for less protected interests.

In the 19th and beginning of the 20th century the Church insisted that much of the role that mixed free associations of labour and employers could play in negotiating the solution of

⁹ Since it involves *voice* in the definition of common rules of behaviour.

proletarianisation.¹⁰ The *corporation of arts and crafts* was extended in this way to play a new role in industrial capitalism to facilitate the dialogue between capital and labour (Solari, 2006a,b). The aim was to find the *just measure* for what today we call a *governance compromise*. CSR today should receive and reinvent this tradition of dialogue and construct the institutions which may help an enlarged dialogue for the mutual acknowledgement of interests. A profitable dialogue, however, requires a balanced power wherein financial capital with its greater mobility is re-aligned with the other factors of production.

In particular, the unbalanced power in favour of capital favours the production of *social costs* (those never accounted formally) borne by stakeholders in favour of monetary gains for the shareholders.¹¹ That means that most of the costs of enterprise's adaptation therefore are most likely to be inflicted to stakeholders. That leads to formal efficiency but to substantive social inefficiency. The public function of the corporation is acknowledged by according a limited responsibility to incorporated capital. This benefit should be however be balanced by a social responsibility which is at least defined as avoiding imposing social costs by its strategic decisions.

Finally, CST of the 19th century (e.g. Liberatore, 1989), which embraced a classical and substantive perspective, affirmed that only nature and labour are responsible of productivity, capital is just a means. Shareholder value means attributing all decision power to the resource which is not productive.

Zamagni (2006) substantially supports an increase of stakeholders' participation to corporate decisions. He argues that although managers are appointed by shareholders, they are responsible to the whole corporation intended as a unitary organisation. It would otherwise be difficult to understand the reason of limited responsibility for shareholders. That would not mean shifting the control of companies from capital to labour. It means favouring a development of institutions favouring a balanced bargaining process in the definition of strategies, helping social dialogue and participation. We may agree with Pesch (1917:74) that «*there is no such thing as an unconditional, free, absolute right of private property that does not involve also obligations*». The aim is to achieve what O'Boyle (1998) calls "*cooperative work toward the common good in economic efficiency*" – with *efficiency* defined in broad terms including a plurality of variables including social ends. The successful experience of Germany's codetermination – labour representatives in the company's surveillance committee – represents a concrete case of collaboration and incentive for responsibility.

Regrettably, the financialisation of the economy does not only concern large corporations. It also has an impact on small firms becoming more and more disembedded from the socio-cultural environment. The separation between capital and the other factors of production in the small and medium enterprises similarly is due to the practice of trading off everything against profits, of over-evaluating the role of competition over collaboration, organisation, participation and personal commitment.

Rules are needed for re-transforming capital in way that is complementary to the labour factor. Corporate social responsibility experiments are not enough; they need to be backed by solid general institutions.

¹⁰ *Rerum Novarum* reaffirmed this principle which, however, has a long history.

¹¹ Galbraith concentrated on this issue. See Ramazzotti and Rangone (2006) for an understanding of unemployment on these lines.

5. Education and collective action to foster participation

In this paper we do not propose replacing good practices and spontaneous initiatives of firms with government action. On the contrary, bottom up initiative is seen as the main reform needed. However, sound practices and the evolutionary progress which can be produced by them risk being strongly constrained by an unfavourable institutional environment. Economic institutions align individual incentives to society's ends. Creating stakeholders rights of participation with an increasingly disembedded capital would be really difficult. As a consequence, collective action at different levels is necessary to restore some rule which balances the relative mobility of the different factors of production.

We argue that in an economic environment in which good social outcomes are increasingly traded-off with short term profits, individuals cannot bear all the responsibility for 'pro-social' outcomes. Ethical behaviour emerges only within the framework of the right institutions. In particular, some institutions to help the dialogue between the different interests engaged in a corporation is welcome as CST has been proposing for a long time. Individual ethics should be complemented by socio-economic institutions helping individuals work for the common good.

The first step in an improvement of institutions would be a new emphasis on education which considers ethics and economics a unitary issue. In particular, the social dimension of the enterprise and the ethics of responsibility should be reinforced in our culture to define more precisely what a 'good company' is. The second step is to develop rules to help fostering the correct duties and rights of actors involved in the company. Then, some standards of ethical conduct may be developed which help the diffusion of information on these issues which help people chose.

References

- Alford H. and M. J. Naughton (2002) "Beyond the Shareholder Model of the Firm: Working toward the Common Good of a Business" in Cortright, S.A. and M. J. Naughton (eds.) *Rethinking the Purpose of Business: Interdisciplinary Essays from the Catholic Social Tradition*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, pp.27-47.
- Alford H., B. Sena and Y. Sheherbinina (2006) "Philosophical underpinnings and basic concepts for a dialogue between CST and CSR on the 'good Company'", position paper for the Angelicum conference, October 2006.
- Antoine C. (1901) *Corso d'Economia Sociale*, Sienne, Ufficio della Biblioteca del Clero.
- Baeck L. (1994) *The Mediterranean Tradition in Economic Thought*, London, Routledge.
- Boatright J. R. (1999) *Ethics in Finance*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Boyer, R. 2000. "Is a Finance-led Growth Regime a Viable Alternative to Fordism? A Preliminary Analysis." *Economy & Society* 29:111-45.
- Caloia A. (2003) "Etica della finanza e finanza etica: ruoli e valenze nella problematica odierna" in D. Parisi and C. Rotondi (ed.s) *Francesco Vito, Attualità di un Economista Politico*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero.
- Cathrein V. (1911) *Moral Philosophie, (5rd ed.)* Herdersche, Freiburg (It.ed. *Filosofia Morale*, Florence, Libreria Editrice Fiorentina 1913).
- Donaldson T. and L. E. Preston (1995) "The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications", *The Academy of Management Review*, vol.20 (1) : 65-91.

- Engelen E. (2002) "Corporate governance, property and democracy: a conceptual critique of shareholder value", *Economy and Society* 31:391-413.
- Froud J., C. Haslam, S. Johal and K. Williams (2000) "Shareholder value and financialization: consultancy promises and management moves", *Economy and Society* 29:80-110.
- Froud J., S. Johal, A. Leaver and K. Williams (2006) *Financialization and Strategy – Narrative and Numbers*, London, Routledge.
- Galbraith J. K. (1975) *Money*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
- Garvey G. E. (2003) "The theory of the firm, managerial responsibility, and catholic social teaching", *Journal of Markets and Morality* vol.6 (2): 525-540.
- Hilferding R. (1923/2006) *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*, London, Routledge, (*Das Finanzkapital*, Wien).
- Johnston J. F. Jr. (2005) "Natural law and the fiduciary duties of business managers", *Journal of Markets and Morality* vol.8 (1) : 27-51.
- Lazonick W. and M. O'Sullivan (2000) "Maximizing shareholder value: a new ideology for corporate governance", *Economy and Society* Vol. 29 (1): 13–35.
- Lazonick W. (2005) "Evolution of the new economy business model" Working paper.
- Liberatore M. (1989) *Principii di Economia Politica*, Rome, A. Befani.
- Lissack M. R. and K. A. Richardson (2003) "Models without morals: towards the ethical use of business models", *Emergence* 5(2):72-102.
- Lyons B. and L. Orłowski (2006) "Transparency in financial markets and institutions: a catholic social thought perspective", communication at *The Good Company. Catholic Social Thought and Corporate Social Responsibility in Dialogue*, Pontifical University of St. Thomas (Angelicum), Rome October 5-7.
- Maines D. and M. Naughton (2006) "Middle level thinking", position paper for the Angelicum conference, October 2006.
- Marangoni GD. And S. Solari (2006) "Flexible specialisation 20 years on: how the 'good' industrial districts in Italy have lost their momentum" *Competition and Change* (1) pp.73-87.
- Nell-Breuning von O.S.J. (1957) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Heute*, 2 vol.s, Freiburg, Herder.
- O'Boyle E.J. (1998) *Personalist economics: Moral Convictions, Economic Realities, and Social Action*, Boston, Kluwer.
- Pesch H. (1896-1900) *Liberalismus, Sozialismus und christliche Gesellschaftsordnung*, Freiburg, Herder.
- Pesch H. (1905-26) *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*, Herder, trad. *Teaching Guide to Economics*, five volumes/ten books, translated by Rupert J. Ederer, Lewiston (ME): The Edwin Mellen Press, 2002-2003.
- Pesch H. (1917-2004) *Ethics and the National Economy (Ethik und Volkswirtschaft)*, Norfolk, VA, IHS.
- Ramazzotti P. and M. Rangone (2006) "Unemployment as a social cost", in W. Elsner, P. Frigato and P. Ramazzotti (ed.s) *Social Costs and Public Action in Modern Capitalism*, London, Routledge.
- Ratzinger G. (1881) *Die Volkswirtschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen: etisch-soziale Studien über Kultur und Zivilisation*, Freiburg, Herder.
- Solari S. (2006a) "Looking Forward to a Third Way and Disappointment: From Neo-Thomism to Corporatism", paper presented at the annual ESHET conference in Porto, April.

- Solari S. (2006b) "Röpke's economic humanism and its relevance to the understanding of industrial districts" forthcoming in *Storia del Pensiero Economico*.
- Stockhammer E. (2004) "Financialisation and the slowdown of accumulation" *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28 (5), 719–741.
- Stockhammer E. (2006) "Shareholder value orientation and the investment–profit puzzle", *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, Vol. 28, No. 2 193-215.
- Röpke W. (1958 [1998]). *Humane Economy - The Social Framework of the Free Market*, ISI books, Wilmington (Del.)
- Taparelli L. (1851) *Saggio Teoretico di Diritto Naturale Appoggiato sul Fatto*, Livorno, V. Mansi.
- Taparelli L. (1854) *Esame Critico degli Ordini Rappresentativi della Società Moderna*, Rome, Tipography of Società Cattolica.
- Tawney R.H. (1921 [1982]) *The Acquisitive Society*, Brighton, Wheatsheaf.
- Theocarakis N. J. (2004) "Nicomachean ethics in political economy: from the scholastics to the neoclassicals", working paper, june.
- Toniolo G. (1905 [1952]) *Trattato di Economia Sociale e Scritti Economici*, 5 vol.s, Città del Vaticano, Comitato Opera omnia G. Toniolo.
- Toniolo G. (1913 [1947]) *Capitalismo e Socialismo*, Città del Vaticano, Comitato Opera omnia di G. Toniolo.
- Toporowski J. (2000) *The End of Finance*, Routledge, London.
- Vito F. (1936) "Economia ed etica", *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali* May pp.254-271.
- Vito F. (1949) *Economia e Personalismo*, ed. Vita e Pensiero, Milan.
- Williams K. (2000) "From shareholder value to present-day capitalism", *Economy and Society* Vol. 29 (1): 1–12.
- Zamagni S. (2006) "Responsabilità sociale delle imprese e 'democratic stakeholding'" Working paper n°28 Bologna.