

Spring 5-17-2014

BELOVED CO-LABORERS: A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK FROM LEO XIII'S WRITINGS ON THE DIGNITY OF LABOR

Henry J. Davis
Fordham University

Follow this and additional works at: https://fordham.bepress.com/gse_student

Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, Henry J., "BELOVED CO-LABORERS: A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK FROM LEO XIII'S WRITINGS ON THE DIGNITY OF LABOR" (2014). *Education Student Dissertations*. 1.
https://fordham.bepress.com/gse_student/1

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Education at DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Student Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact considine@fordham.edu.

BELOVED CO-LABORERS: A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK FROM LEO XIII'S
WRITINGS ON THE DIGNITY OF LABOR

HENRY J. DAVIS

BA, Iona College, 2000
MA, Manhattanville College, 2006

Mentor
Gerald M. Cattaro, EdD

Readers
Sheldon Marcus, EdD
Toby Tetenbaum, PhD

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
2014

COPYRIGHT

© Henry Davis, 2014, All Rights Reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thank you to my mentor Dr. Gerald Cattaro, and to Dr. Sheldon Marcus and Dr. Toby Tetenbaum for their collective guidance and support; those family and friends who are too numerous to list; my big sister and confidant, Elizabeth; and my parents, Gail and Henry, who always supported my endeavors with equal passion and unconditional love.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Allison, who equally sacrificed and gave of herself during the dissertation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM	2
Introduction	2
Leadership in Changing Times	7
Purpose of the Study	11
Research Questions	12
Significance of the Study	12
Definition of Terms	14
Theoretical Framework	15
Limitations	16
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Early Life and Leadership of Leo XIII	17
Awakening to the Treatment of Labor in Industrialized Europe	22
Historical Context during Pecci's Labor Efforts	25
Using the Written Word to Defend Church and Labor	28
Competing Ideological Systems on Labor Emerge	33
The Labor Question Visited: Pecci's "Church and Modern Civilization"	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER III. THE LABOR POPE FOR A NEW ERA: AN OVERVIEW	38
<i>Aeterni Patris</i> : The Leadership Model Guiding Leo XIII on Labor	39
Marxism and The Church’s Impending Stance on Labor	43
Historical Context of <i>Rerum Novarum</i>	46
<i>Rerum Novarum</i> : Leo’s Opus on Labor Relations	50
<i>Graves De Communi Re</i> : Clarifying the Christian Labor Movement	52
CHAPTER IV. METHODOLOGY	55
Historical Paradigm	57
Servant Leadership Framework	58
Data Collection	61
Research Questions	62
Research Design	62
Limitations of Study	65
Delimitations of Study	66
CHAPTER V. RESULTS	67
Theme 1: Natural Rights of Man Via God’s Natural Law	68
Theme 2: Love and Christian Charity	73
Theme 3: Jesus Christ as Divine Model for Laborers and Leaders	81
Theme 4: Labor as a Practical and Moral Way to Life	86
Theme 5: Authority’s Responsibility to Dignity and Labor	92
Implications of Leo’s Leadership for Contemporary Leaders	100

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSION	104
Applying the Leonine Themes to a Leadership Framework	104
Recommendations for Future Studies	106
Conclusion	109
REFERENCES	111
APPENDIX. IRB EXEMPTION LETTER FOR HISTORICAL ANALYSIS	131

Abstract

**BELOVED CO-LABORERS: A LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK FROM LEO XIII'S
WRITINGS ON THE DIGNITY OF LABOR**

Henry Joseph Davis

Fordham University, New York, 2014

Mentor: Gerald Cattaro, EdD

Many sources identified 19th-century Pope Leo XIII as one of the fathers of modern-day Roman Catholic social teachings. Throughout his church leadership life, Leo authored pastoral and encyclical letters on topics addressing the dignity of labor. In this historical analysis study, the objective was to code Leo's 1877-1878 Lenten Pastoral Letters, his labor encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, and the *Rerum*-inspired *Graves de Communi Re* to extract major recurring themes on the importance of working-class labor and the inherent worth of all human beings. The purpose of this study was to consider the leadership of Pope Leo XIII on the dignity of labor through a historical analysis of his writings. The goal was to bring about social change between managers and employees. The results from the analysis stage indicated five prevalent themes emerged from Leo's selected writings: the natural rights of man via God's natural law, love and Christian charity, Jesus Christ as divine model for laborers and leaders, labor as a practical and moral way of life, and the responsibility of authority's to dignity and labor. From the themes, a series of questions emerged to form a leadership framework for decision-making. The internal questions derived from the themes may offer Catholic leaders an ethical foundation for formulating leadership actions while remaining truthful to their faith tradition, to create a collaborative environment with employees, and to increase servant-based leadership attitudes comparable to the Gospel Christ.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In uttering the traditional Latin phrase, *Habemus papum* (English translation: “We have a pope”), from the balcony of St. Peter’s Basilica, French Cardinal Deacon Jean-Louis Tauran introduced the world to the new head of the Catholic Church, Pope Francis I (Wooden, 2013). The event, occurring on March 13, 2013, was a first of sorts even though numerous elected popes went through similar ceremonious beginnings. Besides being the first Jesuit Pontiff in the Church’s long history, the former Archbishop of Buenos Aires, Jorge Cardinal Bergoglio, replaced a predecessor who was still alive. Ending his pontificate in February 2013 for health reasons, Benedict XVI became the first pope in 600 years to leave office; the last was Gregory XII, who abdicated his position in 1415 to unify the papacy against the anti-popes of Avignon during the Western Schism (Cullinane, 2013). The Church Benedict XVI left behind was one traumatized by widespread accounts of clergy sexual abuse in America and Europe, often cited as a significant factor for Catholics leaving the Church, as well as reports of financial corruption within the Vatican (Allen, 2013a; Byron & Zech, 2012). Inheriting these and a host of other difficulties, the world ultimately viewed Francis’s first 100 days in a positive light, especially in the United States of America, where 84% of U.S. Catholics polled expressed a favorable opinion of his pontificate (Pew Research Center, 2013).

Taking the name Francis in honor of St. Francis of Assisi, the Pope symbolically made a statement that the Church would return to its humble pastoral roots. St. Francis represented, “poverty, humility, simplicity and rebuilding the Catholic Church” (Allen, as cited in Martinez, 2013, p. 1). In turn, Francis lived up to this moniker, preaching openness and acceptance in

global parishes where all Catholics should be encouraged to participate in the sacraments, especially those Catholics discriminated against by parish clergy and workers who had judged them sinful. Using the example of a parish refusing baptism to the newborn of a single mother, Francis stated:

A closed door! This is not zeal! It is far from the Lord! It does not open doors! And so when we are on this street, have this attitude, we do not do good to people, the people, the People of God. (as cited by K. Clarke, 2013, p. 1)

Preaching simplicity of life by shunning conventional traditions (e.g., personally living in communal quarters instead of the Papal apartments) and doing without materialistic privileges associated with the position of pope, Francis attempted to live the belief that the Church was of and for those less fortunate (Allen, 2013b). Even before his elevation, the former cardinal was a proponent for allowing individuals, regardless of race or status, the opportunity to join unions and freely seek financial stability (Bergoglio & Skoraka, 2013). As the new pope, Francis seemingly carried on this significant component of his former pastoral ministry. For the 2013 G8 summit, whose members consisted of countries with the world's largest economies, Francis wrote a letter of support for the often overlooked human element in economic discussions.

Directed to British Prime Minister, David Cameron, Francis wrote:

Every economic and political theory or action must set about providing each inhabitant of the planet with the minimum wherewithal to live in dignity and freedom, with the possibility of supporting a family, educating children, praising God, and developing one's own human potential. This is the main thing; in absence of such a vision, all economic activity is meaningless. (as cited in Vatican Radio Print Service, 2013, p. 2)

Francis condemned the exploitation of Bangladeshi factory workers laboring for roughly \$50 a month, labeling the practice as modern-day slavery (Calamur, 2013). In his Vatican radio broadcast on the feast of St. Joseph the Worker, Francis communicated the intrinsic worth of labor, saying:

Work is fundamental to the dignity of a person. Work, to use an image, “anoints” us with dignity, fills us with dignity, makes us like God, who has worked and still works, who always acts (cf. Jn5:17); it gives you the ability to maintain ourselves, our family, to contribute to the growth of our nation. (Vatican Radio Print Service, 2013, p. 2)

Francis’s concept of viewing labor as a sacred, dignified, and spiritually vital part of the human experience had long been an implication throughout the Church’s existence. In 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13, the *presbyteros* or elders (Brown, 1984) of the Christian church were instructed “To respect those who are laboring among you and who are over you in the Lord and who admonish you, and to show esteem for them with special love on account of their work. Be at peace among yourselves.” For many of today’s leaders, being a steward like Francis, whose aim was to empower groups through dignity and trust (Doohan, 2007), greatly resembled such biblical roots. While such descriptions assisted in comprehending what moral leadership meant, the passages partially presented contemporary leaders with an applied understanding of the innate worth each human being possesses. From this perspective, the researcher chose to analyze writings of Pope Leo XIII, one of the first pontiffs of the modern age who extensively outlined labor and its human element on behalf of the Church.

Similar to Francis’s inherited turmoil, Leo XIII was elected to lead a Roman Catholic Church in 1878 that was experiencing its own turbulence. His predecessor, Pope Pius IX, had lost control of the Papal States against the Piedmontese royal family and Garibaldi’s forces,

which eventually unified the Italian state (Sperber, 2005). Besides temporal upheaval, the Church of Pius IX witnessed its political influence erode in Western Europe after he openly denounced Liberalism to the masses (Woodward, 1924). The decline intensified after the First Vatican Council officially defined the papal infallibility of the Pope in matters relating to faith and/or morals and when exercising the absolute teaching authority of *ex cathedra* (“from the chair”) on doctrinal issues, strengthening his authoritative position over the global Catholic Church (Fulop-Miller, 1937).

The fear of widespread Vatican control allowed leaders like German Chancellor Otto Von Bismarck to establish anti-Catholic policies such as the May Laws, making it mandatory for religious personnel to be trained in state universities and to seek government approval for clerical certification (Kiefer, 1961). Germany’s distrust of its native Catholics helped usher in the *kulturkampf*, or *culture clash*, which sought to increase the state’s power at the expense of Church rights (Healy, 2001). For Leo XIII, these tribulations only added to his newer challenge of defining the Catholic Church’s perception of working-class individuals, a position never officially outlined in previous papal documents (Burton, 1962). This assignment was a delicate undertaking because many prominent clergy members linked to wealthy monarchs often clashed politically with local parish priests of poorer communities (Latourette, 1961). In turn, several Vatican officials remained focused on the European Church and the continent’s power structure instead of equity issues faced by common men, especially those residing in non-Western countries (Massaro, 2011).

Ensuring an equitable balance between laborers and industrialists was a delicate proposition for the new pope. Leo XIII clearly understood that his words on labor carried a significance that critics could easily misconstrue to favor one group. While Leo XIII was an

ardent supporter of labor unions grounded in Christian values, he recognized that each country had its own specialized methods of interacting with labor forces. Reinforcing the complex climate Leo XIII endured was McGovern's (1903) observation:

The labor question had spread in proportion with the growth of nations in the Old and New Worlds. It had been, however, dragged into the politics of empires, kingdoms and republics to suit the designs of crafty party leaders. There soon arose a deadly and apparently disastrous strife between capital and labor, the workman believing that the man who possessed the money was his implacable enemy, while the capitalist was equally tyrannical in his treatment of labor. (pp. 351-352)

Faced with opposition from both sides, Leo XIII's messages needed to challenge negative societal attitudes attached to laborers and employers, bringing them closer together as equals in the eyes of God and the Church. In the encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, or "Of New Things," Leo XIII tried to bridge class divisions by establishing the Church, workers, national authorities, and employers as catalysts for bringing about widespread justice (Henriot, DeBerri, & Schultheis, 1989). Similarly, in other works, Leo XIII (1888) maintained that civil authorities must be followed if their actions originated from the reason and intellect God gifted to humanity via natural liberty. Through such writings, Leo XIII began to show discretion and foresight that could aid in spreading equality on a global level. In his effort to confront discrimination, Leo XIII's leadership showed a steadfast commitment to the Church's vision of what constituted "The city of God with prudence in adapting the Church's temporal teachings to the pressing issues of the day-including . . . the condition of the working classes in modern industrial society" (Kraynak, 2007, p. 529).

Leadership in Changing Times

The myriad of problems Leo XIII dealt with in his papacy would require the same communicative leadership approach in today's world. Working- and middle-class individuals were still vulnerable to wealthy organizations and conglomerates involved with handling the economic well-being of nations. The United States-based energy firm Enron, for instance, defrauded employees and investors out of their pensions while avoiding income taxes from 1996 to 1999 ("Enron 'Bribed Tax Officials,'" 2003). In 2008, then-president George W. Bush, with help from Congress, devised a bailout policy named the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP), benefiting Wall Street with \$700 billion of taxpayers' dollars (Jaffe, 2010). Using this exorbitant amount to assist insurance corporations like American International Group (AIG) took place to rectify mortgage loans issued by similar institutions that ultimately became distressed (Stout, 2008). Though the program erased doubtful fiscal choices made by the financial sector, individual families were not as fortunate. According to Neil Barofsky, former U.S. Treasury Department Inspector General overseeing TARP, American homeowners with financial woes were often evicted, even though banks could have provided aid that was less costly to their investors (Carter, 2012).

Fiscal injustices were not designated solely to corporate entities. Governmental budgets regulating how to spend taxpayer dollars sometimes inadvertently or intentionally aided in creating an iniquitous situation for the working class. Illustrating this point was U.S. Congressman Paul Ryan's proposed federal budget plan entitled, "The Path to Prosperity: Restoring America's Promise." The Wisconsin-based Republican stated his budget would cut the current deficit from 9% gross domestic product (GDP) to roughly 1.6% by 2021 without tax hikes affecting citizens (Ip, 2011). To accomplish this, Ryan aimed to reduce government

spending by reconfiguring contemporary public healthcare programs Medicare and Medicaid so that in 2023, eligible seniors would receive a set amount to purchase private health insurance or buy into a revamped Medicare system (Serafini, 2012). This transfer of funds would release the federal government from being the primary insurers of senior citizens, purportedly driving down insurance costs because competition generated via personal choice would influence premiums (Rucker & Fahrenthold, 2011).

Though this action seemed fair enough, implementation would create the problem of overall affordability. Working-class and retired people on strict budgets would mostly be unable to meet the rising cost of healthcare years into the system, eventually having to ration necessities to pay the difference presently covered under Medicare (Calmes, 2012). As a result, private healthcare providers could discriminate against financially insolvent and sickly individuals in favor of wealthier clients, forcing Medicare to bankrupt itself by absorbing the greater cost of caring for the needy (Bendavid, 2012).

The Catholic academic community panned Congressman Ryan's plan for altering healthcare, as well as promoting cuts to programs fighting poverty and reducing Pell Grant support for disadvantaged students. Fr. Thomas Reese (2012) of the Woodstock Theological Center at Georgetown University dismissed Ryan's claim that his budget was grounded in Catholic social tenet of subsidiarity by writing:

Subsidiarity is not a free pass to dismantle government programs and abandon the poor to their own devices. This often misused Catholic principle cuts both ways. It calls for solutions to be enacted as close to the level of local communities as possible. But it also demands that higher levels of government provide help—"subsidiium"—when

communities and local governments face problems beyond their means to address such economic crises, high unemployment, endemic poverty, and hunger. (p. 1)

Reducing assistance programs and corporate misuse of public funds are not the only obstacles struggling laborers face in the United States. On the lower end of the economic spectrum, U.S. businesses seeking personal gains have often taken advantage of guest workers wishing to improve their financial situations. Classified by the U.S. Department of Labor as temporary agricultural and non-agricultural workers, foreign laborers are permitted entry into the country to fill labor shortages occurring during harvest season or when U.S. workers are not willing or able to fulfill a specific skill set (U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services, 2013; U.S. Department of Labor, 2013). To obtain these temporary positions, agricultural workers must secure an H-2A visa and their non-agricultural counterparts an H-2B visa guaranteeing adequate wages and accommodations from potential employers. However, documented cases of unfair wage practices and other labor abuses have surfaced in the public eye.

In one case, *Castellanos-Contreras v. Decatur Hotels*, temporary workers accused the New Orleans-based Decatur Hotel chain of not repaying initial fees given to recruiters for procuring employment after Hurricane Katrina. The fees, ranging up to \$5,000 per worker, put enormous financial strains on families living in poverty-stricken areas of Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, and Peru. Consequently, Decatur reneged on the 40 plus workweeks they promised temporary workers, making it virtually impossible for them to recover costs and retain a decent income (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2007).

Besides not receiving agreed-upon salaries, the troubles laborers face are not entirely fiscal. For female workers toiling away in agricultural settings, the chance of sexual abuse is never beyond the realm of possibility. According to the nonprofit organization Human Rights

Watch, immigrant women are highly susceptible to unscrupulous supervisors preying upon their vulnerable states. Many of these incidents go unreported due to the women's fear of U.S. authorities if the workers are undocumented and fear of retaliation from supervisors in the form of physical abuse or loss of employment (Meng, 2012). A large percentage of female farm workers suffer through sexual assaults. A report from M. Bauer and Ramirez (2010) indicated that out of 150 Mexican female agricultural workers surveyed, 80% confided they were harassed sexually while on the job. The collaborating factor between both studies was the fear and shame experienced by each victimized woman.

Child laborers were another population overlooked in agricultural areas scattered throughout the United States. Federal laws are less stringent regarding underage laborers working on farms with parental consent (Coursen-Neff, 2010), unlike their urban counterparts. Agricultural employers often expect the children to work extended shifts for below minimum wage and under conditions where injuries are commonplace. As confirmed by the International Labour Organization (2013), about 115 million boys and girls between the ages of 5 and 17 are recruited to work in high-risk environments, with an estimated 22,000 fatalities per year and countless injuries that go unreported to authorities worldwide.

Estimates suggested that 34% of younger U.S. workers involved in deadly farming mishaps were 16-19 years old (U.S. Department of Labor, 2010). Inexperience and machine malfunctions often caused incidents. In one recent case, two young men lost their lives when employers illegally sent them into an Illinois grain silo to chisel corn deposits from its sides. Ill equipped and without warning, both workers suffocated when they sank underneath the bin's 24-foot-high corn pile (Morris & Berkes, 2013).

Whether discussing the plight of migrant workers or the monetary difficulties endured by America's working class, many institutions neglected to view laborers as human beings whose personal worth and output had intrinsic value beyond mere economic figures. Leo XIII's attitude towards humanity and labor could potentially offer leaders a faith-based reference point for reorganizing priorities, elevating workers to the forefront when contemplating leadership actions. Leo XIII's messages may have the capacity to influence all systematic levels of management by producing a trickledown effect within ranks.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to consider the leadership of Pope Leo XIII on the dignity of labor through a historical analysis of his writings. The investigation provided philosophical and theoretical depth concerning the complexity of religious leadership to bring about social change between managers and employees.

During Leo XIII's pontifical reign in the latter part of the 19th century, the rapidly paced Industrial Revolution brought about immense changes affecting working-class families. Recognizing the need to safeguard rights for Catholic workers, Leo XIII knew the institutional church's official support of labor was necessary to broker a fair and equitable balance to prevent further class divisions. As a result, two objectives Leo XIII held for his administration were to show, "The Church was not the enemy of civil sovereignty and . . . that the Church had a deep and loving interest in the working people of the world" (Burton, 1962, p. 131).

To reveal these common leadership themes, historical analysis was used to interpret primary and secondary sources focused on Leo XIII's treatises about the laboring class. According to McDowell (2002), "History is primarily concerned with the study of human beings, their actions, and the consequences of these actions for other individuals and for society" (p. 27).

From this perspective, the research was an examination of the historical context in which Leo XIII faced the labor challenge and how the meaning contained within his responses shaped his leadership agenda.

On the topic of what Catholic and Democratic leaders should exemplify, C.A. Curran (1950) stated, “Leadership is wedded to the quest for truth and reality, and to the active participation in public and social affairs through the stimulation of each individual’s personal sense of responsibility and ability to think for himself” (p. 237). Through detailed analysis, this examination uncovered Leo XIII’s self-perceived responsibility to the Church’s working class followers and to society as a whole via his pastoral words. Based on prevalent themes found in such historical messages, future moral leaders can begin to truly value one another’s contributions emerging from the sacred state of humanity, which transcends social or political status.

Research Questions

Research questions guide and form the foundation of a study. The aim of this study was to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the recurring themes in Pope Leo XIII’s words regarding the importance of working-class labor and the inherent worth of all human beings?
2. How do these issues affect understanding of Leo XIII’s leadership approach?
3. What can contemporary leaders learn from Leo XIII’s messages to initiate policy to enhance the dignity of labor and bring about social change?

Significance of the Study

The significance of this research lay in its potential to offer Catholic leaders a framework for analyzing leadership actions, especially when faced with conditions affecting their

communities and organizational infrastructures. In extracting messages used by Leo XIII to promote the underrepresented during difficult times, leaders can adapt the self-same concepts to develop policies representing distinct Catholic values and sound leadership practices. When applied to established models, the findings of this study have the ability to support existing leadership theories by infusing a Catholic paradigm with its own considerations in regard to the human condition.

Aligning with this newer understanding of servant-based Catholic leadership is the capacity to illustrate an effective attitude for collaboration. To be a successful leader in a democratic society like the United States, one “must be able to easily relate to others and have good communication skills” (Levi, 2010, p. 169). In current times, when the Catholic Church has faced external rifts with emerging societal attitudes, leadership could benefit from historical interactions displaying unity as an end goal (McBrien, 2010). By examining this past father of the Catholic Church, contemporary leadership can expand on Leo XIII’s communicative practices for reaching positive outcomes when harmonious balance would otherwise be unattainable.

To commemorate the 100th anniversary of Leo’s encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, Pope John Paul II’s *Centesimus Annus* (1991) invited members of the faith to revisit this pronouncement because it “is still suitable for indicating the right way to respond to the great challenges of today, when ideologies are being increasingly discredited” (John Paul II, 1991, para. 12). The timelessness of Leo’s messages and his leadership acumen could become a sustainable formation tool to show leaders how to work together without sacrificing one’s personal dignity or belief system. From this foundation, followers could actively contemplate the role of Catholicity in their leadership lives and build upon Leo’s prevailing themes in contemporary circumstances.

Definition of Terms

Gaining a complete understanding of recurring terms is essential for readers to process results found within the study. The following explanations will aid in in this effort.

Catholic social justice. This is defined by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' (USCCB; 2013a) explanation of Catholic social teachings. Because we are all shaped in the image of God, the function of social justice is to recognize that all life should be respected and defended against inequities denying its sacred dignity. Hence, social justice occurs when people (a) advocate for the economic welfare of those in need, (b) protect the rights of working-class individuals and their families, and (c) practice solidarity that does not discriminate based on racial, social, or ideological differences.

Christian charity. Christian charity derives from the notion that mankind is one with the Christian Savior Jesus Christ. This connectivity with humanity and the divine calls us to care for others with love as morally right and cyclical in nature (Leo XIII, 1901a).

Christian democracy. Christian democracy is a religious paradigm based on the gospels and meant to improve the spiritual and physical well-being of humanity (Leo XIII, 1901a).

Divine or Natural Law. This comes from the belief that God provides humanity with reason allowing mankind to discern between what is moral and what is sinful (United States Catholic Conference, 1994).

Encyclical. An encyclical is a letter of instruction authored by the Roman Catholic Pope and targeting the Church's global community of Bishops or those residing in specific regions ("What is an Encyclical?," 2013).

Historical analysis. This research methodology systematically analyzes artifacts from the past such as written documents to uncover a greater sense of meaning (Jupp, 2006).

Historical context. This is the sociopolitical happenings surrounding a past occurrence (“Glossary of Commonly Used Terms,” 2013).

Moral leadership. This term takes its meaning from the USCCB (2013b) understanding of morality. Human beings are made in the likeness of God. Therefore, every individual possesses an inherent dignity, which includes the capacity to experience goodness and truth. The intelligence required to comprehend God’s truth is realized through the gift of free will. While free will provides humans the necessary means to rationalize from right and wrong, humanity is not immune to evil, even after Jesus Christ redeemed the world of Original Sin. From a leadership framework, an individual who acknowledges that (a) sinful acts are a reality of human nature, (b) leadership actions only deriving from good intentions may be deemed as morally just, and (c) evil objectives can never achieve moral status despite the end results, is a practitioner of moral leadership.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used to outline this research study was Robert Greenleaf’s (1977) servant leadership, which views leaderships as an invitation to serve others in their pursuit of completing short- and long-term goals. Because the leader’s primary objectives are to (a) assess group needs, (b) focus members on worthwhile organizational goals, and (c) nurture followers towards serving their fellow man, Greenleaf’s leadership model complemented the moral leadership paradigm as described in the Catholic tradition. Similarly, servant leadership offered the research leadership qualities to assist in analyzing the overall structure of Leo’s leadership messages.

Limitations

When a researcher attempts to extract meaning from past events, the individual relies heavily on personal interpretations to form conclusions. From this understanding, the general limitation of historical analysis may be the historical researcher himself: “For while [historians] commonly deal with very specific events, the exercise of explaining human motives or behavior is likely to embrace an extremely wide range of evidence and possible interpretations” (M. W. Bauer & Gaskell, 2000, p. 324). While individual viewpoints can provide new ways to identify certain phenomena, the same perspectives have the power to direct readers down a singular path by posing as non-negotiable facts. Therefore, individuals may scrutinize results discovered within this study based on their own paradigms (Creswell, 2003). The limitations and delimitations associated with this research appear in the following chapter regarding methodology. To counteract the limitations, qualitative triangulation will safeguard the study’s internal validity during each step of the analysis stage.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Early Life and Leadership of Leo XIII

Previous experiences are influential factors in a leader's development because, "They are vessels into which significance can be poured and carried to faraway destinations with relevance in many leadership contexts" (Janson, 2008, p. 91). Leo XIII was born Joachim Vincent Raphael Louis Pecci on March 2, 1810, in the Italian town of Carpineto outside of Rome. His parents, Count Ludovico Pecci and Countess Anne Prosperi-Buzi Pecci, both came from politically connected families whose lineages included 14th-century Italian leader and champion of democratic reform, Cola di Rienzi (Burton, 1962). Though coming from a privileged background, Pecci learned the value of caring for those less fortunate from his mother, Anne. Pecci's older brother and Jesuit theologian, Giuseppe Cardinal Pecci, recounted,

She was a woman devoted to the poor and to good works. She was ever doing something for the needy. In the years in which the harvests had failed, she had bread baked and distributed at her door, or sent to the infirm and the sick. She was also the soul of all works of charity and zeal in the town and its neighborhood. (Kiefer, 1961, p. 3)

At the age of 8, Pecci and his brother Giuseppe enrolled in the Jesuit-run Viterbo College in Rome. When he was a student, his Jesuit instructors noted Pecci's intelligence and knack for scholarly work. However, what set him apart from his classmates was his acumen with regard to human relations. The consensus reached by those around him was that he possessed "tender piety and spotless purity of soul" (B. O'Reilly, 1903, p. 55). So extensive was teenage Pecci's reputation that he was chosen to recite Cicero on Pope Leo XII's jubilee, granting him special favor with the Pontiff (de Narfon, 1899).

While suffering through periodic bouts of illness during his school days, Pecci remained steadfast and dedicated to his studies. He was literate in Latin, often writing poetry and prose in the classical language. Besides his love of poets Virgil and Dante, Pecci was intimately connected with the philosophy of Church Doctor St. Thomas Aquinas. Inspired by Aquinas's theological writings, Pecci learned to filter the modern world through a Thomistic lens, which carried over into his adult life. Later, as Archbishop of Perugia, Pecci prominently incorporated Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* and *Summa Gentes* into the curriculum of his newly founded academy for seminarians named after St. Thomas (R. H. Clarke, 1903). Once elected pope, he installed *Summa Theologica* as the official framework for Catholic theologians (Elias, 2002), bringing forth Aquinas' works to a whole new generation of scholars.

Concluding his education at Viterbo, Pecci went on to the Collegio Romano, also known as the Gregorian University, where he was awarded a doctorate in theology in 1832 (Burton, 1962; B. O'Reilly, 1903). Pecci next enrolled at the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics to study Canon and Civil Law, eventually earning advanced degrees within the discipline (O'Byrne, 1903). During his tenure at the academy, Pecci debated on whether his future included ordination into the religious life or if he would become a secular administrator in the Papal government (McGovern, 1903). During this time, the head of the academy, Bartolomeo Cardinal Pacca, noticed Pecci's leadership ability and recommended him for the position of domestic prelate to then-Pope Gregory XVI (Furey, 1903). In January of 1837, Gregory XVI appointed Pecci a domestic prelate, an honor often reserved for nobility demonstrating skill and wisdom in their administrative duties.

After his appointment, Pecci was elected referendary to the Court of Segnatura by Church superiors in recognition of his intellectual capacity and soon found himself part of the

Congregation di Buongoverno, which oversaw fiscal operations in the Papal properties (B. O'Reilly, 1903). Though Pecci's civilian prelate career was brief, the experience brought him closer to joining the priesthood. When cholera spread throughout Rome, causing widespread devastation in the summer of 1837, Pecci assisted his superior, Giuseppe Cardinal Sala, in administering to the sickly. While Cardinal Sala was able to attend to the full spiritual needs of those dying in Roman hospitals, Pecci was limited by his failure to have taken vows.

Multiple accounts praised Pecci's dedication and personal disregard for safety in caring for the afflicted. However, according to Schmidlin and Waal (1904), though Pecci displayed altruistic qualities, "His only regret was that he had received only minor orders and thus could not add the consolation of the sacraments to his ministrations" (p. 55). On December 23, 1837, Pecci was ordained into the priesthood and assigned his first administrative detail as a religious figure, being named the Apostolic Delegate Governor of Benevento by Gregory XVI (McCarthy, 1899).

In the three years Pecci served as Governor of Benevento, the province enjoyed a resurgence marked by reduced taxation that encouraged agricultural growth and continued stability, resulting from the reinstatement of its court system (Furey, 1903; O'Byrne, 1903). The outcomes experienced via Pecci's leadership transformed Benevento into a desirable area that was not lost on the Neapolitan hierarchy. In an attempt to acquire Benevento from the papacy, the King of Naples offered a substantially larger property closer to Rome in exchange for the smaller papal province (R. H. Clarke, 1903). The pope's secretary of state, Luigi Cardinal Lambruschini, met with Pecci to review the offer. Though Gregory XVI found the exchange appealing, Pecci advised against the transaction on moral grounds. His major concern was for the working-class people of Benevento, reasoning that after gaining freedom from exploitive tax

practices and with their economy in an upswing, the Church should not chance the possibility of destroying that progress by transferring it over to new ownership (Burton, 1962). The pope rejected the proposition shortly thereafter.

After Pecci distinguished himself in Benevento, Gregory XVI chose Pecci as the new Papal Governor of Spoleto. However, the pope soon changed his mind and decided Pecci's skill set would best serve in the more demanding city of Perugia (O'Malley, 1903, p. 72). For the Vatican, the Umbrian capital was an important political piece for preserving control over the Papal States (Furey, 1903). Perugia was rife with anarchic sentiments that called for revolution against Rome and unification of the Italian state. Progressively more citizens blamed the Church for worsening conditions and began joining organized societies like the Freemasons and the Italian Nationalist group "Young Italy," in hopes of improving their economic situations (Kiefer, 1961; O'Byrne, 1903). With anti-Church sentiments spreading throughout Perugia, the Vatican knew it would inevitably lose crucial ground with the Italian working class. B. O'Reilly (1903) described the problem:

In the year 1841, the seeds left behind by French Voltaireanism and Jacobinism had been long growing and waxing strong, till they now defied all efforts to uproot them. They had become so thickly mixed with the wheat in the ripening harvest-fie'd that to the wisest husbandry, it was a puzzle to know how to prevent them from utterly choking the good grain. . . . Illuminism, Voltaireanism, Jansenism, and then the Jacobinic frenzy employed these [secret] agencies to destroy the Christian order and Christendom of our fathers. (pp. 103-104)

To counter secular opposition and alleviate the financial burdens of modest landowners, Pecci began visiting moneylenders to question them on their operating procedures. If he found

they were overcharging landowners, he would provide the moneylender the option of canceling the debt or face trial in a court of law (O'Byrne, 1903). Through such interactions, the people of Perugia realized Pecci was a man of justice who championed the plight of the poor (Quardt, 1964).

To improve the material well-being of working-class Perugians, Pecci opened a savings bank to protect their financial assets (Fulop-Miller, 1937). The bank, privately funded with Pecci's own money, was another step in securing trust between the Papal government and its provinces. Following his appointment in Benevento, Perugian Count Anatoile Conestabile delle Staffe conveyed the mutual appreciation of the city for their bank, which benefited "the poor and rich alike" (McGovern, 1903, p. 97). Together with the community-based plan for financial stability, Pecci supported educational initiatives benefitting working-class citizens. As a firm believer in technical education, Pecci launched new schools around Perugia that specialized in agriculture and other practical disciplines useful for gaining employment (O'Byrne, 1903).

Pecci's reforms in law, labor, and education quickly reached Gregory XVI's court. Pleased by the news, Gregory XVI personally thanked Pecci for his efforts in promoting equity among the Perugian people (Keller, 1882). Shortly afterward, Gregory appointed Pecci the Nuncio of Brussels and granted him the title Archbishop of *Damiata in partibus infidelium* on January 27, 1841; a requirement for his new diplomatic post in Brussels (Burton, 1962; de Narfon, 1899).

Awakening to the Treatment of Labor in Industrialized Europe

Pecci's newfound role as diplomat was integral to his impending defense of labor in works like *Rerum Novarum* by exposing him to the marginalization and mistreatment of laborers (Quardt, 1964; Ward, 1966). Unknown to him at the time, the Papal States were a foregone era compared to modern Belgium, where the Industrial Revolution was in full motion. The experience of being thrust into modernity deepened Pecci's awareness as he witnessed the positive and negative effects of the Industrial Revolution. For one, the economic wealth produced by new industries helped to create Belgium's extensive railway system and the installation of gas street lamps throughout the city (Hall, 1899). Though such advances were impressive, Pecci also noticed the underbelly of industrial wealth. The modernization of manufacturing via machines put many laborers out of work. Those who were fortunate enough to still have employment accepted meager wages just to remain employed (Burton, 1962). In a depiction of Belgium's labor force at this time, Wallace (1966) wrote:

Belgium was a good place in which to learn what the Industrial Revolution was doing to laborers. The metallurgical industry, from the mining of ore to the manufacture of steel and iron, was leaping forward, side by side with the textile industry. The progress of the industrial masses engaged in these undertakings was, however, in the direction of increasing misery. Frequently without work, they could not protect themselves against constant hunger and wretchedness. Even when employed, the workers existed in surroundings not fit for human beings. Child labor was common, and female labor was frequently employed on public works such as canal construction. Wages were low, hours were long, and the work was heavy. (pp. 7-8)

Though Pecci's time as diplomat in Brussels was short lived, the realization that employers discarded workers and their very livelihoods for profits opened his mindset to the importance of protecting labor. In 1846, Pecci was called back to Rome and named See of Perugia, where he increased charitable efforts on behalf of the needy (O'Malley, 1903; T'Serclaes, 1903).

In the first few years of his rule in Perugia, Pecci appeared to continue where he left off as papal governor. He oversaw the construction and renovation of 36 churches while restoring seminaries that instructed the clergy (Wallace, 1966). Education, as during Pecci's time in Belgium, became a major component of his leadership platform. He stressed a liberal education including the sciences and made religious instruction mandatory at every level of the educational spectrum. All parish churches and elementary schools provided students with catechetical training, which advanced to the study of "theology, canon law, philosophy, and hermeneutics" (B. O'Reilly, 1903, p. 143). Seeing education as an intrinsic right, Pecci instituted a citywide system with the Perugian diocese that allowed both male and female students from all age ranges, up to and including adults, to receive training in the tenets of Christianity (Hall, 1899).

Pecci's investment in revising clerical and lay education was one way he tried to counter the secular element viewed as undermining Catholicism and the working-class (Burton, 1962). However, the Perugians gained their self-respect through acts of charity. Shortly after Pecci was elevated to cardinal by Pius IX in 1853 (Oldcastle, 1899), a famine struck the region, causing an increased need for services and supplies. Helping to alleviate this need was *monti frumentari* (deposits of grain), which Pecci established in each parish before the famine to assist townspeople during potential emergencies (B. O'Reilly, 1903). Besides an available food source, Pecci also formed charitable associations consisting of men from varied socioeconomic

statutes to assess the basic needs of every diocese in case natural disasters occurred. Outlining the mission of these associations, Pecci explained:

To give to the poor from out of our abundance is a duty imposed by the Divine Master on all Christians without exception of times or persons. But to help them with what is more than superfluous, by limiting our appetites in what we use to live, especially when it is required by their extraordinary poverty and sufferings that we should do so; to help them because they bear the image of our Heavenly Father, and because their deplorable condition touches our hearts; to aim, in fact, at enabling them to bless God's fatherly providence in their distress, as it is His hand which is reached out to them through ours...this is what shows in its proper light the greatness and helpfulness of Christian beneficence. (as cited in McGovern, 1903, p. 206).

Practicing this form of Christian charity, Pecci opened a soup kitchen for the needy at his personal residence, supplying them with bread and "nourishing, substantial soups and broths" every day (B. O'Reilly, 1903, p. 187). Hoping his self-sacrificing act would serve as an example, Pecci urged wealthy citizens and the collective religious communities to deny themselves extra luxuries and donate provisions to the poor. Whereas Italian revolutionaries blamed the people's misfortunes on the Church, Pecci proved the opposite by undergirding his swift administrative action with religious principles that helped feed the hungry and gain employment for the jobless (R. H. Clarke, 1903).

The actions included setting up an orphanage for boys run by The Brothers of Mercy from Mechlin, an institution for abandoned young girls managed by the Sisters of Province of Champion, a home for the care of troubled women, and the Graziani Conservatory, which educated young women already in the workforce. Additionally established were institutions

specializing in industrial and agricultural training for laborers; the Donnini Hospital for those suffering from terminal illnesses, run by the Sisters of the Stigmata of St. Francis; and the St. Joachim association, which attended to the needs of elderly priests (R. H. Clarke, 1903; Furey, 1903; McGovern, 1903; B. O'Reilly, 1903; de T' Serclaes, 1903).

Historical Context During Pecci's Labor Efforts

In Perugia, Pecci implemented a pastoral approach for attending to the needs of laborers by operating among them and ensuring fulfillment of their physical and spiritual needs through the parishes he oversaw (McCarthy, 1899). Though protecting such necessities was difficult in an anti-clerical atmosphere, Pecci's experience with modernist resentment taught him that the Church needed to move beyond political and philosophical arguments to address goals such as the labor question (De Souza, 2003). Increasingly, the region became divided between those in support of Italian unification and those choosing to remain loyal to the Church's authority. Mainstream support for unification received a major boost when Sardinian Minister Count Camillo Benso di Cavour joined forces with the British, French, and Ottoman empires in the Crimean War against Russia. In return for Sardinia's participation, Great Britain and France promised to support the Italian kingdom's quest to annex the Papal States from the Pope and reclaim Austrian-owned Italian properties at the 1856 Congress at Paris (Coulombe, 2009). For Pecci, this burgeoning revolution would physically manifest itself in the Massacre of Perugia.

With an army of French troops, Napoleon III attacked Austrian forces occupying Italy's Northern provinces, capturing the Milanese capital of Lombardy in 1859 (Corrigan, 1938). Paralleling the French seize of Lombardy, Tuscan revolutionaries invaded Perugia, holding control of the Papal territory until Swiss soldiers sent from Rome reclaimed order (Kiefer, 1961). Though the uprising was short-lived, the violent skirmish, which saw many rioters and citizens

killed, became a rallying cry for Italian patriots. In Cavour's memoir, author Dicey (1861) wrote, "The massacre of Perugia . . . had created such indignation in Italy that the rescue of Perugia [a year later] from Papal tyranny was almost as popular as the deliverance of Naples" (p. 211). This sentiment was mirrored in Garibaldi's (1889) autobiography, which referenced "avenging Perugia" multiple times before discussing crucial moments leading up to unification (pp. 200 & 205).

Similarly, British diplomat Sir James Hudson (as cited in Godkin, 1880) expressed equal disgust regarding the Pope's army, stating, "Atrocious deeds like those of Perugia, and threats like those of the allocution ought to persuade the sincerest Catholics of the approaching fall of the temporal power of the popes" (p. 168). Other non-Italian observers like American tourist Edward Perkins described how his family had to purchase their safety from the Swiss guards who ransacked the conquered city. The *New York Times* corroborated the scenario of carnage when it told readers,

After a desperate struggle outside the walls, the insurgents were routed of course, and the disciplined mercenaries entered the city with the aid of the army of priests and monks domiciled at Perugia, but encountered continued opposition in the streets, including missiles from the windows and roofs. In the midst of the universal consternation, the proprietors of the hotels assured their guests of the safety of these asylums, but the infuriated troops appeared to have repudiated all law, and rushed at will into all houses, committing shocking murders and other barbarities upon the defenseless inmates, men, women, and children. . . . The conduct of the troops has excited the deepest emotion in every circle throughout the country. All parties unite in denouncing the Papal authorities,

and there is a universal cry for vengeance. (“The Massacre at Perugia: The Outrage to Mr. Perkins and His Party,” 1859, para. 2)

Contrary to the *Times* account and those of Italian nationalists were publications such as the *Dublin Review*. In a response to the violence that transpired, the *Review* defended the Pope’s decision to send troops as his only option to halt foreign and domestic aggression (“The Massacre of Perugia,” 1859). Furthermore, the purported killing of innocent people was disputed by Giuseppe Pecci, S. J. (as cited in T’Serclaes, 1903), who explained,

The truth is that the Swiss troops, not finding any rebels in the streets and receiving shots from the windows of houses where the rebels were concealed, burst into these houses, but they did nothing where they did not meet with any resistance. The presences of women and children even saved the life of several rebels. The troops were certainly very much excited, but the captains were able to hold them in check and there was nothing to be deplored in the houses where the rebels did not open fire. (p. 86)

The ulterior motives of European powers like Great Britain and France to publicly support the rebel uprising were substantial. Some estimated that England wanted to topple the Pope’s temporal power and France desired to maintain its authoritative stake in Sardinian land (“The Massacre of Perugia,” 1859). Despite contrasting accounts, Pecci was lauded for maintaining a rational demeanor during the chaotic attack. Even Italian King Victor Emmanuel II’s biographer, Godkin (1880), proclaimed that Pecci’s “good sense and moderation formed a contrast to the conduct of the other bishops. He not only did not embarrass the government by useless opposition, but he assisted in maintaining order in his diocese” (p. 222). Though Pecci distinguished himself in the face of military adversity, the region of Umbria, including Perugia, was lost the following year to Emmanuel’s Piedmontese forces (Quardt, 1964).

Using the Written Word to Defend Church and Labor

With the northern region now controlled by the United Kingdom of Italy, Pecci as leader had to endure a government whose aim was to remove all aspects of the Church's influence from Italian culture. The attempted removal manifested itself in policies that allowed for the confiscation of ecclesial properties and laws restricting Church involvement in civil unions and lay education (Fulop-Miller, 1937). During this time of strife, Pecci placed great emphasis on leading the Perugian diocese through his pastoral letters. From his mindset, the public possessed an intelligence that could still differentiate between morally right and wrong actions, despite military pressures to conform (O'Byrne, 1903). This faithfulness in others was visible in Pecci's open response on the Pope's temporal rule, entitled *On the Temporal Dominion of the Pope*.

Written in February 1860, the purpose of *On Temporal Dominion* was to inform parishioners of the inherent danger the Pope would encounter if subjected to secular governance (Burton, 1962). While Pecci did not condemn Italian unification, he disagreed that the Pope should no longer have a temporal state to rule (Kiefer, 1961). The idea behind this reasoning was that unlimited autonomy would safeguard the Pontiff's ability to run religious functions, minus the possibility of external persecution (R. H. Clarke, 1903). Developing this concept further, Pecci wrote:

Everybody knows how easily a government can, even by indirect means, close up every avenue to publicity, cut off all means of communication, put all sorts of obstacles in the way of truth, and give falsehood a free field. In such a situation how is the Pope to superintend the affairs without number of all the churches, to promote the extension of God's kingdom, to regulate worship and discipline, to publish bulls and encyclicals, to convene councils, to grant or to refuse canonical institution to bishops, to have at his

command the congregations and courts which are necessary for the management of so many weighty affairs, to keep off schism, to prevent the spread of public heresies, to decide religious disputes, to speak freely to rulers and peoples, to send nuncios and ambassadors, to conclude concordats. To employ censures, to regulate, in fact, the consciences of two hundred millions of Catholics scattered all over the earth, to preserve inviolate dogmas and morals, to receive appeals from all parts of the Christian world, to judge the causes thus submitted, to enforce the execution of the sentences pronounced-to fulfill, in one word, all his duties, and to maintain all the sacred rights of his primacy? (as cited in B. O'Reilly, 1903, p. 204)

As mentioned earlier, the sacrament of marriage became a source of contention between the Piedmontese and the Catholic leadership of Umbria. The Piedmontese viewed marriage as a civil matter that did not require Church authorities, whereas Pecci and the Church believed that removing God from marriages defiled the spiritual bond and overall validity of the unions (Keller, 1882; McGovern, 1903; O'Byrne, 1903). Directing the grievance straight to Emmanuel II, Pecci sent his letter entitled *The Bill Concerning Civil Marriage Examined from the Point of View of Religious Interests* in 1861 to protest the Italian government's new law against religious wedding ceremonies (Furey, 1903). Though Pecci understood his letter might fall on deaf ears, he equally knew that explaining the Catholic stance on the importance of religious traditions like marriage could appeal to the king's desire to retain a sense of public morality (Burton, 1962; McGovern, 1903). In reasoning with the opposition yet remaining resolute on critical points, Pecci wrote:

Does the state wish to co-operate in preserving from the abuses of individual licentiousness the purity or legitimacy of marriage? There is a way of doing so without

invading others' rights. Let it combine with the Church that precious and sadly needed harmony of action which arranges and secures so admirably the social and religious interests of a nation; let it show itself to be an ally, not an arbitrary master; let it accept and sanction the sacred laws of the Church, impose their observance on its subjects, even in externals, and it will thus infallibly attain its true purpose...But let the state beware, and we beg it to beware, of putting thorns and fetters on the Catholic conscience, and of putting itself as a teacher in the place of the Church, the divine and only guide from whom Catholics obtain the rules of morality and justice. (as cited in B. O'Reilly, 1903, p. 226)

Pecci's leadership via the written word came with many personal dangers. The majority of his administration in Perugia was marked by revolution and, later, by occupation (Hall, 1899). Priests considered enemies of the new state were murdered to chants of "Death to Priests! Long Live Italy!" (T'Serclaes, 1903, p. 88). Besides threats of physical violence, Piedmontese rebels were not above raiding seminaries and robbing religious orders of their belongings and land (Talbot, 1886). Disregarding his personal safety for the rights of others, Pecci fought to retrieve the Camaldolese Friars' Monte Corona abbey confiscated by the Italian state (Oldcastle, 1899). Drafting another letter of protest, Pecci acknowledged that the Friars were permitted to plead their case in municipal court, but condemned the decision against them as religious bias, stating:

The (court decision) admits that religion is inseparable from a wise instruction and education. But then it excludes in the most absolute manner the direction and superintendence of the religious authority from these institutions in which youth is instructed and educated, and substitutes for it privately that of the government. . . . It is easy to measure the scope and consequences of this measure. By it you violate the

constitutional right of the Church; you alter the solemn agreements which accompanied the erection of these institutions; you violate and set aside the last will and testament of the generous benefactors who founded them and endowed them on such formal conditions; you ignore the origin of these foundations and the property of the Church in those which, under her direct auspices and with her own substance and means, she called into existence. (as cited in McGovern, 1903, p. 159)

During these aforementioned tribulations, the writings of Pecci began to take full form as a voice for those persecuted and exploited by unfair practices. As noted by an unnamed source in B. O'Reilly's (1903) work, Pecci

Displayed the most efficient zeal in pleading before the new men in power the innocence of his parish priests, wrongfully persecuted and imprisoned, as well as to save from measures of violence and instantaneous expulsion religious communities, among which were Dominicans, Barnabites, Camaldolese Hermits, Missionaries, Oratorians. He acted in the same way to save cloistered communities of nuns from expulsion and concentration [in one house] to prevent the closing and profanation of churches. (p. 194)

Pecci's respectful dissident approach was used to counter further injustices imposed by the Italian government. When civil authorities began drafting younger clergy members into the military, Pecci started a committee to raise funds to purchase their freedom, allowing them to continue their ministerial studies. In defying the draft law, Pecci wrote, "Put a stop, Sire, to these laws which succeed one [liberty for] the other, and all in injury to the Church, and an injury which will eventually rebound to the state too." (as cited in Burton, 1962, p. 62).

Another instance when Pecci disputed the law occurred when the girls' school he founded in Perugia came under government control. Knowing that underprivileged students

were turned out, Pecci declared to Emmanuel, “Poverty, the want of a proper site, and other obstacles had for a long time frustrated the desires of the public,” yet the Church was there to fill the institutional need that now was lost to them (R. H. Clarke, 1903, pp. 113-114). When the government replaced the faculty of an all-male Catholic school in Perugia with their own instructors, Pecci removed his name and coat of arms from the institution. With its Catholic reputation removed, the former student body did not return (Keller, 1882).

Defending his flock against biased rulings, Pecci found himself increasingly susceptible to governmental intrusions. The most well-known incident happened when three priests from Pecci’s diocese renounced the temporal sovereignty of Pius IX through a written statement and joined the Italian national movement (O’Byrne, 1903). Pecci reprimanded the rogue priests on their actions, demanded that they examine their conscience, and questioned their worthiness to lead Sunday mass. Upset by this exchange, the priests complained to civil authorities, stating that Pecci suspended them from their duties based on their political affiliation (T’Serclaes, 1903). The municipal court subpoenaed Pecci to explain his motives for punishing the priests. When Pecci testified, he disputed the priests’ claims because he never formally suspended them and reversed the blame to the court for meddling in spiritual matters explicit to the church’s domain (Kiefer, 1961). The court found Pecci not guilty and allowed him back to his post.

Such confrontations seemed to strengthen Pecci’s resolve in protecting the Church and those oppressed by outside agents. Yet, Pecci’s attitude on matters of dogma and individual rights did not translate to antagonism of civil government or the outright disobedience of laws. As stated in B. O’Reilly’s (1903) work:

On all these occasions, the tone of [Pecci’s] correspondence with the civil authorities were uniformly dignified and moderate, while being also full of vigor and convincing,

such as to compel the respect of these officials, and to prevent measures of greater harshness and destructiveness from being enacted against his diocese. (p. 194)

Reaffirming this sentiment, then-Italian Prime Minister Urbano Rattazzi wrote to his wife about Pecci, saying:

This Pecci is a man of undeniable merit. He is gifted with great energy and power of management, coupled with the mildest manners imaginable. The fact is that, in spite of his incorruptibility and loftiness of mind, and in spite of the deep-rooted respect he has inspired in our officials, Cardinal Pecci's concessions will be mere matters of form. He will give way, just to the extent that would be expected from a man of the world, and no more. He is very strongly attached to the Holy See, and his principles are unbending. A man of his invincible, almost aggressive, firmness will not yield. He is distinctly one of those priests who compel admiration. He has considerable political talent, and his knowledge is still more extensive. . . . Cardinal Pecci does not condescend to small compromises. When we took possession of his seminary, he merely replied that he needed only a few rooms, and he is now living in his palace with the pupils from the seminary. He has them to dine and spend the evening with him. He is doing for Perugia what Cardinal Riario-Sforza tried to do for Naples: his is creating a scientific movement. In the meantime, not one of our officials has been invited to cross his threshold. If he should encounter me, I feel sure he would run away as if he had seen the devil. (as cited in de Narfon, 1899, p. 87)

Competing Ideological Systems on Labor

During Pecci's 32 years of service in Perugia, the country experienced countless changes that permanently altered the cultural and religious landscape of Italy. With waning temporal

power, Pope Pius IX called the first Vatican Council in 1864 to list the religious faults of modern society, which eventually developed into the *Syllabus of Errors*. Included with the new *Syllabus* was the declaration of Papal Infallibility, which proclaimed the Pope's infallible nature in matters of faith and reason or with *ex cathedra* (from the bench) pronounced directly by the Pontiff (Bury, 1964). While *Syllabus* reaffirmed the Pope's spiritual authority, the proclamation did not make overt claims to political power (Perreau-Saussine, 2012). The abstention from civil control was later reflected in *Rerum* (Leo, 1891) when it acknowledged government officials and their law-making abilities, ultimately placing them as co-guardians of worker rights alongside the Church.

In 1870, overall unification was solidified when Rome fell to Italian forces, resulting in Pius IX's loss of temporal power and his self-imposed exile as prisoner of the Vatican (Riall, 1994). Italian socialism, originally limited by "the national movement, [Italian patriot and anti-socialist] Giuseppe Mazzini's influence, and . . . the absence of great industries," was steadily gaining ground after the country's emancipation (King & Okey, 1901, p. 61). The increased interest in socialism, according to Russian anarchistic and philosopher Mikhail Bakunin, was attributed to Italy's vast number of men without career prospects coupled with university students who helped spread socialistic ideas in the agricultural villages where they resided. From this favorable environment, Bakunin was able to usher in the International Working Men's Association, which assisted the advancement of socialism in Italy's labor force (Rae, 1901).

The onslaught of nationalistic pride and Italy's secularized form of government gave way to ideologies inhospitable to Catholicism. Karl Marx (2002), Communism's chief founder and German philosopher, openly criticized the Church as contributing to class inequalities, urging governments that the "state can free itself from inner torment only by becoming the *bailiff* of the

Catholic Church” (p. 56). Fellow German economist and sociologist Werner Sombart (1902) showed a similar distrust of religion, stating, “So long as men try to support monarchy and capitalism as a necessary and Divine institution, using the Christian Church for this purpose, the social movement must become anti-ecclesiastical and thus anti-religious” (p. 162). These increasingly popular beliefs found an audience with several Italian liberals whose own beliefs viewed religion as a limitation to seeing their material needs met (Corrigan, 1938).

The Labor Question Visited: Pecci’s *Church and Modern Civilization*

Pecci maintained a position far from the political hub of Rome. The Secretary of State for Pius IX, Giacomo Cardinal Antonelli, was a staunch religious conservative who labeled Pecci’s diplomatic maneuverings as too progressive. In turn, Antonelli used his political power to keep Pecci far from Rome, where he might influence the Curia (T’Serclaes, 1903). Though he had limited contact with the governmental Church and tension-filled dealings with Italian liberals in Perugia, Pecci was able to remain a driving force for the Church in relation to its role in contemporary society and its support of the working class.

Considered by numerous sources to be his most influential pastoral letter series as See of Perugia, Pecci’s *Church and Civilization* for the Lenten seasons of 1877 and 1878 clearly addressed errors attributed to Christian living (Keller, 1882). Pecci’s purpose in discussing these missteps was to educate the clergy and everyday men on Catholic truths because knowledge would have the power to overtake “the intellectual poison” disseminated by the new left (B. O’Reilly, 1903, p. 279). Writing from a sense of urgency, Pecci made the case that the Church was a catalyst for advancing society because it provided humanity with the necessary spiritual guidance to move into a new age of development. Pecci placed the clergy on equal footing with

economic industries and social organizations that assisted in man's progress because meaningful endeavors could not exist without a moral foundation present (Wallace, 1966).

By including the Church as a vibrant participant interested in the evolution of mankind, Pecci turned to how the Catholic faith championed the working man throughout its history. According to Pecci (1878), pagan belief systems based on Greek and Roman philosophies despised the act of manual labor, deeming workers as the lowest common denominator next to slaves. Though such non-Christian societies shunned laborers, Catholicism was built on the teachings of Jesus Christ, a carpenter whose own labor illustrated that people could achieve humbleness and moral strength through work. The idea of labor as virtuous was further extolled by the monastics whose agricultural endeavors fed the hungry and whose contributions to the local infrastructure improved travel for the communities they called home (Pecci, 1878). Whereas labor was a blessing to mankind, Pecci (1878) clarified that labor without moral perspective could lead to greed and unethical practices.

Pecci's *Church and Civilization* proved to be a critical work as it reassured the world that the Catholic Church was not against scientific advancements but opposed to the omission of Christianity as a factor contributing to human progress (McGovern, 1903). After addressing the Lenten letters to the public, Pecci's message spread "beyond the borders of Italy" (T'Serclaes, 1903, p. 91). His pragmatic understanding of the modern world and reverence for man's growth helped to usher in a newer framework, allowing religion to remain relevant in a rapidly changing world. The momentum carried by Pecci's *Church* brought him recognition and visibility among the Curia, finally leading him to Rome in September of 1877 to replace the deceased Filippo Cardinal de Angelis as Pius IX's papal chamberlain (Wallace, 1966).

A few months later, Pius IX's 32-year reign as Pontiff ended with his death on February 7, 1878. In a span of 13 days, the Conclave elected Cardinal Pecci the next Pope, with 44 out of 62 possible votes. Thus, on the last official ballot, the former Cardinal of Perugia became Pope Leo XIII (O'Malley, 1903). At 68 years of age, Leo was concerned that his pontificate would be a short reign, placing the Church at a disadvantage during a time when stability was greatly needed. However, his tenure as Pontiff would help revive the Church in relation to social matters affecting ordinary men, such as labor and human dignity, while opening the Vatican "to ideas and problems and to the political and social forces of his time" (Fulop-Miller, 1937, p. 38).

CHAPTER III

THE LABOR POPE FOR A NEW ERA: AN OVERVIEW

When 83-year-old Prospero Cardinal Caterini presented Pope Leo XIII to the 19th century world from the main balcony of St. Peter's Basilica (Hall, 1899), the secular climate Leo previously experienced in Perugia had overtaken Italy. The Liberalists opposing the Church felt solid in their position, equating the death of Pius IX to the end of the Papacy (Smith, 1903). Modern society had greatly shifted towards an Enlightenment paradigm ushered in by the French and Industrial Revolutions, Marxism, and socialism, which ultimately challenged Christianity as an ideological force competing for the hearts and minds of the working class (Schmandt, 1961). The Church's conservative stance on politics, philosophy, and science created a wedge between many belonging to the bourgeoisie and laborers vying to improve their living situations. A major factor contributing to the skepticism felt by the Church regarding modernity was that it promoted autonomy and religious pluralism that could be used to contradict Catholic dogma, jeopardizing the Church's spiritual sovereignty (Hayes, 1920). Many in the Curia viewed revolution and democracy cynically because these ideals could attempt to disprove the Church, declaring it an outmoded institution unnecessary for continued human growth (Ireland et al., 1903).

With the pressure of doctrinal beliefs subjected to intellectual and scientific scrutiny, Leo had the daunting task of showing the global community that the Church could thrive in modern times, especially emphasizing the issue of worker rights (Hennesey, 1988). Included in this undertaking was the mending of political bridges throughout the European continent. More and more, countries formally identified as Catholic distanced themselves from Vatican's rule; in several instances, instituting laws that openly discriminated against the institutional church. As stated by Quardt (1964),

In France, freemasonry was reigning and freemasons were oppressing Catholics by their anti-Church legislation. The situation was similar in Austria after she severed diplomatic relations with the Vatican, upon the Declaration of Papal Infallibility. In Belgium, the Apostolic Nuncio was evicted from the country. In England, the Catholic Irish were persecuted, as were Poles in Russia. The worst situation, however, prevailed in Germany, where the cultural conflict heaped ruin upon ruin. (pp. 55-56)

Whereas Pius IX was a headstrong personality who remained fixed in negotiations (Burton, 1962), how Leo would respond to his new role was unclear. The media of the day revealed their own particular slants on Leo concerning what type of leadership persona he might assume. The American periodical, *The Messenger*, anticipated that Leo would take a moderate stance in dealing with secular governments, showing great restraint and rationale developed from his previous experience in church affairs (“Career of the New Pope,” 1878). *Harper’s Bazaar*, on the other hand, was hesitant in appraisal, making the point that although Leo was labeled moderate, the very nature of being Pope would require him to continue as the prisoner of the Vatican, eschewing compromise for the sake of Catholic unity (“Leo XIII, The New Pope,” 1878). From the far left, *The American Socialist* publication considered Leo to be nothing more than a puppet; seeing him as another pawn of the church, whose individuality was nonexistent (“Puppets,” 1878). The anticipation over Leo’s leadership and decision-making paradigm would soon emerge in one of his earliest encyclicals, *Aeterni Patris*, which insisted on the restoration of Christian philosophy, namely that of medieval church doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas.

Aeterni Patris: The Leadership Model Guiding Leo XIII on Labor

The world leaders of the 19th century had several philosophical frameworks at their disposal for analyzing issues affecting their respective domains. In mediating terms that would

support stability between the government and Church while countering contrary positions against religion, Leo highlighted the teachings of Aquinas as a solution for troublesome times (Hill, 1998). To set in motion Aquinas' philosophical model, Leo penned the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879), with the purpose of bringing renewed awareness to his works so a new generation could process their contemporary surroundings more faithfully. Moreover, the purpose of *Aeterni Patris* was to serve as a bridge for the Church, enabling the papacy to make the transition from its former reluctant stance on modernity to one actively engaged in current society (Ventresca, 2009).

From the onset of *Aeterni Patris* (1879), Leo made the point that the Church supported scientific innovation if the process leading up to advancement was in communion with Catholic principles. Another philosophical paradigm utilized for devising a concept might have contained oversights that masked its true nature (Leo XIII, 1879). In avoiding the schools of philosophies he viewed as mistakenly denying the divinity of God in favor of the human experience, Leo XIII pinned Aquinas as the apex of scholastic thought for attaining logic and truth. From Leo's mindset, Aquinas was a conduit of the Holy Spirit who acknowledged that intellectual capacity originated from God. From this starting point, individuals versed in Aquinas' teachings could understand divine truths associated with earthly order. As stated by Leo (1879):

The teachings of Thomas on the true meaning of liberty, which at this time is running into license, on the divine origin of all authority, on laws and their force, on the paternal and just rule of princes, on obedience to the higher powers, on mutual charity one toward another-on all of these and kindred subjects-have very great and invincible force to overturn those principles of the new order which are well known to be dangerous to the peaceful order of things and to public safety. (para. 29)

Leo viewed Aquinas's philosophy, highlighted in such works as the *Summa Theologica*, as integral to the education of clergy members. The appeal for Leo was that in Aquinas's time, he also tried to make sense of his surroundings, taking into account societal trends and scientific movements from the Catholic viewpoint. Mirroring the quest for unity between modernity and the 19th-century Church, Leo believed Aquinas already provided the outline allowing Catholics to live fully without straying from the Christian ideals often at odds with prevailing secular thought (McCool, 1994). This sense of Aquinas as integrator of established doctrine in the ever-changing world came from the premise that faith and reason were congruous to each other; that sacred scriptures could be revealed through divine means, and God could be found through rational measures (Pirie, 2009).

In essence, reason should not be denied because it was given to man for the purpose of personal discovery and meant to complete the divine plan God ultimately had in store for mankind (Fulop-Miller, 1937). To gain the entire vision of this divine plan, Aquinas believed that one required Christian faith to aid against the purported shortcomings of thought systems based on reason alone because they were more susceptible to errors (MacIntyre, 2009). Leo's *Aeterni* extolled the need for this systematic theology, which embraced Christian revelation alongside philosophical notions. Concerning the importance of *Aeterni*'s scholastic bent,

As a philosophy then Scholasticism offered a sounder view of man and society than the positivism and Kantianism espoused by the anticlerical liberals. Scholasticism could provide the theoretical foundation for a sounder and more truly human education than the truncated secular education provided by the "lay" schools and universities of the anticlerical governments. Scholastic social ethics could lay the philosophical groundwork for a broad and sane social program for Europe's new industrial civilization. A wiser, more

humane, and juster social program, we must admit, then the "laissez-faire" individualism of the positivist or Kantian liberals. (McCool, 1978, p. 204)

While *Aeterni*'s end goal was optimistic in that it wanted to provide solutions for sociopolitical issues, there were those detractors who saw neo-Thomism as a reactionary move similar to Pius IX's claim of moral infallibility; a desire to go back to the height of the Church's power where its doctrine remained unquestioned by the majority (Colish, 1975). French journals such as *Siecle*, *Temps*, *Republique*, and *Univers* judged *Aeterni* an impediment to Catholic thought. In their estimation, Thomism was a rigid structure useless to laborers whose main concern was survival as well as academic institutions who taught many subjects not necessarily religious in nature such as mathematics and physics (Wallace, 1966). In 1880, Columbia University Professor Archibald Alexander offered a similar assessment in *The Princeton Review* article *Thomas Aquinas and the Encyclical Letter*. Alexander (as cited in Gargan, 1961) wrote that *Aeterni* was avoiding the issues of the modern age with an outmoded philosophy which copied Aristotle's psychological meanderings, rendering it ineffective compared to Kant and the philosophical breakthroughs from the Renaissance. However, what critics did overlook was that even though Leo was looking towards the past for answering the modernity question, he unequivocally valued the innovations and inventions of 19th century (Schmandt, 1961). As stated by Leo (1879) in *Aeterni*:

The wisdom of St. Thomas, We say; for if anything is taken up with too great subtlety by the Scholastic doctors, or too carelessly stated—if there be anything that ill agrees with the discoveries of a later age, or, in a word, improbable in whatever way—it does not enter Our mind to propose that for imitation to Our age.

With these words, Leo expressed the necessity for discarding anything that would undermine future truths, cautioning that no matter how indispensable past knowledge may be, one must equally tread with caution (Schmandt, 1961). It is from this mindset that Leo was able to rekindle a positive relationship with German Chancellor Otto Von Bismarck, eventually leading to the Kulturkampf's demise (Ward, 1966). By seeing Pius IX's diplomatic blunders with Bismarck, Leo was able to compromise on points such as adherence to civil authorities, illustrating that the Church could coexist with world governments (Krason, 2009).

In Thomism, Leo was able to devise a framework that could be used to address a myriad of issues facing his pontificate and the global Christian world. This paradigm saw the Church's chief role as leading people to God's word so they could attain eternal salvation. With that being said, the state was also recognized as a necessary function since man was a social creature who requires material goods not only for survival but to achieve his fullest sense of self under God's providence (Hayles, 1958). It was through this belief that Leo (1879) applied Aquinas' teachings to the matter of labor, particularly in his May 15, 1891 encyclical entitled *Rerum Novarum*.

Marxism and the Church's Impending Stance on Labor

Before *Rerum*, the Roman Curia did not clarify how labor should be viewed or protected in a highly industrialized world where the distribution of wealth was increasingly lopsided (Burton, 1962). The Church's lack of resolve on the labor question opened the way for competing ideologies to secure a foothold among the European working class. Eventually, Marx's socialist principles exposing worker abuses in *Das Kapital* inspired the formation of labor unions in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Holland, Italy, Poland, Finland, and the former Catholic stronghold of France (Riccards, 2012). Though some criticized Marxist thinking

as simplifying everything into a class war between the wealthy and poor, it contained enough truth to rally a population mistreated by capitalism into a compelling force (Corrigan, 1938).

Marx's appeal for laborers affected by the Industrial Revolution began to take shape when he coauthored the *Communist Manifesto* with Frederick Engels in 1848 (Barbour, 2012). In this collective work, Marx and Engels (1848/1888) described how the Bourgeois class, or the industrial capitalists, redefined relations with the Proletariats, or the working class, to the point where private property was transformed into a restricted commodity available only to the wealthy. By taking ownership of available resources, the Bourgeoisie controlled the market using minimal cash payouts for work rendered; further expanding their profit margins (Marx & Engels, 1848/1888). To maintain this increased capital flow, the Bourgeoisie concocted new methods of production to boost competition between laborers seeking employment opportunities. Likewise, the Bourgeoisie deemed the capitalist framework as socially intrusive while the establishment of large urban cities supplanted rural life, forcing laborers to trade in their personal plots of farmland for rented flats (Boyer, 1998).

In an attempt to counter capitalism, Marx and Engels (1848/1888) insisted that private property be confiscated and turned over to the state to prevent the formation of private monopolies. As the sole proprietor of businesses, the state would be in charge of distributing revenue collected from commerce for public works such as developing land for agricultural purposes and supplying free education for children. To ensure that resources were equally distributed, manufacturing and agricultural industries would be dispersed throughout the country so no one geographical setting would benefit over the other. Additionally, the state would exercise authority over communication and transportation systems on behalf of the populous. The purported result of this new communist state would be a classless society in which everyone

would own an equal share of resources, allowing them to freely develop without the hypothetical financial yoke restraining their progress (Marx & Engels, 1848/1888).

The impact of Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital* helped change the European political mindset so people increasingly viewed the Church as an opponent of economic and social progress. During the revolutions of 1848, Marx expressed his disdain for organized religion by identifying the Pope as a relic of Europe's past who allied himself with conservative monarchs against the workers' movement (Luxmoore & Babiuch, 1999). By the time Leo assumed his position as head of the Roman Catholic Church, the popularity of socialist groups adhering to Marxist theories was significant, and laborers felt empowered via an ideology that voiced their concerns and predicted their eventual victory over oppressive forces (Spalding, 2000). This spreading of Marx's Communism served a dual purpose as many in the Church, including Leo, "believed the time was coming for the Church to realign itself more wholeheartedly with the cause of social reform and to build up its social influence rather than relying on the wielders of power" (Luxmoore & Babiuch, 1999, p. 302).

Ironically, despite the Church's agenda against socialism, Leo and Marx shared some commonalities in their perceptions of social conditions. Both men witnessed the upsurge of economic growth in industrial hotbeds such as England and Belgium, where machinery replaced skilled laborers, making a select few businessmen an exorbitant amount of money. From this experience, Leo mirrored the sentiment of Marx in that man's dignity was injured by his inability to earn a decent living at the hands of manipulative business practices. Therefore, a small group of men controlled the labor of many, taking full ownership of their employee's work to further increase profit margins and personal power.

Leo, as well as Marx, saw this situation as a travesty because the working class produced all the wealth yet could not share in its benefits. Though similar in this line of thought, Leo disagreed with Marx's belief that violent upheaval was necessary to achieve a classless society or that the dissolution of private property would achieve greater equity among the people (Fulop-Miller, 1937). Instead of dismantling sociopolitical systems, Leo saw the labor issue as one that required religion, the Church, employers, and the government to ensure fair treatment was upheld on the behalf of laborers (Wallace, 1966).

Historical Context for *Rerum Novarum*

Many of the social principles underlying *Rerum* trace back to the German priest and eventual Archbishop of Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler circa 1848. Around this timeframe, Ketteler lectured to Catholic lay groups on the meager wages and abject poverty suffered by German factory workers. Recognizing that the Church must respond to this pressing matter, Ketteler addressed a collective of Catholic organizations in Frankfurt to discuss potential plans of action. The approach Ketteler ultimately found useful for countering socialism and laissez faire capitalism was the philosophy of Aquinas, which eventually shaped his well-known work, *The Question of the Worker and Christendom* (Mich, 2011).

A proponent of the right to own property, Ketteler advocated for seldom heard of rights such as reasonable workdays, improved working conditions, employer-based assistance for injured workers, and government compliance inspectors to ensure worker rights (Mich, 2011). Kettler's emerging social welfare construct was furthered by fellow German priest, Fr. Adolph Kolping, who established the *Gesellen Verein* or Journeymen's Union that supported employed and unemployed laborers, providing affordable housing in the society's hostels and providing hands-on training for a host of trades and professions. This German-based movement spread

throughout Europe, especially in Austria, Hungary, and Switzerland, where the *Verein's* trade publication, *Kolpingblatt* was distributed. Common financial safeguards such as establishing savings accounts and regularly paying into disability benefits began via Kolping's *Verein* (Herbert, 1951).

On the American front, the largely Christian-based labor organization, the Knights of Labor (KOL), mirrored Ketteler's social justice approach and sought to use this platform to align itself politically with the Catholic Church's hierarchy. Founded in 1869 by Philadelphian labor leader Uriah Stephens, the KOL was known for its innovative stance on worker rights, believing that wage equality should be upheld for everyone despite skill level, race, or sex. In addition, the KOL lead the way in unionizing industrial and assembly workers while establishing a no-strike position against unfair labor practices, preferring the use of boycotting employer products or services to gain leverage in arbitration. Through these beliefs and practices, the KOL was able to incorporate smaller trade unions throughout the United States into its coalition (Weir & Hanlan, 2004).

While the KOL's goal was to be the conscience and democratic voice of the working class in American politics, the influence of corporate wealth in deciding political elections was a threat to achieving this position (Hild, 2012). Terence Powderly, the Irish Catholic head of the KOL following Stephens' departure, recognized the importance of the Vatican's role in countering this type of big-business government for preserving the labor movement's momentum, especially for the Catholic faction represented by the KOL. In securing this backing, the KOL knew it would have to move from its secretive oaths and practices, often compared to freemasonry, to achieve greater organizational transparency and convince the Church's hierarchy that it was in line with Catholic principles regarding labor concerns.

However, the suspicion of organizations shrouded in secrecy caused numerous American bishops to specifically view the KOL with contempt. Faced with the possibility of losing Catholic KOL members due to the fear of religious ostracism within their respective communities, the protection of labor rights via unions was in danger of stalling indefinitely (Phelan, 2000).

From within the Catholic hierarchy, two integral labor union supporters, America's James Cardinal Gibbons and England's Henry Edward Cardinal Manning, advocated for the Vatican to publically endorse the KOL as an organization in good standing with the Church. Cardinal Gibbons and Manning decided that pleading the case of the KOL directly to Leo was the correct course of action when rumors were rampant that the Church would soon distance itself from the labor union and worker rights question altogether (Burton, 1962). In February of 1887, Gibbons penned a letter in defense of the KOL, explaining to the Pontiff that the organization protected workers from dishonest business practices that left them vulnerable to mistreatment and financial ruin.

Subsequently, Gibbons made it clear that the Church's refusal to recognize the KOL would lead faithful followers in the United States to believe they had been abandoned in favor of wealthy businessmen, leaving the workers to find solace elsewhere (Ellis, 1974). Gibbons stated that as a democracy, the American government would side with those suffering from inequality and see the Church as an opponent of true justice. In closing, Gibbons directed nine items for Leo to contemplate, writing:

Finally, to sum it all up, it seems clear to me that the Holy See should not entertain the idea of condemning an association . . . 1. When the condemnation does not seem *justified* either by the letter of the spirit of its constitution, its law, and the declaration of its leaders. 2. When the condemnation does not seem *necessary*, in view of the transient

form of the organization and the social condition of the United States. 3. When it does not seem to be *prudent*, because of the reality of the grievances of the workers, and the admission of them made by the American people. 4. When it would be *dangerous* for the reputation of the Church in our democratic country, and possibly even arouse persecution. 5. When it would be *ineffectual* in compelling the obedience of our Catholic workers, who would regard it as false and unjust. 6. When it would be *destructive* instead of beneficial in its effects, impelling the children of the Church to disobey their Mother, and even to join condemned secret societies, which they have thus far shunned. 7. When it would be *ruinous* for the financial maintenance of the Church in our country, and for the Peter's pence. 8. When it would turn into suspicion and hostility the outstanding devotedness of our Catholic people toward the Holy See. 9. When it would be regarded as a cruel blow to the authority of the bishops of the United States, who, it is well known, protest against such condemnation. (Gibbons, as cited in Ellis, 1956, p. 472)

Gibbons and Manning's argument in defense of the KOL, along with a submittal of the organization's bylaws furnished by Powderly, led to the Pope's eventual blessing (Burton, 1962; Ellis, 1974). In an August 29, 1888 letter penned by the Prefect for the Propagation of Faith, Giovanni Cardinal Simenoi, he affirmed Leo's decision to Gibbons.

Rome is not in principle opposed to the tentative organization of workingmen outside of the bosom of the Church and that she is far from placing her power at the service of capital against the claims of labor. Labor and capital are two forces which the Church considers with an impartial eye and with the ardent desire to see them both forward the prosperity of nations and the weal of souls. (as cited by T'Serclaes, 1903, pp. 225-226)

***Rerum Novarum*: Leo XIII's Opus on Labor Relations**

With Vatican backing now secured for the KOL and the rise of European labor federations such as the Ketteler-inspired lay group, The Fribourg Union, Leo moved forward with his encyclical tackling labor conditions and the treatment of modern workers in *Rerum Novarum* (Mich, 2011). Promulgated on May 15, 1891, *Rerum Novarum* (English translation: *Of New Things*) focused on the rights of laborers and the obligations employers had in securing such rights as recognized by the Church. From the start of *Rerum*, Leo denounced the immeasurable amount of greed and lack of accountability that operated within the free market system (Hitchcock, 2012). Connected to the unscrupulous practice of hoarding monetary and material resources, *Rerum* (Leo XIII, 1891) reaffirmed the notion of the laborer as being an individual who by God's graces was entitled to share in those profits created from their work. The reason, as provided by *Rerum*, was that for man to be fully human and to achieve his highest aspirations, he must have assets at his disposal to sustain himself as well as those under his care. As God's authority supersedes man's laws, employers must abide by this supernatural power and safeguard their workers' ability to earn a proper living because this ideal has been destined for all people (Leo XIII, 1891).

The ownership of property was another source of contention during the time of *Rerum*'s (Leo XIII, 1891) debut. Socialists during this period argued for the systematic dismantling of privately owned lands so the state could confiscate and share them among its citizens. Viewing this as an injustice, Leo explained that private property was in line with God's natural law, and that socialism was manipulating the underprivileged and their desire for wealth in the pursuit of taking away possessions rightfully acquired by others. In further developing the argument for private property, Leo described how both man and animal contained the drive for self-

preservation, yet man was the only creature endowed with intelligence and reason. Due to this capacity to rationalize, man required more than the temporary sustenance animals craved for survival, such as stable environments. Therefore, the possession of land and the enjoyment of its fruits fell in line with man's need to be autonomous and make personal decisions for his continued well-being under natural law. In saying this, Leo defended the right of workers and employers to acquire and maintain their own plots of land.

Although, in *Rerum*, Leo XIII (1891) advocated for personal property, he did not excuse owners from taking liberties with those under their employ. Instead, Leo envisioned employers as an intricate part of society who could contribute not just to the economic but also to the spiritual welfare of those less fortunate. Employers were called to recognize the humanity of their workers by affording them time off for religious and family obligations, allowing for a manageable work week, providing suitable wages, and supporting unions that protected worker rights and offered members educational opportunities (Henriot et al., 1989; Leo XIII, 1891).

Employer cooperation, according to Leo (1891), was part of a more integral equation in achieving justice for labor forces. The civil government and the Church itself must involve themselves in preserving an equitable environment for employers and workers. For Leo, the environment would be attained by the government not interfering with family life, because parents had the God-given right to raise children as they deemed fit. Though government interference was discouraged, civil authorities were summoned to guard the rights of family life from intrusion. The one exception to this rule was if an act threatened family life or the community at large and required prompt action. For their part, the government was an observer who acted as a last resort to uphold the rights of all involved parties (Leo XIII, 1891).

The Church, as the center of religious and moral life, had the freedom to preach gospel truths and act as a guiding force for influencing labor practices. In arbitrating appropriate working conditions through Christian social beliefs, Church leaders could promote fair labor practices and property rights for both sides, impartially dispensing counsel in hopes that people would use material wealth to assist the needy so humanity could concentrate on their higher calling of eternal salvation. To realize this goal of gratifying the material and spiritual needs of humanity, the Church needed to act as the moral consciousness of the people and provide them instruction, as Jesus Christ did in his pastoral ministry (Leo XIII, 1891).

Graves De Communi Re: Clarifying the Christian Labor Movement

In framing the labor question, Leo's (1901b) encyclical, *Graves De Communi Re*, further clarified the roles of Catholic social thought and Christian democracy within the political arena. After *Rerum* (Leo XIII, 1891) was initially released to the public, many religious and lay groups began defining themselves as Christian Democrats who placed economic rights above all other aspects of the faith (McMillan, 2006). Witnessing that misunderstandings were common concerning political activism and that worker's rights, though vital, were elevated at the expense of other societal responsibilities, Leo released *Graves* on January 18, 1901, to expand on the finer points of supporting the labor movement while maintaining one's own religious identity.

For Leo XIII (1901b), *Graves* had a twofold purpose: to caution Christians against interweaving popular government with Christian Democracy and to encourage similar participation in societal issues comparable to efforts implemented on behalf of the working class (Molony, 2006). To explain these motives, *Graves* defined Christian Democracy as religiously grounded and in accordance with gospel teachings meant to improve the overall existence of every human being. Connecting Christian Democracy with church teachings, *Graves* articulated

that justice was conceptually holy as the right to acquire property or goods was a direct result of God's plan for us. The same reason of justice as holy was used to justify why Christian Democracy should remain out of the political realm. According to *Graves*, God's natural law as well as religious truths found in the gospels transcended human governance. Because natural law was divine and supernatural, no one should attempt to place it under civil jurisdiction because Christian Democracy must remain free from governmental rule. The reason for this call to sovereignty was so the global community could lawfully follow its ideals of loving God and caring for His children, despite their respective governments' constitutions (Leo XIII, 1901b).

While Christian Democracy's aim was to perfect the souls of humanity so they could share in eternal life, in *Graves*, Leo (1901b) equally preached on the necessity of the influential and wealthy to take familial guardianship of the working-class. The principle steering this duty was Christian charity. As described in *Graves*, Christian charity arose from the fact that all mankind were connected to each other in Christ. For this reason, caring for mistreated laborers or the destitute via charity was the equivalent of illustrating one's love of God. However, to be complete, Christian charity had to be enacted from religious tenets set forth by Jesus through His church. Without religious beliefs operating as its foundation, this form of charity would be incomplete (Leo XIII, 1901b).

Alongside the need for religious faith in confronting oppressive labor situations, *Graves* (Leo XIII, 1901b) encouraged the launch of charitable institutions to attend to the various needs of laborers as they worked for economic self-sufficiency. The establishment of such institutions funded by the rich would continue in the tradition of the Church that aimed to alleviate the working-class. As described by Leo (1901b), the establishments would provide education and temporary financial support to workers until they reached a position to better care for themselves

and their dependents. Fitting into the Catholic scheme of being one body in Jesus Christ, whenever an individual reached stability, the person was called upon to take care of his brothers in a cyclical fashion. Whether it was fiscal or through religious evangelization, *Graves* extolled the virtue that humanity was unified and any actions perpetrated on its behalf would be repaid in both the temporal and spiritual realms.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

The study methodology employed was historical analysis, with qualitative coding operating as the analytical instrument for interpreting data. In understanding historical analysis and research, McDowell (2002) stated, “Historical research does not consist in the mere collection of ‘facts,’ but rather in the interrelationship between factual evidence and the interpretation of this evidence by historians” (p. 4). Historical analysis concerns itself with reconstructing meaning from past events or documents, asking questions on the material examined, and producing narrative interpretations of the results. From this approach, the significance of historical analysis as a research methodology comes from its ability to unearth viable solutions for present-day issues, highlight past interactions and beliefs in terms of previous and potential impact on society, and encourage new perspectives on established ideas and assumptions (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

Relying upon written accounts is an integral part of historical analysis. Using existing documents, researchers are able to assemble meaning and produce understanding from past occurrences (Howell & Prevenier, 2001). Of all writings, the two most common incarnations are primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are firsthand accounts of an event and/or original documents from a subject under study. A secondary source is a derivative account taken from an original work or previous event (Holosko & Thyer, 2011).

For the objectives of historical analysis, primary sources are the most desirable because they provide greater validity than the subjective nature found in secondhand descriptions. To assure the reliability of primary sources, the researcher must weigh the writings under certain guidelines to confirm their authenticity. The guidelines, known as external criticism, are a series

of questions a researcher is to ask before viewing a document as genuine. Such inquiries ask who authored the work, who was the group the author tried to reach, whether others within the same period mentioned the work in question, and the nature of the circumstances in which it was written (Berg & Lune, 2012).

Once the work achieved validity, the analysis and interpretation phase commenced. Historical analysis requires the researcher to be an innovative and critical thinker to interpret data. This translates into working among large bodies of information to detect the contextual relationships within the figures, linking common factors together to reveal new insights on a given person or time period. The challenges faced in this type of research include that contrary historical accounts and missing data can alter true understanding of past documents. However, to continue making connections and developing emergent themes, historical analysis must rely on the informed interpretations of the researcher outlined by the individual's theoretical framework (Lewenson & Herrmann, 2007).

In conjuncture with the researcher's framework, the use of internal criticism is helpful to expand on the interpretations. Internal criticism questions the meaning and purpose of documents under evaluation. By inquiring as to the motives of why a document was written or the feasibility of an event occurring, the thinking process allows the researcher to stay focused on factual data. With that said, Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) cautioned that improbable situations or findings should not automatically be cast away because, "Most people can recall several highly improbable events that have occurred in their lives" (p. 527).

Historical analysis concerns itself with providing a blueprint for readers that chronicles the logic used in formulating the researcher's results (Danto, 2008). For this specific purpose, the study required use of qualitative coding as the research design. The advantage in combining

the methods was that coding broke down data to its core, where theories could begin to surface (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Following the dissection of data, the coding process organized data into patterns that eventually told a linear story (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) and satisfied the expectations established by historical analysis.

Historical Paradigm

This study incorporated use of a multilevel historical research paradigm based on the works of Carr, Fischer, Bloch, and Evans. In defining history, Carr (1967) stated,

When we attempt to answer the question, What is history?, our answer, consciously or unconsciously, reflects our own position in time, and forms part of our answer to the broader question, what view we take of the society in which we live. I have no fear that my subject may, on closer inspection, seem trivial. I am afraid only that I may seem presumptuous to have broached a question so vast and so important. (p. 5)

Based on the above explanation, the researcher acknowledged that perception was subjective to one's own personal experiences, implying that values are an involved process that researchers cannot separate on a project-to-project basis. For this reason, the researcher's value system had the potential to shade findings by filtering analysis through individual beliefs (Fischer, 1970). Though the sense-making process was partial to personal views, this partiality was countered to some degree by recognizing that a past event might have an alternate meaning attached to it. Instead of discarding potential meaning due to biased judgments, the researcher adopted a position grounded in understanding. The byproduct of this effort to understand was a mindset open to mankind's diversity and the unlimited possibilities defining moments in time (Bloch, 1964).

Emerging from the state of understanding was the desire for truth. The methods used to obtain knowledge were not neutral because personal values influenced procedures. In spite of this, the imbalance created by the methods did not necessarily affect the truth in final outcomes. Whereas points of view and descriptions of events might not be similar in nature, the final assessments on both could hypothetically contain truth despite their varying theoretical lenses (Evans, 1997). While truth may emerge in multiple approaches, the researcher recognized that making definitive claims on inexact evidence counteracted the reality and substance of any results found during the study (Fischer, 1970).

Regarding religion, the researcher believed that God provided universal meaning and structure under which human events operated throughout history. Though God is ever-present in a historical context, this does not translate into God directly intervening during an alleged event. Similarly, the researcher attested that humanity should not depict God as the sole reason for acts perpetrated by humanity or that God actively chooses outcomes in favor of one particular group (Carr, 1967).

Servant Leadership Framework

The theoretical framework supporting the researcher's historical research paradigm was servant leadership. As defined by Greenleaf (1977), servant leadership is one's personal inclination to serve others first and foremost, followed by a deliberate decision to become a leader. In being a servant first, the leader understands his or her primary role is to be an available resource for team members attempting to complete tasks. Throughout the process, the servant-leader is to question himself/herself on whether the support allows individuals to increase their knowledge base, become more self-sufficient, and nurture their own desires to serve those around them in a similar manner (Spears, 2001). Under thoughtful scrutiny, servant

leadership suggests that faith is an honorable position to maintain when evaluating a person's progress, because results require extended periods of time to surface. Having faith acquires significant meaning because as more subscribe to its method, they will have the power to create positive change within an organization and within society as a whole (Greenleaf, 1977).

To achieve change, the servant leader must have a solid foundation based on organizational values. In servant leadership, such values are defined by how the collective can come together to realize the goals of the organization. Though a collaborative process, the leader must use personal authority to guide the group toward the agreed-upon goals for the overall longevity of the institution (Autry, 2004). Therefore, the leader is an individual who must have a keen sense of direction and uses this ability to focus others into one cohesive voice.

By repeating the aims associated with each goal, the servant-leader fosters confidence within the group, providing perspective for those unable to visualize results. Yet, before a person can guide others towards realizing a goal, trust must exist between the leader and the members of the group (Greenleaf, 1977). To gain such trust, the servant leader must exhibit a morality dwelling within the individual's conscience (Covey, 2001). If the servant leader's conscience is in tune with universal principles like integrity, equality, and justice, it will strike a chord inside others, overshadowing negatives that would hinder joint efforts (Covey, 2001; Greenleaf 1977).

Identifying specific traits a servant leader should possess is vital for those called to servant leadership. The principles offer aspiring leaders an internal checklist to utilize when conducting public or private business. As identified by Spears (2001), the characteristics embodying the heart of servant leadership are "listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and

building community” (pp. 5-8). From the list, servant leaders are individuals who build self-esteem in others and revitalize their surroundings, changing all they encounter in a positive way.

The commitment to promote equality among all individuals is another essential component of servant leadership. To begin facilitating this process, open communication is necessary to construct awareness of another group’s plight in those unfamiliar with the given experience. Following internalization of the discussed experiences, emotions such as compassion and understanding begin to replace preconceived notions created before the dialogue exchange. Eventually, candidness leads to “a disciplined and unflinching look at the wrongs we do to one another,” leading to forgiveness and reconciliation (Ferch, 2012, p. 30).

As a leadership approach, servant leaders are expected to gain deeper insights concerning the population for whom they advocate to enhance their overall effectiveness in driving change. From a Christian standpoint, the model of Jesus Christ and his disciples intertwined with the tenets because their ministry was to work alongside the poor and marginalized, experiencing firsthand the heavy burdens faced in everyday life. Jesus’s message regarding God’s love of the underprivileged and their ultimate reward of eternal life helped to ease suffering while bringing to light the economic injustices perpetrated. An example associated with Jesus practicing this brand of servant leadership was during the Sermon on the Mount, where he emphasized the care of the needy as central to God’s plan for us (Agosto, 2005).

Honest communication and intimate involvement in one’s community are derivatives of moral authority. For the servant leader, moral authority differs from formal authority in that moral authority must be earned from employees, whereas formal authority is a functional power automatically assigned to a position, such as hiring or firing a subordinate. According to Sipe and Frick (2009), moral authority emerged through personal humility, placing the concerns of

others above personal matters, encouraging inclusion and cooperation, possessing the ability to weigh the greater good when making decisions for the whole, and meeting adversity head on. Eventually, the acceptance of moral authority in servant leadership comes to be reciprocal as it calls other members to follow in this give-and-take attitude (Graham, 1995).

In addressing servant leadership for seminary trustees, Greenleaf (1998) explained that a servant leader's role is to consider a series of questions, such as, "Whom and what purpose should this seminary serve?" (p.185). From a theoretical standpoint, this line of questioning complements the critical reasoning aspect featured in the study's historical paradigm and supports the inquisitive character of the research design. The servant leadership framework is grounded in actions meant to improve the lives of others through empathy and generosity (Mittal & Dorfman, 2012). This principle provided the research with a valuable lens for deciphering Leo's writings on protecting laborers.

Data Collection

For this study, the researcher used Leo XIII's pastoral letters and encyclicals related to the topic of labor. The strength of utilizing primary sources is their permanence, which enables multiple examinations. Besides affording an element of stability, this type of data eliminates the subjective leanings often found in secondary accounts that can influence the researcher during the analysis stage (Yin, 2009).

To acquire the works, the researcher used the Internet as a technological tool for unearthing rare documents scarcely found in hard copy today. This type of technology was beneficial for gathering historical texts, especially because an electronic document's delivery rate via e-mail attachment was immediate, compared to traditional mailing methods. Gathering data online was cost-effective from a traveling standpoint because of the ability to access scholarly

databases and websites from a private residence instead of physically occupying a space such as the Vatican Library to read pastoral letters, papal encyclicals, and similar documents.

Supporting this concept of the world as “flat” is the ability of current technology to overcome geographical landscapes with broadband connections to transport information and personal communications instantaneously to one’s own workstation, wherever that is (Friedman, 2007, p. 8).

Research Questions

Research questions guide and form the foundation of a study. The aim of this study was to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the recurring themes in Pope Leo XIII’s words regarding the importance of working-class labor and the inherent worth of all human beings?
2. How do these issues affect understanding of Leo XIII’s leadership approach?
3. What can contemporary leaders learn from Leo XIII’s messages to initiate policy to enhance the dignity of labor and bring about social change?

Research Design

Qualitative coding was used in the study to reveal emerging themes from the letters and encyclicals of Leo XIII on labor. As defined by Saldana (2012), a theme is “a phrase or sentence that identifies what a unit of data is about and/or what it means” (p. 139). In its earliest stage, qualitative coding began with proposing multiple questions and recording temporary responses when reviewing a given document. The data resulting from these exchanges became codes, which then formed categories (Strauss, 1987). From these categories, the researcher began to decipher recurring structural patterns surfacing from the work, uncovering new associations for scrutiny during the analysis stage (Stake, 2010).

Each document included in this study underwent a preliminary stage of open coding. This coding phase called for an unbiased inspection of text with the purpose of identifying corresponding data segments to categorically group together. To accomplish this task, a line-by-line reading of the document took place. This method of reviewing each line safeguarded the study against omitting data that could affect the representation of a phenomenon. As stated by Bryant and Charmaz (2007), “Line-by-line coding forces the researcher to verify and saturate categories, minimizes missing an important category, and ensures relevance by generating codes with emergent fit to the substantive area under study” (p. 275). After exhausting all probable classification sequences, subcategories emerged from their existing groups. These subcategories, also named properties because they signified various elements of their respective categories, were condensed to enhance meaning (Creswell, 2007). This centralization of prevailing themes had a two-fold effect: to introduce unexpected results not originally conceived or to shift the focus or course of a study in another direction (K. O’Reilly, 2008).

For the next stage of coding, the second-level approach was pattern coding. The main function of pattern coding was to assemble data sets found in open coding, further refining them for analysis. This took place by locating the “themes, causes/explanations, relationships among people, and [detailing] theoretical constructs” that appeared within the data sequences (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 70). Applying these plot points produced a diagram of the newly coded themes, comparing them with those originally coded to illustrate the progression of meaning leading to the conclusion.

Throughout both phases of coding, analyzing passages for manifest and latent content was necessary. *Manifest content* is the noticeable items in transcripts or documents that are quantifiable, such as the repetition of phrases or words stressed multiple times throughout a

work. In contrast to this exterior approach is *latent content*, through which a researcher attempts to identify and understand the causality beneath messages, adding depth to the original words. Applying both approaches supported individual weaknesses linked to manifest and latent content analysis. Analysis of manifest content allows for greater validity by calculating language, but does not allow for further development of the measured material or its meaning. Analysis of latent content provides descriptive insight that generates greater understanding, yet has the risk of misinterpretation, especially if the author referred to the coded content only once (Rubin & Babbie, 2009).

After coding the selected writings of Leo XIII using the aforementioned process, a conceptual map emerged to combine themes found in each document. The model for the conceptual mapping functioned hierarchically as comprehensive themes, descriptions, and direct excerpts branched out from Leo's collective major themes (Moon, Hoffman, Novak, & Canas, 2011). This schematic approach assisted in pointing out significant ideas and accompanying text that required re-evaluation, depending on alternative themes originating from other works. Merging the collective findings into one distinct diagram provided the opportunity to expand certain themes featured across multiple works and reevaluate the original text to uncover additional meaning. Use of the process enhanced the ability to connect theoretical constructs and discuss their commonalities from a relational viewpoint (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003).

Concluding the data analysis stage was the interpretation of the completed themes and supporting materials leading to the themes, based on the conceptual map. The illustration of each step guided the interpretation from its beginning to results and identified transitions within the formation of themes while highlighting pertinent sections of Leo's text to support the analysis (Patterson & Williams, 2002).

Limitations of the Study

This study had three significant limitations. A personal acknowledgement statement that may influence subsequent findings also appears in this section. The first limitation dealt with the translation of Leo XIII's letters and encyclicals. Each of the writings analyzed was originally in Latin or Italian. Due to the researcher's limited understanding of these languages, using English versions of the works was more appropriate for the analysis and coding phases. While the Vatican's website endorsed the translations as effective substitutes, the syntax might have been considerably altered, changing the work's intended meaning. The contextual miscues from untranslatable concepts might have caused some themes to be different from those initially conceived by the author.

The second limitation attached to the study was the potential for misinterpretation of data. While historical analysis urged the use of critical thinking and imagination to construct interpretations, no exact instrument existed to confirm whether an interpretation was correct. Historical analysis is similar to the qualitative approach of content analysis in that they both depend on the written word to find meaning. Among the many benefits of analyzing past documents was that they remained unchanged, allowing time to digest their ultimate meaning. Some drawbacks existed as well. A sizable factor plaguing this approach was that it was "limited to recorded communications and can raise issues of reliability and validity" (Rubin & Babbie, 2009, p. 250). Lewenson and Herrmann (2007) suggested that written historical accounts will always miss some details but, "historians [must] work around these issues and make decisions about the [existing] data," which they can do quite effectively through theoretical frameworks.

Coinciding with the previous issue of restricted communication, the third limitation of this study was the problem of personal verification. The author attributed to these texts, Leo XIII, died in 1903, and those involved in crafting the ideas present in his writings have long been deceased. Therefore, the researcher had no opportunity to interview direct participants or the author himself to corroborate themes evolving from the analysis.

To expose any potential for bias in addition to the limitations, the researcher acknowledged his Roman Catholic background and current employment at a Jesuit university. A Judeo-Christian upbringing conveyed the values shaping the researcher and helped to construct his moral compass. The researcher was aware of his own subjectivity when analyzing the documents drafted by Leo XIII. Despite leaning towards a Catholic interpretation, maintaining personal transparency was essential to enable readers to comprehend the results of the study. Acknowledgment of subjectivity was the first step for the researcher “to see in new and different ways what seems to be ordinary and familiar” concerning the analysis process (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. 27).

Delimitations of the Study

The self-imposed restrictions placed on this study were twofold. With regard to data collection, the research included only letters and encyclicals addressing the topic of labor, even though Leo XIII wrote some 85 encyclicals and countless other works throughout his religious life. The topic of the study was documents on labor only from Leo, despite that a succession of popes, theologians, and writers after his reign wrote on labor and Catholic social justice.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to consider the leadership of Pope Leo XIII on the dignity of labor through historical analysis of his writings. To accomplish this aim, choosing a research design meant to extract recurring themes found in Leo's works was helpful to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the recurring themes in Pope Leo XIII's words regarding the importance of working-class labor and the inherent worth of all human beings?
2. How do these issues affect understanding of Leo XIII's leadership approach?
3. What can contemporary leaders learn from Leo XIII's messages to initiate policy to enhance the dignity of labor and bring about social change?

The result of these questions helped to provide philosophical and theoretical depth concerning the complexity of religious leadership in the quest to bring about social change between managers and employees and to provide a template for Christian leaders. Following the designated protocol in the Methodology section, five prevailing themes emerged from Leo XIII's writings on labor.

1. Natural rights of man via God's natural law
2. Love and Christian charity
3. Jesus Christ as divine model for laborers and leaders
4. Labor as a practical and moral way of life
5. Authority's responsibility to dignity and labor

Each theme was systematically coded across Leo's *Pastoral Letters for Lent, 1877-1878* (Pecci, 1878), his labor encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, and the later social encyclical *Graves De*

Communi Re, which further refined tenets addressed in *Rerum*. This chapter contains detailed discussion of the themes, including textual examples from the collective works and from external sources outlining the findings.

Theme 1: Natural Rights of Man via God's Natural Law

The concept of every human being having an equal claim to earthly necessities despite class or rank is prominent in Leo's leadership platform. His Lenten *Pastoral Letters* imply numerous times that through God's intercession, humanity has the gift of natural rights protecting their temporal inheritance, namely the byproducts of their labor necessary to sustain life. Pecci (1878), in quoting Genesis 1:28, proclaimed, "Subdue the earth and rule over it" (p. 41). Elaborating on this message of respect for man's natural birthright, Pecci (1878) maintained, "Now, man has received from God, for his inheritance in time, this earth on which he lives and of which he was made the master" (p. 41). This idea of the common man sharing equal footing with his brethren coincided with Aquinas' beliefs on natural law.

According to Aquinas (as cited in Belanger, 1997), natural law is man's internal indicator of an action as moral based on the criterion that it supports God's plan for humanity. In turn, natural law is a permanent state constructed of reason that conveys man's dignity through its ability to determine the rights all should share (United States Catholic Conference, 1994). To clarify the common rights, religion brings the divine source of God directing individuals towards good to the forefront (Belanger, 1997; United States Catholic Conference, 1994). The acknowledgement that God is everyone via the gift of reason is what shows human dignity. From this standpoint, Pecci (1878) affirmed that man's general worthiness allows him to utilize all available resources in pursuit of a righteous life, saying:

And, indeed, this king of all creatures [human beings] exercises his right when, tearing away the veil that hides his possessions, he does not stop at what falls under his eyes or what he finds under his hands, but diving into the very depths of nature, gathers up the treasures of fecundity of forces he finds there, and bends them to his profit and to that of his fellow men. (p. 42)

The natural rights theory introduced in Leo's *Pastoral Letters* continued its development in *Rerum* (Leo XIII, 1891), where private property emerged as a major focal point. Towards the beginning of *Rerum*, Leo explained that humanity was separated by "*mens seu ratio est*" or "the mind or reason," which elevated man above God's other creations (para. 6). On behalf of man's right to self-preservation, Leo (1891) stated:

It is the mind, or reason, which is the predominant element in us who are human creatures; it is this which renders a human being human, and distinguishes him essentially from the brute. And on this very account—that man alone among the animal creation is endowed with reason—it must be within his right to possess things not merely for temporary and momentary use, as other living things do, but to have and to hold them in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only things that perish in the use, but those also which, though they have been reduced into use, continue for further use in after time. (para. 6)

Philosophers Aristotle and Aquinas viewed the capacity to rationalize actions similarly, as integral in confirming humanity's worth beyond the instinctual behavior of animal kind. From this mindset, Leo affirmed that reason was a deliberate act possessing a projected outcome that had the potential to become a righteous deed (Copleston, 1991). In turn, "God's rule of law is present and active in us in our practical reason, yet not in a way that prevents our reasoning

from being genuinely ours” (Mulcahy, 2011, p. 90). Mirroring the aforesaid description of reason, Leo (1891) stated:

This becomes still more clearly evident if man’s nature be considered a little more deeply. For man, fathoming by his faculty of reason matters without number, linking the future with the present, and being master of his own acts, guides his ways under the eternal law and the power of God, whose providence governs all things. (para. 7)

In establishing man’s intrinsic worth by way of God’s natural law, Leo maintained the need for universal recognition of the right to property and sustenance. Illustrating his preference once again for the Thomistic approach, Leo (1891/1943) used Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae* to justify private ownership as a non-negotiable right, with the following quote, “*Licetum est, quod homo propria possideat. Et est etiam necessarium ad humanam vitam*” meaning “It is lawful for man to own his own things. It is even necessary for human life” (pp. 28-29). This stance concerning man’s earthly rights acquired renewed significance as Leo urged civic leadership to be mindful of their involvement with natural law. In this vein, Leo (1891) wrote:

The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man; and the State has the right to control its use in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would therefore be unjust and cruel if under the name of taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fair. (para. 47)

To distinguish between intervening on the side of justice and ignoring the innate rights of others, which would violate natural law, Leo (1891) insisted:

There are occasions, doubtless, when it is fitting that the law should intervene to prevent certain associations, as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unlawful, or dangerous to the State. In such cases, public authority may justly forbid the

formation of such associations, and may dissolve them if they already exist. But every precaution should be taken not to violate the rights of individuals and not to impose unreasonable regulations under pretense of public benefit. For laws only bind when they are in accordance with right reason, and, hence, with the eternal law of God. (para. 52)

From Leo's leadership viewpoint, even those in high positions must not compromise natural law or the rights featured under natural law. The justification was that temporal leaders, though capable of ruling their respective people with reason, could not overturn God's divine authority as the source that grants leaders power (C. E. Curran, 2002). On the right of individuals to establish labor unions and societies aiding the poor, Leo (1891) stated:

It is indisputable that on grounds of reason alone such associations, being perfectly blameless in their objects, possess the sanction of the law of nature. . . . The rulers of the State accordingly have no rights over them, nor can they claim any share in their control; on the contrary, it is the duty of the State to respect and cherish them, and, if need be, to defend them from attack. (para. 53)

In further defining the worker rights that remained untouchable by human law, Leo (1891) continued:

That right to property, therefore, which has been proved to belong naturally to individual persons, must in likewise belong to a man in his capacity of head of a family; nay, that right is all the stronger in proportion as the human person receives a wider extension in the family group. It is a most sacred law of nature that a father should provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten; and, similarly, it is natural that he should wish that his children, who carry on, so to speak, and continue his personality, should be

by him provided with all that is needful to enable them to keep themselves decently from want and misery amid the uncertainties of this mortal life. (para. 13)

Whereas Leo (1891) specifically made the point that governments had the right to reasonably regulate private ownership through man-made laws, he cautioned:

The earth, even though apportioned among private owners, ceases not thereby to minister to the needs of all, inasmuch as there is not one who does not sustain life from what the land produces. Those who do not possess the soil contribute their labor; hence, it may truly be said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some toil, some calling, which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself, or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth. (para. 8).

While the right to own property and benefit from its use came from divine ruling, Leo ensured that landowner rights should not supersede those of the common worker. Leo (1891) reminded managers and leaders of industry that their first duty was to promote justice by way of supporting every individual's attempt to earn a living, commenting:

Wealthy owners and all masters of labor should be mindful of this—that to exercise pressure upon the indigent and the destitute for the sake of gain, and to gather one's profit out of the need of another, is condemned by all laws, human and divine. (para. 20)

In this passage, Leo acknowledged the need for leadership to watch over those under their employ. Seeing justice as an immersion process transcending mere employer/employee roles, Leo (1901a) conveyed the belief by quoting 1 John 3:18: "*Non verbo, neque lingua, sed opere et veritate*" meaning "Not in word, nor tongue, but in deed and in truth" (p. 305). It is not enough for ownership to view justice as a mere requirement. Instead, those in lofty positions should raise their subordinates to the level of friend and kin (Leo, 1901a).

The need for leadership to acknowledge and respect the innate rights of human beings did not translate to a society with complete disregard for governmental rule. Leo attested that while natural rights were benchmark for making decisions on behalf of laborers, individuals must adhere to societal laws for the sake of order. Without alienating either side, Leo (1901a) maintained:

Both the natural and the Christian law command us to revere those who in their various grades are shown above us in the State, and to submit ourselves to their just commands. It is quite in keeping with our dignity as men and Christians to obey, not only exteriorly, but from the heart, as the Apostle expresses it, "for conscience' sake," when he commands us to keep our soul subject to the higher powers. (para. 9)

The limits Leo placed on leadership were not meant to hinder but to create a culture of inclusion where even the humblest worker's needs were met (Pope, 2005). Leo (1901a) challenged global leaders:

Let no one condemn that zeal which, in accordance with the natural and divine laws, aims to make the condition of those who toil more tolerable; to enable them to obtain, little by little, those means by which they may provide for the future; to help them to practice in public and in private the duties which morality and religion inculcate; to aid them to feel that they are not animals but men, not heathens but Christians, and so to enable them to strive more zealously and more eagerly for the one thing which is necessary; viz., that ultimate good for which we are born into this world. (para. 10)

Theme 2: Love and Christian Charity

The love of labor and those who toil on a daily basis to supple others with goods and services was a significant theme found in Leo's writings. For Leo, the Church was an institution

that not only recognized laborers as essential members of society, but individuals deserving of care and assistance. In his Lenten pastoral letters, Pecci, who later became Leo XIII, outwardly claimed:

The Church has not only the unquestionable merit of having ennobled and sanctified labor ...she has a still nobler merit, a still higher glory: that of having restrained men within reasonable bounds, and having prevented herself from being carried by an excessive love of labor to such an extent as to convert into a source of barbarous oppression what, exercised with discretion, is a means of obtaining for herself desirable advantages and an honest prosperity. (Pecci, 1878, p. 28)

Leo's vision of labor had grounding in the concept that loving workers meant shielding them from those who exploited employees for love of profits. In other words, the Church wanted nothing more than to restore the natural rights taken away from the working class by unscrupulous business practices. Love acted as the resin to keep communities together and reminded all classes of people that laborers needed comfort akin to ecclesial efforts supporting the poor (Pecci, 1878). Promoting love as a sacrificial act which inspires others to reciprocate, Pecci exemplified the Church's approach by writing, "She was not content with establishing asylums, hospitals, retreats, but she did incomparably more; she caused the divine virtue of sacrifice to penetrate into the souls of her children" (p. 52).

Love and charity were two concepts often intertwined when discussing the appropriate treatment of labor. In theological terms, charity is a significant aspect of love because giving alms takes the higher purpose of empowering individuals and/or groups according to God's design (McDermott, 2013). Pecci (1878) advanced this description of charity to include the survival of civilization itself, believing that society could not function without a transcendent and

unifying love bringing all its diverse members together. To enact what Pecci referred to as “Christian charity,” one must follow in the footsteps of Jesus Christ, who called upon the wealthy and working-class “to help the weak, and obtain the blessings reserved for those who would rather give of their goods than receive the goods of others” (Pecci, 1878, p. 51). Pecci saw love, charity, and sacrifice as an interrelated set of actions divine in their operation and not above God Himself in practice and execution, and asserted that such virtues proved humanities’ worth.

[God] exercises a loving care over all His creatures indiscriminately, even those deprived of [average] reason, from the greatest to the least; that He guides and preserves them by wise laws, and that He embraces all rational creatures with such tenderness as to love His dearly beloved Son for the redemption of all And he loves not only those who acknowledge and adore Him, and are obedient and respectful to Him, but even those who betray Him, who rise up against Him and trample His laws under their feet. And for this love that God nourishes, within Him for His creatures, He, most assuredly, expects nothing for Himself for He is the absolute Master and the Creator of all things. Not satisfied yet with being so lavish of His love, He adds to it the immense sacrifices by which He has been pleased to redeem us at the price of His sufferings and of His blood, to cleanse us from the state of original sin, and make us a people acceptable in His sight and pursuers of good works. Such, dearly beloved, is the foundation of the mutual relations that men should have towards each other, according to the morals preached by the Spouse of Jesus Christ. (Pecci, 1878, pp. 83-85)

If God was willing to sacrifice His beloved son to redeem mankind of the original sin compromising our natural birthright, then every human being, in Leo’s mindset, was worthy of

love and the charity that supported this love. From an organizational standpoint, Pecci reassured his audience that God was ever-present in the institutional Church where these tenets were practiced, authenticating the message of love and charity by stating, “the vivifying breath of God pervades all parts of the Church, to awaken the power of sacrifice and . . . a prodigious energy ready to alleviate all manner of afflictions” (Pecci, 1878, p. 54).

Rerum reflected the Church as an institution of and for the poor, establishing a rapport with its majority of followers (Leo XIII, 1891). Whereas agents outside of the Church might see charity as negative and shameful, Leo brought dignity to the act of receiving by elevating charity as a genuine kindness laborers should view with brotherly love. Leo wrote:

In order to spare them the shame of begging, the Church has provided aid for the needy. The common Mother of rich and poor has aroused everywhere the heroism of charity, and has established congregations of religious and many other useful institutions for help and mercy, so that hardly any kind of suffering could exist which was not afforded relief. (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 30)

Charity was in no way to be considered dishonorable because the characteristics making up honest labor were deserving of imitation and financial support if earned wages were inadequate. In backing this notion, *Rerum* depicted “the providence of God” as boundless to the rules of time and space (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 59). Being ethereal in nature, love and charity took on this same form, which caused them to be prevalent in every century. For this point, Leo wrote on the situation of laborers in the early Church, explaining:

We are told that it was cast as a reproach on the Christians in the early ages of the Church that the greater number among them had to live by begging or by labor. Yet, destitute though they were of wealth and influence, they ended by winning over to their side the

favor of the rich and the good-will of the powerful. They showed themselves industrious, hard-working, assiduous, and peaceful, ruled by justice, and, above all, bound together in brotherly love. (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 59)

If labor was eventually accepted during a period of extreme persecution, Leo (1891) estimated that a similar acceptance, compassion, and respect could find itself in modern times for the common worker. Such acceptance and appreciation could take on a cyclical motion to shape future occurrences, reaching an altered level of awareness where charity was not pitiable but a revered duty. To initiate the change where human dignity could be recognized and truly loved, Leo went to the source upon which the Church was built, Jesus Christ, to promote the universal ideals of love and charity.

The instruments which she [the Church] employs are given to her by Jesus Christ Himself for the very purpose of reaching the hearts of men, and derive their efficiency from God. They alone can reach the innermost heart and conscience, and bring men to act from a motive of duty, to control their passions and appetites, to love God and their fellow men with a love that is outstanding and of the highest degree and to break down courageously every barrier which blocks the way to virtue. (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 26)

Leo estimated that every human being had the potential to love another person through religious convictions. However, the true power of charity came from meaningful contemplation and the eventual decision to be Christ-like, which according to Leo, meant not allowing unfavorable notions of the laboring class to dictate whether to offer support. In effect, offering charity should take place freely and without strings, just as God gives freely of His love to humankind (Leo XIII, 1891).

Tying in to his message of labor as a vital component deserving of generosity, Leo reaffirmed charity as a necessary activity to celebrate humanity's God-given worth. In Acts 20:35, where the virtue of looking out after one another was extolled, Leo (1891/1943) quoted Jesus by writing, "*Beatius est magis dare, quam accipere,*" which translated to English meant, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (pp. 30-31). In line with this sentiment, Leo (1891/1943) used Matthew 25:40 where Jesus said, "*Quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis,*" or "As long as you did it for one of these, the least of My brethren, you did it for Me" (pp. 30-31). These words rectified Leo's argument on loving labor comparing workers and everyone alike to the Christian God, whose 'laws and judgments' are beyond reproach (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 22).

The idea of charity as a common standard for imitation and reciprocation is clearly implied in *Graves*, where Leo (1901b) claimed:

The Christian law of charity . . . embraces all men, irrespective of ranks, as members of one and the same family, children of the same most beneficent Father, redeemed by the same Saviour, and called to the same eternal heritage. . . . Wherefore, on account of the union established by nature between the common people and the other classes of society, and which Christian brotherhood makes still closer, whatever diligence we devote to assisting the people will certainly profit also the other classes, the more so since, as will be thereafter shown, their co-operation is proper and necessary for the success of this undertaking [of a Christian-based democracy]. (para. 8)

Leo (1901b) believed charity was not just a revered practice with a time-honored history, but one that mutually benefitted those handing over resources for the welfare of others. Emphasizing the connected quality of charity within the Church and civilization, Leo reiterated

the need for full participation, because to fail in this respect inevitably hurt the economic and social foundations of society. Maintaining this stance of charity profiting all was Leo's insistence on creating institutions to provide financial support as well as training for workers so they could improve their situations. The rationale behind such organizations was not to dole out free services but to instill a sense of understanding and self-worth to carry laborers past their current situation. Leo (1901b) continued:

To aim at that [charity-based institutions] is not only to dignify the duty of the rich toward the poor, but to elevate the poor themselves, for, while it urges them to work in order to improve their condition, it preserves them meantime from danger, it refrains immoderation in their desires, and acts as a spur in the practice of virtue. Since, therefore, this is of such great avail and so much in keeping with the spirit of the times, it is a worthy object for the charity of righteous men to undertake with prudence and zeal. (para. 17)

Charity dignified labor in that it did not allow workers to debase themselves or rescind their natural rights under God's law for their daily survival (Leo XIII, 1901b). The only way to prevent such miscarriages of justice against the working faction was for those in leadership positions to see charity and love as binding forces coming from a greater spiritual source. When leaders deemed love as one of "the highest things we know in the universe" (Nichols, 1991, p. 76) and originating from a divine source, individuals had to accept their duty to God (Leo XIII, 1901b). Leo touted this shared obligation with the words:

For, no one lives only for his personal advantage in a community; he lives for the common good as well, so that, when others cannot contribute their share for the general good, those who can do so are obliged to make up the deficiency. The very extent of the

benefits they have received increases the burden of their responsibility, and a stricter account will have to be rendered to God who bestowed those blessings upon them. What should also urge all to the fulfillment of their duty in this regard is the widespread disaster which will eventually fall upon all classes of society if his assistance does not arrive in time; and therefore is it that he who neglects the cause of the distressed masses is disregarding his own interest as well as that of the community. (Leo XIII, 1901b, para. 19)

The intent of the charitable institutions Leo described in *Graves* was not to replace existing secular organizations performing the same work. Instead, Leo (1901b) viewed charity and institutions working on behalf of society, such as the Church and government, as collaborators in God's mission of loving one another. Similarly, charity was not a competitive force because loving humanity required the sacrifice of abundance for the sake of general prosperity. To not make this sacrifice was an offense comparable to stealing (Merton, 1967). Concerning this form of charity, Leo (1901a) cited John 13:34-35, where Christ said, "*Mandatum novum do vobis, ut diligatis invicem, sicut dilexi vos ut et vos diligatis invicem. In hoc cognoscent omnes quia discipuli mei estis, si dilectionem habueritis ad invicem*" or "A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another, as I have loved you, that you love also one another. By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for the other" (pp. 305-306; para. 13). In other words, we live to love, and when we extend this fraternal love to someone else, we validate their human dignity as well as our own innate humanity (Merton, 1979).

Theme 3: Jesus Christ as Divine Model for Laborers and Leaders

From Leo's earlier writings, Leo often viewed Jesus Christ as the protagonist who transformed labor from a despised state to one of respectability and dignity through His own example. To support this claim, Pecci (1878) rationalized that if the Christian Son of God chose to be born of humble origins and to earn his living as a carpenter, then Christ automatically distinguished the laborer role by choosing His divine Self as one of their members. Equally, Pecci (1878) described Christ as someone who cherished the self-sufficiency and sincerity a hard day's work evoked in individuals and the surrounding communities, saying:

He did not blush to labor with His own blessed hands in a humble workshop in Nazareth. It was by labor that the Apostles, sent forth by Jesus Christ, desired to earn their living, so as not to be a burden to their brethren and to be able also to succor the indigent. (p. 20).

Through Christ, Leo praised labor as an action individuals could use to promote the greater good, which was helping those who did not have the means to support themselves or their families. Thus, if the incarnation of God could be born poor and labor for his own sustenance as well as for the less fortunate, then a worker's divine worth was confirmed twofold: one in being an equal member of the human race and the other for contributing to a society dependent on the byproducts of their labor. Pecci (1878) further encouraged obedient laborers to mimic Christ as the preeminent model for showing the value of labor, stating:

Jesus Christ, besides being a Divine Model, is most perfect, because He appears as our Master in all the conditions of life. . . . Oh, my dear co-laborers! . . . You, who so often share your meager subsistence with the poor, and who would gladly do more and better than this, for those bereft of this world's riches; fail not, whenever the opportunity presents itself, in holding up before the eyes of these unfortunates, the example of that

Divine Saviour, the very sight of whom is our greatest consolation. . . . You will calm those wild and unruly agitations that may, one day, degenerate into acts of the most barbarous atrocity; you will lift up those souls that poverty has humbled in their own eyes, and in the eyes of others, and who, by the teachings of Christ, will be able to appreciate their dignity, that royal dignity that Jesus Christ obtained for them, and which they will try to preserve by honesty and the practice of all the virtues. (pp. 107-109)

The model of Jesus Christ comes from what Pecci (1878) described as “the school of ineffable love,” which valued everyone despite their socioeconomic status, taking on the plight of the “honest laborer” in need of assistance (p. 86). Christ was the ultimate sign of virtue sent by God so humankind could see the errors of their ways and correct those wrongs, devaluing another human being’s worth, such as the honest laborer (Benedict XVI, 2007). To not repent for the bad treatment of workers or to ignore their needs altogether was hypothetically similar to Luke’s parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. In Luke 16:19-31, Christ told the story of a well-to-do man who ignored a suffering Lazarus outside the gates of his home, only to find after his demise that Lazarus had earned his spot in heaven with Abraham, as reward for his earthly suffering. The wealthy man’s final destination, on the other hand, was in a place of torment and despair analogous to hell for not using his temporal means to help Lazarus. Inspired by similar gospel teachings, Pecci (1878) instructed leadership to be on the side of Lazarus and the working man through Christ, saying:

But if Jesus Christ is, on the one hand, the most perfect Model of the poor, He is also, on the other, an equally perfect Model for the kings and the great men of this world. Jesus Christ is a king, and He displays His kingly dignity by the absolute empire He exercises over all nature and over the souls of rational beings; nature humbles itself at the sound of

His voice, it modifies, it suspends the course of the immutable laws that control it; the winds subside; ailments multiply; souls, even the most hardened and perverse are subdued by His word, by the irresistible fascination of His look and of His countenance. But this royal power that He possesses so completely, He uses for the salvation of men; for supplying their wants; for healing the many infirmities that afflict them; for rousing them from the iron sleep of death; for delivering them from the oppression of Satan, who has taken possession even of their bodies; for delivering them from the still more oppressive and dangerous tyranny of the wicked passions that abide in them and the vices that soil them. (pp. 109-110).

In essence, evil perpetrated via the abuse of power or with wealth was not Christ-like or virtuous because such of leadership denied one's humanity for the sake of personal gain. While evil and suffering were "woven together in the web of our mortal life," Leo's *Rerum* posed that Christ endured the same path, and through this act, delivered the working class from the mire to their rightful place within humanity (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 21). Leo (1891/1943), quoting 2 Tim. 2:12 wrote, "*Si sustinebimus, et conregnabimus,*" meaning "If we endure, we shall reign with Him" (p. 28). This call to follow Christ and see Him as both worker and master was vital within Leo's viewpoint on labor. For workers, grief was easier to accept when they were on the side of justice and would eventually receive their spiritual reward in Christ. Likewise, faithful employers could share in Christ's goodness if they cared for the needy, like the good shepherd in John's gospel (John 10:1-21; Leo XIII, 1891). The lesson from this belief is additionally summarized in II Corinthians 8:9, "*Egenus factus est, cum esset dives*" translated "Being rich, He became poor" (Leo XIII, 1891/1943, p. 30). Leo (1891) used this saying to show:

From contemplation of [Christ's] divine Model, it is more easy to understand that the true worth and nobility of man lie in his moral qualities, that is, in virtue; that virtue is, moreover, the common inheritance of men, equally within the reach of high and low, rich and poor; and that virtue, and virtue alone, wherever found, will be followed by the rewards of everlasting happiness. Nay, God Himself seems to incline rather to those who suffer misfortune; for Jesus Christ calls the poor "blessed"; He lovingly invites those in labor and grief to come to Him for solace; and He displays the tenderest charity toward the lowly and the oppressed. These reflections cannot fail to keep down the pride of the well-to-do, and to give heart to the unfortunate; to move the former to be generous and the latter to be moderate in their desires. Thus, the separation which pride would set up tends to disappear, nor will it be difficult to make rich and poor join hands in friendly concord. (para. 24)

To enact this divine model, Leo (1891) stressed the Church's role as guardian in promoting Christ and His gospel teachings to better inform society on those measures needed for constructing a just society. According to Leo (1891), the Church "does her best to enlist the services of all classes in discussing and endeavoring to further in the most practical way, the interests of the working classes" as the model of Christ would dictate (para. 16). Because the Church's concern was with the laborer, Leo challenged the Christian community to be like the Catholics who advocate for the working class to improve their situation. In distinguishing between the types of support expected for accomplishing justice, Leo (1891) advocated the individual or group should do all in their power to support the worker's family life, which was the cornerstone of their existence, alongside religion. Included in aiding their personal goals was acting as an arbitrator between workers and employers to achieve greater equity between both

parties and ensuring that each group fulfilled their duties as well as “The laws of the Gospel—that Gospel which, by inculcating self-restraint, keeps men within the bounds of moderation, and tends to establish harmony among the divergent interests and the various classes which compose the body politic” (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 55).

In *Rerum*, Leo (1891) explained that Jesus redeemed man through his resurrection, and if society was to rid itself of injustices injuring human dignity, society must follow the precepts found in the gospels. Hence, the model of Christ urged laborers and leaders alike to be active participants in this realm, altering society to recognize and love humanity as sacred (de Alba, 2007). Leo (1901a) advanced the concept of cultivating awareness with regard to human dignity by referencing Matthew 25: 35-36, where Christ said:

Esurivi et dedistis mihi manducare; sitivi, et dedistis mihi bibere; hospes eram, et collegistis me; nudus, et cooperuistis me; infirmus, et visitastis me; in carcere eram, et venistis ad me. (English trans.) For I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; naked and you covered Me; sick and you visited Me; I was in prison and you came to Me. (p. 306)

According to Leo (1901b), these words proved that the Christ model recognized the *solatium corporis* or physical comfort of man that is essential for preserving an ethical approach in managing labor. While such activities indicated direct contact with a person in need, Leo (1901b) incorporated Luke 11:41 where Christ declared, “*Quod superest, date eleemosynam*” or “They give alms” (p. 307), referring to those who were unable to work amongst the poor but wanted to impact their lives for the better. Offering alms, however, was not to replace work within the community or to be shameful for the recipient. With the Christ model in effect,

helping the working class with actions or monetary assistance “draws closer the bonds of human society,” honoring every person as worthy under the eyes of God (Leo XIII, 1901b, para. 16).

Jesus Christ as divine model for labors and leaders was constant in Leo’s writings, from the point that the theme directed people to do all in their power to help others. This concept was important for Leo, because in his estimation, Christ validated labor through supernatural means, providing spiritual and earthly charity for the working class. So, if the Supreme Being utilized His time “doing good and healing all that were oppressed” (Leo XIII, 1901b, para. 15), then the working class and their own efforts were worthy of praise.

Theme 4: Labor as a Practical and Moral Way of Life

Leo established that labor and the inherent dignity of mankind were divine in nature via the providence of God and through the efforts of Jesus Christ, and he also wrote about the practicality and need for honest labor. The beginning of this view is in Pecci’s (1878) pastoral letters, where he distinguished labor as elementary for humanity’s survival. In laying out a workable sequence supporting labor’s life-sustaining quality, Pecci (1878) stated:

Look at the least of men, the most obscure of artisans; he has always, wherewithal, good or bad, to clothe himself, to cover his feet. Consider how many persons, how many peoples must have been employed to furnish each one with clothes, shoes, etc. Every man can daily raise a piece of bread to his mouth; look again at how much labor, how many hands it has taken to accomplish this result, from the laborer who with difficulty ploughs the ground to plant the seed, to the baker that has converted the flour into bread! Every man has certain rights; he finds in society lawyers to defend them, magistrates to enforce them by their sentences, soldiers to make them respected. Is he ignorant? He finds schools, men who write books for him, others that print them, and others that

publish them. To satisfy his religious tendencies, his aspirations towards God, he finds some of his brethren, who, forsaking all other occupations, devote themselves to the study of sacred sciences, renouncing the world, its pleasures, and their families to be better able to respond to these superior demands. But this is enough to show you that it is indispensable for us to live in society so that our wants, which are as exacting as they are varied, may be gratified. (pp. 9-10)

Pecci (1878) believed society required laborers to keep society moving forward.

Successively, Leo demonstrated through his words that labor drove production, and without the talents of a qualified labor force, no socioeconomic group would enjoy profits or returns. For this reason, labor was a morally vital task every able-bodied person should perform because the dependence on items and services equated to survival, a spiritual right from God (Finn, 2012).

Pecci (1878) affirmed the Church's love of practical labor initiatives as historical in nature, citing the monastic movements of medieval Europe as catalysts for reversing negative attitudes towards labor. For Pecci (1878), the monastic communities were seamless models of why labor should be held in great esteem. Agricultural developments and the very infrastructure created to make early travel possible were from the efforts of "poor monks who gave such a great impetus to that which makes life more prosperous and comfortable" (p. 22). Monasticism showed labor could advance society as their joint civil projects yielded positive returns, forming a domino effect for other groups to follow suit. As a result, Pecci (1878) lauded the reciprocal aspect of labor as in communion with God by fulfilling God's desire for man to prosper in all facets of existence. The Church and its followers "ennobled and sanctified labor" (Pecci, 1878, p. 28), which in turn made it a valuable commodity to be revered and protected from abusive practices that would strip away a worker's spiritual dignity, such as denying the right to worship

on Sundays or to receive time off to settle personal affairs. While Pecci exalted labor as a dignified way to live life, he advised against placing work and profits above gospel values such as love and forgiveness, because doing so would corrupt the inherent goodness of labor.

Leo (1891) continued to build on labor's pragmatic qualities in *Rerum* by attributing the continued existence of humanity to the act of labor. Leo advanced the notion that natural resources gifted by supernatural means were worthless unless fashioned into usable and life-sustaining items. As Leo (1891) stated:

Truly, that which is required for the preservation of life, and for life's well-being, is produced in great abundance from the soil, but not until man has brought it into cultivation and expended upon it his solicitude and skill. (para. 9)

Hence, Leo's vision of labor as a necessary and cherished activity framed how society should view and treat laborers. Leo (1891) further outlined the perception when he wrote:

But those who deny these rights do not perceive that they are defrauding man of what his own labor has produced. For the soil which is tilled and cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition; it was wild before, now it is fruitful; was barren, but now brings forth in abundance. That which has thus altered and improved the land becomes so truly part of itself as to be in great measure indistinguishable and inseparable from it. Is it just that the fruit of a man's own sweat and labor should be possessed and enjoyed by anyone else? As effects follow their cause, so is it just and right that the results of labor should belong to those who have bestowed their labor. (para. 10)

In Leo's writing, separating the worker from his output, which was worthy of spiritual and temporal remuneration, was unrealistic. The worker who willfully performed his part was virtuous, which implied true dignity and goodness (Watt, 1929). Labor, then, was a multi-

dimensional act, given that it became part of one's soul. The duality of the labor was that it held the potential to mold individuals into moral beings while sustaining their corporal needs (Leo XIII, 1891). Considering Leo's earlier theme addressing natural rights, each laborer was capable of achieving virtue because humanity was equal in its ability to promote the common good (De Jonghe, 1998). From this description, Leo viewed labor as a major factor in living a righteous life with profound meaning. In discussing the meaning, Leo (1891) wrote:

Life on earth, however good and desirable in itself, is not the final purpose for which man is created; it is only the way and the means to that attainment of truth and that love of goodness in which the full life of the soul consists. It is the soul which is made after the image and likeness of God; it is in the soul that the sovereignty resides in virtue whereof man is commanded to rule the creatures below him and to use all the earth and the ocean for his profit and advantage. (para. 40)

Leo (1891/1943) followed this statement by quoting Rom. 10:12, "*nam idem dominus omnium*" which translates to mean, "for there is the same Lord of all" (pp. 52-53). Thus, all classes of people have the right to exist, and those who were not born into wealth could rely on labor, which adhered to God's natural law. Leo (1891) further acknowledged that in this world, "People differ in capacity, skill, health, strength; and unequal fortune" (para. 17), yet each of these various skill sets are needed as society calls upon all types to maintain societal functions. Notwithstanding these functions, every class of person had the equal right to seek their fortunes through labor and assist others who had been denied the chance to realize their potential (Leo XIII, 1891). In view of how labor strengthened a person's dignity, provided for the family unit, and assisted in building society, its usefulness in spiritual, social, and fiscal terms rendered it indispensable to humankind (Shannon, 2005).

As written in *Rerum*, living a moral life grounded in labor was a lifestyle that not only honored the participant but was also a virtue protected by supernatural means. According to Leo (1891):

No man may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats with great reverence, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation of the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; no man has in this matter power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right; he cannot give up his soul to servitude, for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, the most sacred and inviolable of rights. (para. 40)

Man's existence through labor supplied him with physical materials for nourishment and produced greater awareness with regard to his innate dignity, defining him as a human being. Accordingly, Leo (1891) stated:

A man's labor necessarily bears two notes or characters. First of all, it is personal, inasmuch as the force which acts is bound up with the personality and is the exclusive property of him who acts, and, further, was given to him for his advantage. Secondly, man's labor is *necessary*; for without the result of labor a man cannot live, and self-preservation is a law of nature, which it is wrong to disobey. (para. 44)

In other words, labor could not be a commodity that reduced workers to the status of objects (Dorr, 1983). Labor was a way of life that, above all else, acknowledged human dignity and asked the question of how its implementation could better serve humanity.

The belief that labor potentially equated to a meaningful and productive existence was well-established throughout *Rerum*. In Leo's (1901b) *Graves*, the concentration on the

beneficial nature of labor moved towards fostering foundations that upheld the institution of labor. Leo (1901b) realized that although labor brought about change in the individual and in society itself, implanting measures was essential to ensure that external sources did not taint this method of living. To support the Church's efforts in proclaiming labor as a suitable existence, Leo (1901b) wrote:

As regards not merely the temporary aid given to the laboring classes, but the establishment of permanent institutions in their behalf, it is most commendable for charity to undertake them. It will thus see that more certain and more reliable means of assistance will be afforded to the necessitous. That kind of help is especially worthy of recognition which forms the minds of mechanics and laborers to thrift and foresight, so that in course of time they may be able, in part at least, to look out for themselves. (para. 17)

The realization that society must empower laborers to continue their path towards a righteous life was essential, from Leo's leadership perspective. Specifically, Leo reiterated throughout *Graves* that the values formed via labor must be practiced on a continual basis and he called laborers and leaders to be mindful in perfecting their souls with prayer. Using the examples of St. Francis and St. Vincent de Paul, Leo (1901b) stated:

But in the fulfillment of this obligation (assisting the working class) let there be the greatest caution and prudence exerted, and let it be done after the fashion of the saints. Francis, who was poor and humble, Vincent de Paul, the father of the afflicted classes, and very many others whom the Church keeps ever in her memory were wont to lavish their care upon the people, but in such wise as not to be engrossed overmuch or to be

unmindful of themselves or to let it prevent them from laboring with the same assiduity in the perfection of their own soul and the cultivation of virtue. (para. 24)

Leo (1901b) echoed previous sentiments by saying to laborers and leaders that while labor offered a means to an end, separating oneself from a personal relationship with God removed the spiritual lessons found in the act of labor. In Leo's (1901b) estimation, Jesus Christ and Church consecrated labor. Thus, supporting initiatives that safeguarded labor was a major moral factor for leaders to consider.

Theme 5: Responsibility of Authority to Dignity and Labor

Throughout his writings, Leo explicitly described the importance of labor and the universal dignity attributed to humankind. This culmination of beliefs came together for Leo under leadership that understood its role concerning labor and its duty defending the working class. In Pecci's (1878) *Pastoral Letters*, he paraphrased Rom. XIII, I. saying, "Power is from God" (p. 97). Immediately, Leo established the hierarchical chain of authority informing leaders that power was borrowed from God and not the sole property of any living being. Pecci (1878) wrote:

But if power is from God, it should reflect the divine majesty to command respect and the goodness of God to become sweet and acceptable to all subject to it. Whoever, then, holds the reins of power; whether it be an individual or a community; whether the functions be held by election or by birth; in a democratic country or in a monarchy, must not look to power for the gratification of ambition, nor the vain pride of being above everybody; but, on the contrary, he must seek the means of serving his brethren, even as the Son of God, Who came not to be ministered unto but to minister unto others. (p. 97)

The active choice to serve others by utilizing individual authority was the appropriate method for using leadership power (Greenleaf, 2002). Those who abused influential positions were subject to retribution that could carry over to other areas of life. On Church leadership, Pecci (1878) explained:

Far different is the power that springs from Christian teaching; it is modest, laborious, careful to encourage good, and is restrained by the consciousness that at the last judgment, punishments are reserved for those who govern badly. It is impossible, dearly beloved, not to see this; we feel our hearts expand before so noble an image of authority, and the obedience it demands and which is indispensable to the order and advancement of society, is stripped of all its bitterness and becomes mild and easy. The teachings with regard to persons subject to authority are in keeping with those regarding persons in authority. If authority is indebted to God for its existence, its majesty and its solicitude to accomplish everything good, it is impossible to believe that any one can rebel against it, because he would be rebelling against God. The obedience of the subject must be free, loyal, and should spring from an inward feeling, and not from a fear of servile punishment; it must carry with it the proof of its sincerity and inspire a cheerful acceptance of the sacrifices demanded by him who holds the reins of power, for the fulfillment of his ministry. (pp. 98-99)

This view of leadership placed the leader in a position of accountability as subject to God's law, which included supporting labor initiatives advancing human dignity and morality. In conjuncture with humbling oneself to serve the will of God, leaders were expected to understand that sacrifice akin to the Gospel Christ was how authentic leadership formed. An example of the servant-based leadership Leo described may appear in Luke 22:27 (as cited in

Arbuckle, 1996, p. 122), when at the Last Supper, Jesus said, “For who is the greater: the one at table or the one who serves? The one at table, surely? Yet here am I among you as one who serves!” As a result, the willingness to sacrifice everything for the common good, like Christ, was what legitimized one’s authoritative claims (Hunter, 2004).

Leo’s (1891) call for the responsible use of authority and power continued in *Rerum*, where the Church assumed the leadership mantle imparted to it by Christ. Acting as the living embodiment of Christ, the Church was afforded supernatural guidance, allowing it to touch man’s soul and conscience, part of his divine makeup. By influencing humanity’s spiritual attributes linking man to God, leaders true to their nature and open to the Holy Spirit could mirror this virtuous leadership. For the Church’s part as an institution, Leo (1891) wrote:

It is the Church that insists, on the authority of the Gospel, upon those teachings whereby the conflict can be brought to an end, or rendered, at least, far less bitter. . . . The Church improves and betters the condition of the working man by means of numerous organizations; does her best to enlist the services of all classes in discussing and endeavoring to further in the most practical way, the interests of the working classes; and considers that for this purpose recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the intervention of the law and of State authority. (para. 16)

In *Rerum* (1891), the Church provided the basis for leading with conscience as well as venerating labor with proclamations such as “the principle duty [of leaders/employers] is to give everyone what is just” (para. 20). However, Leo’s Church understood that crafting governmental policies was out of its jurisdiction because the temporal realm was subject to free will, enabling choice, which theoretically could lead to unscrupulous acts. Notwithstanding such legislative limitations, Leo recognized that the institutional Church could appeal to a leader’s sense of

fairness by defending the right to own private property and encouraging civil obedience, despite varying opinions. Negotiable matters aside, Leo (1891) remained steadfast to his definition of the proper implementation of authority:

The foremost duty, therefore, of the rulers of the State should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, shall be such as of themselves to realize public well-being and private prosperity. This is the proper scope of wise statesmanship and is the work of the rulers. Now a State chiefly and justice, the moderation and fair imposing of public taxes, the progress of the arts and of trade, the abundant yield of the land—through everything, in fact, which makes the citizens better and happier. Hereby, then, it lies in the power of a ruler to benefit every class in the State, and amongst the rest to promote to the utmost the interests of the poor; and this in virtue of his office, and without being open to suspicion of undue interference—since it is the province of the commonwealth to serve the common good. And the more that is done for the benefit of the working classes by the general laws of the country, the less need will there be to seek for special means to relieve them. (para. 32)

This depiction of leadership ascribed to the belief that moral integrity hindered by the state or any organizational structure led a person to betray the sense of self. If a reasonable leader had the freedom to act upon his or her conscience, the exploitation of power was expected to greatly diminish (Manning, 2003). Leo's (1891) leadership approach promoted inclusiveness and every class was present in his plan to protect labor and general human dignity. As Leo suggested, the inequity experienced between the classes of people in society would always remain. For this reason, authority needed pay closer attention to discriminatory practices while

respecting the universal rights of humanity to raise families or partake in religious worship (Leo XIII, 1891).

Whenever the general interest or any particular class suffers, or is threatened with harm, which can in no other way be met or prevented, the public authority must step in to deal with it. Now, it is to the interest of the community, as well as of the individual, that peace and good order should be maintained; that all things should be carried on in accordance with God's laws and those of nature; that the discipline of family life should be observed and that religion should be obeyed; that a high standard of morality should prevail, both in public and private life; that justice should be held sacred and that no one should injure another with impunity; that the members of the commonwealth should grow up to man's estate strong and robust, and capable, if need be, of guarding and defending their country. (Leo XIII, 1891, para. 36)

Leo's (1891) rationale for prudent leadership was to make certain that those with limited voices:

Who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits which they create-that being housed, clothed, and bodily fit, they may find their life less hard and more enduring. It follows that whatever shall appear to prove conducive to the well-being of those who work should obtain favorable consideration. There is no fear that solicitude of this kind will be harmful to any interest; on the contrary, it will be to the advantage of all, for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to shield from misery those on whom it so largely depends for the things that it needs. (para. 34)

The plight of the working-class was a pivotal component from Leo's leadership standpoint. To continue, Leo (1891) stated:

The richer classes have many ways of shielding themselves, and stand less in need of help from the State; whereas the mass of the poor have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State. (para. 37)

Though the wealthy possessed the means to counter most issues, Leo (1891) urged authorities not to completely leave this class to their own devices because every community member should have protection under the law. Leo (1891) urged in *Rerum* that authorities should not oppress those who rightfully earned or inherited their wealth through legitimate channels, similar to abuses experienced by laborers. On maintaining a balanced power structure, Leo (1891) wrote:

Here, however, it is expedient to bring under special notice certain matters of moment. First of all, there is the duty of safeguarding private property by legal enactment and protection. Most of all it is essential, where the passion of greed is so strong, to keep the populace within the line of duty; for, if all may justly strive to better their condition, neither justice nor the common good allows any individual to seize upon that which belongs to another, or, under the futile and shallow pretext of equality, to lay violent hands on other people's possessions. Most true it is that by far the larger part of the workers prefer to better themselves by honest labor rather than by doing any wrong to others. But there are not a few who are imbued with evil principles and eager for revolutionary change, whose main purpose is to stir up disorder and incite their fellows to acts of violence. The authority of the law should intervene to put restraint upon such

firebrands, to save the working classes from being led astray by their maneuvers, and to protect lawful owners from spoliation. (para. 38)

To accomplish better equilibrium, leadership should once again back unions and societies that aid labor. Drafting an outline to enhance union support, Leo (1891) stated:

In order that an association may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its administration and government should be firm and wise. All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organization as may best conduce to the attainment of their respective objects. We do not judge it possible to enter into minute particulars touching the subject of organization; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and aim of the work to be done, on the scope of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time—all of which should be carefully considered. (para. 56)

Embracing power as a force meant to help everyone equally, Aquinas (as cited by Leo XIII, 1891/1943, p. 42-43) stated, “*Sicut pars et totum quodammodo sunt idem, ita id, quod est totius, quodammodo est partis*” which translated to “Even as part and whole are in a certain way the same, so too that which pertains to the whole pertains in a certain way to the part also.”

Ultimately, although different, each class found in human society was part of a larger reality that recognized their dignity and worth as equal in the eyes of God. Leo expected leaders to view their communities in such terms to ensure justice and prevent actions challenging justice that injured one’s humanity. Standing by the concept of defending universal dignity and labor practices, Leo (1891) cited the Church’s everlasting efforts on behalf of these issues:

In regard to the Church, her cooperation will never be found lacking, be the time or the occasion what it may; and she will intervene with all the greater effect in proportion as

her liberty of action is the more unfettered. Let this be carefully taken to heart by those whose office it is to safeguard the public welfare. (para. 63)

Being intimately involved in the happenings of one's community was necessary for leaders to appropriately serve their constituents (Greenleaf, 1977). In *Graves*, Leo (1901b) advocated for a grassroots type of leadership paralleling Christ's own ministry, urging religious leaders:

To go out and move among the people, to exert a healthy influence on them by adapting themselves to the present condition of things, is what more than once in addressing the clergy We have advised. More frequently, also, in writing to the bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, and especially of late, We have lauded this affectionate solicitude for the people and declared it to be the special duty of both the secular and regular clergy. (para. 24)

The invitation to be in communion with the needs of one's people did not equate to a complete disregard of other authorities (Leo, 1901b). In *Graves*, Leo decidedly made the point that if leaders were to right wrongs against the working class or any other marginalized group, they should consult the Church first before using their influence in the community. While the intentions of a leader or union might be sincere, Leo (1901b) cautioned:

Let them not be led astray by an excessive zeal in the cause of charity. If it leads them to be wanting in proper submission, it is not a sincere zeal; it will not have any useful result and cannot be acceptable to God. God delights in the souls of those who put aside their own designs and obey the rulers of His Church as if they were obeying Him; He assists them even when they attempt difficult things and benignly leads them to their desired end. (para. 26)

Thus, Church authorities served as conduits and guardians of the gospels teachings used to shield human dignity from contrary forces (Leo XIII, 1901b). Even as the Church held the authoritative right to judge whether an act was in communion with authentic doctrine, Leo (1901b) wrote that all manners of leadership could remain faithful without reservations:

There remains one thing upon which We desire to insist very strongly, in which not only the ministers of the Gospel, but also all those who are devoting themselves to the cause of the people, can with very little difficulty bring about a most commendable result. That is to inculcate in the minds of the people, in a brotherly way and whenever the opportunity presents itself, the following principles; to keep aloof on all occasions from seditious acts and seditious men; to hold inviolate the rights of others; to show a proper respect to superiors; to willingly perform the work in which they are employed; not to grow weary of the restraint of family life which in many ways is so advantageous; to keep to their religious practices above all, and in their hardships and trials to have recourse to the Church for consolation. In the furtherance of all this, it is of great help to propose the splendid example of the Holy Family of Nazareth, and to advise the invocation of its protection, and it also helps to remind the people of the examples of sanctity which have shone in the midst of poverty, and to hold up before them the reward that awaits them in the better life to come. (para. 25)

Implications of Leo's Leadership for Contemporary Leaders

The main themes found in Leo's writings provided significant knowledge of his leadership approach. Leo viewed every human being as equal in the eyes of God. This equality developed from the divine gift of reason separating humankind from creatures whose mere goal was survival and nothing else. With reason, all classes including laborers deserved the

opportunity to earn a living wage to sustain them and their dependents so they could live fruitful lives, as directed by God's will. Natural law, created to safeguard humanity's inheritance, was irreversible and unalterable to suit the needs of temporal authorities. Instead, Leo expected world governments to defend natural rights deriving from natural law, such as owning private property, because anything less hindered human dignity.

In the practice of leadership, Leo weighed heavily upon love and Christian charity as virtues necessary for meaningful change. To love one another as one would love Christ was central to honoring humanity made in God's image. For those who were vulnerable, a leader must recognize the God-given humanity in the oppressed and support them through charitable actions. While charity may seem irrelevant to standard leadership theories outside the Church structure, Leo saw it as strengthening society because the whole benefitted when its weakest members were empowered. Leadership was to safeguard institutions promoting charity because they fell in line with God's own purpose of teaching humankind love when He sacrificed His son to redeem humanity of its sins. Displaying love and charity was important to counter injustices injuring the right to work for individual survival and potential advancement in life.

To be an effective leader, Leo adopted Christ as the perfect and divine model for embodying virtue. This virtue was achieved when leadership actively cared for the needy, never losing sight that uplifting others not only bolstered society but also fulfilled God's wish for man's salvation. Whereas leaders might marginalize labor as a minor consideration, Leo's belief in the Christ model viewed laborers as key components in accomplishing social and economic good throughout the world. Christ himself supported this belief in labor's sacredness when He chose to be born a carpenter, illustrating the merit and morality found in hard work. In effect, Leo's leadership style considered labor as vital and Godly, given that Christ the laborer preached

about justice in the gospels. From this approach, Leo expected leaders to use their resources to assist the poor, who were God's beloved.

Leo carefully weighted the practical and moral aspects of labor when anticipating leadership action. Labor had a dual purpose; the resources humanity needed to survive were dependent on laborers who fashioned raw materials into useable items and services. In Leo's paradigm, labor reinforced moral living as the result of labor, in line with natural law's precept of self-preservation. Though someone might be unequal in skill or ability, all types were necessary to move society forward, and each of the types deserved to profit from their output. To deny anyone their fair share was to openly disobey divine and natural laws governing the universe. While labor offered much to society, the sanctity of humankind and the gospel values governing man to love one another must not be below labor. Doing so removed labor's predetermined dignity, leaving the act of labor exposed to potential injustices and further injuring the most vulnerable of workers.

Responsible leadership required leaders to devote themselves specifically to the needs of their people. The very nature of leadership placed an unequal amount of power in the control of a few individuals. Yet, as reiterated numerous times by Leo, such power was from God, who demanded its use for the common good. Citing Christ once again, Leo showed emerging leadership in that the one who served was the one who understood the nature of authority. While the purpose of leaders was to serve, in no way did Leo urge followers to rise up against those possessing influence. Instead, Leo placed irreverent leadership in the category of sin, where God would judge the abuses of power and act accordingly. Leadership should not interfere in matters designated under natural law, such as the formation of unions or one's family life. However, leaders must intervene if union abuses occurred or if the dignity of an individual was violated. In

formulating such decisions, leaders should consider the example of the Church, led by the gospels of Christ.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Applying the Leonine Themes to a Leadership Framework

In Chapter V, Leo's writings revealed themes that could counsel Church and secular leaders on the value of labor and how all of humanity should be treated with dignity.

Specifically, the major themes presented were

1. Natural rights of man via God's natural law
2. Love and Christian charity
3. Jesus Christ as divine model for laborers and leaders
4. Labor as a practical and moral way of life
5. Responsibility of authority to dignity and labor

To apply these themes towards a Christian-based leadership framework such as servant leadership, the researcher devised a series of questions for leaders to contemplate when making decisions affecting employees or individuals under their care. The list of questions follows.

1. Will the leadership action go against someone's natural rights?
2. Can the action or policy in question assist the individual without injuring his or her dignity or self-respect?
3. Is the action based on love and concern for a group or motivated by self-interest?
4. Would the action pair well with the gospel teachings and personal acts of Jesus Christ?
5. Is the individual or group implementing the action fairly compensated? If so, are they also achieving personal growth (e.g. career advancement, practical

experience, the action is producing meaningful change within the community, etc.) through the activity?

6. Is leadership completing every possible step to ensure the physical, emotional, and financial security of the employee and/or the interests of the group?

Revisiting the Enron scandal mentioned in Chapter 1 can help demonstrate the implementation of this question-based approach. Formerly known as a major force in the energy and commodities market, Enron executives misrepresented yearly earnings to inflate the value of their stocks. Just before the company's demise, executives sold off their personal shares, knowing the real value was well below market value. In January 2002, Enron stocks plummeted to under \$1, compared to two years prior when a single share was worth over \$90. Middle management and employees who invested their life savings in Enron lost everything due to a technicality in their 401k that placed penalties on selling shares ("Enron Fast Facts," 2013). Hypothetically speaking, if the executive culture at Enron incorporated Leonine leadership themes and urged top-ranking leaders to ask themselves, "Is the action based on love and concern for the group?" or "Can I ensure the physical, emotional, and financial security of the employees or clients?," the disastrous outcome could have been avoided. While no guarantee exists that most leaders would follow this methodology, were Enron's organizational paradigm open to Leo's themes with regard to hiring practices and leadership training, the odds of accountability might have increased.

The guidelines and questions formed via Leo's themes present a moral decision-making plan for Christian and non-Christian leaders alike. Even in the area of Catholic higher education, where many of these beliefs already exist, the themes can be incorporated for greater cohesion and accountability. An ideal example from Georgetown University was the unionization of

adjunct instructors. When over 70% of the Catholic institution's adjuncts voted in favor of forming a union with the Washington, D.C. Service Employees International Union, Georgetown's leadership approved their efforts (Schmidt, 2013). Acknowledging their adjuncts' call for organized representation, coupled with the desire to better serve their needs, Georgetown showed an awareness of labor as preached by Leo.

A few Catholic colleges and universities continue to reject any potential dialogue on unionization. The right of these institutions to reject union initiatives lies with the 1979 Supreme Court case, the National Labor Relations Board (N.L.R.B.) v. Catholic Bishops of Chicago. The Court's final decision found in favor of religious education, exempting Catholic schools from being forced to comply with employee unions that might infringe on religious beliefs ("Adjunct Professors Seek Union Representation," 2013). While unionization might not be a right appropriate for a university operating on a modest budget or hiring for religious purposes, Catholic higher education leaders should nevertheless entertain the question, "Is the individual fairly compensated?" and "Can the policy in question (e.g. the current stand on adjunct unionization) further assist individuals without injuring their dignity or self-respect?"

Recommendations for Future Studies

The dignity of humanity and respect for labor are focal points in Catholic social thought. As mentioned earlier in this study, Leo XIII was one of the first pontiffs to lead a socioeconomic dialogue on the sacredness of labor as well as the inner worth of the working class. Since the issuance of Leo's *Rerum*, many new writings surfaced over the years to address similar concerns. The breadth of Catholic social teachings was clear in Pope Pius XI's (1931) encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, which provided commentary on *Rerum*'s positive effects on 20th-century working conditions, and Pope John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris* (1963), which urged a pluralistic

and global harmony among Catholics and non-Catholics. Continuing the dialogue were Pope Paul VI's (1967) *Populorum Progressio*, which advocated for the human and economic development of third world countries, and Francis's apostolic exhortation, *Evangelii Gaudium* (2013a), which expanded on messages of promoting social justice and less fiscally motivated leadership. These works and numerous other social edicts issued by past and present church leaders contained valuable concepts for developing emerging leadership frameworks. From this belief, the researcher recommended placing select official pronouncements under the qualitative process of historical analysis.

Papal encyclicals offer researchers a fount of information on Church leadership and social responsibility. As indicated in the above paragraph, many popes continued where Leo left off in the realm of the social encyclical. This researcher proposes implementation of a future study of each social encyclical written after *Rerum*, up to and including Francis' *Lumen Fidei* (2013), which discussed the contribution of faith toward the common good. By performing an historical-comparative study, findings could identify shared social themes among differing pontifical leadership styles. The advantage of this approach is that the findings could demonstrate continuity in Church leadership on matters such as human dignity and labor. The advent of additional leadership themes on the aforementioned topics could contribute to the Leonine model established in this study.

While conducting research on Leo XIII, 19th-century Catholic leaders and their writings related to labor, human dignity, and universal rights, scholars clearly had not evaluated and coded the writings for contemporary leadership studies. While gathering primary and secondary sources, the researcher found the manuscripts of Catholic leaders such as Cardinal Henry Edward Manning of England and U.S. Cardinal James Gibbons in public domain. Both of these men

were pioneers in advocating for the fair treatment of laborers, based on man's natural right to lead a fecund existence. Though their ideas preceded Leo's *Rerum*, Manning's and Gibbon's leadership themes on the importance of labor and the dignity of humanity had not been fully examined. A study concentrating on these early advocates of labor and unions could provide further depth to Leo's leadership themes, offering a more distinct and historical view of how leadership could properly support those under their care.

Another option for additional research would be to examine Leo's diplomatic career after he assumed the position of Roman Catholic Pope. From the beginning of Leo's reign, former Catholic countries like Germany became a challenge for Catholic citizens living within their borders. As mentioned earlier, the Kulturkampf led by Bismarck denied Catholics and Church officials basic rights immutable to the human condition. However, by diplomatically acknowledging Bismarck's authority yet never relenting on the need for equality, Leo eventually witnessed the reversal of Kulturkampf-based policies against Catholicism. Performing a hermeneutical analysis of Leo's letters regarding this event could present current leaders with an awareness of how the written word and carefully crafted wording could produce multilayered meanings for encouraging justice.

Analyzing historical documents requires the researcher to understand the context in which a text was written and to extract relevant themes underlying the collective work. With that understanding in mind, the researcher suggests that future studies examining the written works of Church leaders should consider that while the meaning of words changes, the significance of an entire work should not be discarded or diminished. While uncovering themes, the analyst should not ignore a gut feeling as to what a word, phrase, or paragraph segment might suggest to the respective intuition. The historical context provides greater clarity but the

researcher's intellect and instincts are the tools that unearth meaning through various sequences spanning numerous works.

Such newfound meaning can bring to light previously unspecified messages that ultimately contribute to the decision-making actions, communication methods, and leadership beliefs/behaviors of current managers on an extensive level. In summary, the past or present words of a leader might invoke a previously unanticipated thought in someone. Though the thought might be contrary to the accepted norm, if clusters of the subject's works support the newly discovered thought, the concept is certainly worthy of serious review and scrutiny.

Conclusion

Bringing about social change between leaders and their followers or managers and their employees is as much a challenge today as it was in Leo's time. From the writings of Leo, labor abuses were rampant in Europe, where the Industrial Revolution created a need for fast and cheap labor. In early 19th century England, for instance, countless men perished in factory-related accidents due to unrestricted conditions, while 15% of the country's labor force was children (Keys, 2010). Despite the fact that most countries today support labor laws protecting workers, exploitation and neglect remains a reality for workers whose leadership ignores their physical, spiritual, and financial well-being. For religious leadership akin to Leo, the complexity of showing the universal sacredness of world labor and the need to respect human dignity can be daunting. From this challenge, Leo's themes on labor and human rights provided the theoretical context for leaders to improve relations between the powerful and vulnerable, bringing them together as brothers and sisters who share in the family of humankind.

The underlying rationale of the themes uncovered from Leo's writings can apply to any condition or scenario of labor employment. Besides offering an ethical basis for formulating

leadership actions, the themes explicitly provide Catholic leaders the means through which to follow their faith tradition on matters pertaining to labor and the proper treatment of human beings. The dignity of labor approach informs leaders that labor and humanity are intimately linked together, making each worthy of respect as labor benefits humanity's overall well-being. Most importantly, Leo's themes illustrate how being sincere and leading as the servant Christ did nurtures a collaborative setting where everyone has representation and rights guaranteed by God.

REFERENCES

- Adjunct professors seek union representation. (2013, September 9). *America Magazine*, n.p.
Retrieved from <http://americamagazine.org/issue/adjunct-professors-seek-union-representation>
- Agosto, E. (2005). *Servant leadership: Jesus and Paul*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- Allen, J. L. (2013a, February 11). Pope Benedict leaves behind legacy full of ups and downs. *National Catholic Reporter*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/pope-benedict-leaves-behind-legacy-full-ups-and-downs>
- Allen, J. L. (2013b, June 17). Francis at 100 days: “The world’s parish priest.” *National Catholic Reporter*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/francis-100-days-worlds-parish-priest>
- Anfara, V. A., & Mertz, N. T. (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Arbuckle, G.A. (1996). *Refounding the church: Dissent for leadership*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Auerbach, C. F. & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Autry, J. A. (2004). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Barbour, C. (2012). *The Marx machine: Politics, polemics, ideology*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Bauer, M. W., & Gaskell, G. D. (2000). *Qualitative researching with text, image, and sound: A practical handbook for social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bauer, M., & Ramirez, M. (2010). Injustice on our plates: Immigrant women in the U.S. food industry. *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved from http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/downloads/publication/Injustice_on_Our_Plates.pdf
- Belanger, A. (1997). *Ethics of Catholicism and the consecration of the intellectual*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bendavid, N. (2012, March 20). Ryan plan revives deficit duel. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577293330650534266.html>
- Benedict XVI. (2007). *Jesus of Nazareth: From the baptism in the Jordan to the transfiguration*. New York, NY: Image Books.
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Bergoglio, J., & Skorka, A. (2013). *On heaven and earth: Pope Francis on faith, family, and the church in the twenty-first century*. Colorado Springs, CO: Image Books.
- Bloch, M. (1964). *The historian's craft: Reflections on the nature and uses of history and the techniques and methods of those who write it*. (P. Putnam, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Boyer, G. R. (1998). The historical background of the *Communist Manifesto*. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(4), 151-174. doi:10.1257/jep.12.4.151
- Brown, R. E. (1984). *The churches the apostles left behind*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2007). *Sage handbook of grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burton, K. K. (1962). *Leo the thirteenth: The first modern Pope*. New York, NY: McKay.

- Bury, J. B. (1964). *History of the papacy in the 19th century: Liberty and authority in the Roman Catholic Church* (R. H. Murray, Ed.). New York, NY: Schocken Books.
- Byron, W. J., & Zech, C. (2012, April 12). Why they left. *America Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://americamagazine.org/issue/5138/article/why-they-left>
- Calamur, K. (2013, May 1). Pope compares Bangladesh factory workers to “slave labor.” *NPR*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/05/01/180406283/pope-compares-bangladesh-factory-workers-to-slave-labor>
- Calmes, J. (2012, August 11). Elevating Ryan, and his budget details. *The New York Times*. Retrieved by http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/12/us/politics/ryan-and-his-budget-are-a-gamble-for-romney.html?pagewanted=1&ref=jackiecalmes&_r=0
- The career of the new pope. (1878, February 27). *Messenger*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/americanperiodicals/advanced?accountid=10932>
- Carr, E. H. (1967). *What is history?* New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Carter, Z. (2012, June 8). Obama foreclosure program criticized by expert panel. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/08/obama-foreclosure-program-netroots-nation_n_1581740.html
- Clarke, K. (2013, May 25). Pope Francis: Open the doors! *America Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://americamagazine.org/content/all-things/pope-francis-open-doors>
- Clarke, R. H. (1903). *The life of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII*. Chicago, IL: Educational Publishing.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Colish, M. L. (1975). St. Thomas Aquinas in historical perspective: The modern period. *Church History*, 44, 433-449. doi:10.2307/3163823
- Copleston, F. C. (1991). *Aquinas: An introduction to the life and work of the great medieval thinker*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Corrigan, R. (1938). *The church and the nineteenth century*. Milwaukee, WI: Bruce.
- Coulombe, C. A. (2009). *The Pope's legion: The multinational fighting force that defended the Vatican*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coursen-Neff, Z. (2010). Fields of peril: Child labor in U.S. agriculture. *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved from http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/crd0510webwcover_1.pdf
- Covey, S. (2001). Servant leadership and community in the twenty-first century. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 27-34). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cullinane, S. (2013, February 28). Pope Benedict XVI's resignation explained. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/11/world/europe/pope-resignation-q-and-a/index.html>
- Curran, C. A. (1950). The leader's skill in group discussion. *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, 11, 237-250. doi:10.2307/3707342
- Curran, C. E. (2002). *Catholic social teaching 1891-present: A historical, theological, and ethical analysis*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Danto, E. A. (2008). *Historical research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- De Alba, J. M. G. (2007). *Jesus Christ: To know him, to love him, to follow him*. (W. Quinn, Trans.). Guadalajara, MX: ITESO.
- De Jonghe, E. (1998). Common good: Practical orientations. In D. A. Boileau (Ed.), *Principles of Catholic social teachings* (pp. 119-131). Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
- De Narfon, J. (1899). *Pope Leo XIII: His life and work*. (G. A. Raper, Trans.). London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- De Souza, R. J. (2003, October). Two popes. *First Things*, pp. 36-40. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Dicey, E. (1861). *Cavour: A memoir*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Doohan, L. (2007). *Spiritual leadership: The quest for integrity*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Dorr, D. (1983). *Option for the poor: A hundred years of Vatican social teaching*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Elias, J. L. (2002). *A history of Christian education: Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox perspectives*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Ellis, J. T. (1956). *Documents of American Catholic history*. Milwaukee, WI: Bruce.
- Ellis, J. T. (1974). *American Catholicism* (2nd ed. rev.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Enron “bribed tax officials.” (2003, February 14). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2756345.stm>
- Enron fast facts. (2013, July 2). *CNN News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/02/us/enron-fast-facts/>
- Evans, R. J. (1997). *In defence of history*. London, England: Granta Books.

- Ferch, S. R. (2012). *Forgiveness and power in the age of atrocity*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Finn, D. (2012). Human work in Catholic social thought. In K. R. Lord (Ed.), *Two views of social justice: A Catholic/Georgist dialogue* (pp.178-189). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1111/j.1536-7150.2012.00845.x
- Fischer, D. H. (1970). *Historians' fallacies: Toward a logic of historical thought*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Francis. (2013a). *Evangelii gaudium*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium_en.html
- Francis. (2013b). *Lumen fidei*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20130629_enciclica-lumen-fidei_en.html
- Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat 3.0: A brief history of the twenty-first century* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Picador/Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Fulop-Miller, R. (1937). *Leo XIII and our times: Might of the church-power in the world*. (C. M. R. Bonacina, Trans.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Furey, F. T. (1903). *Life of Leo XIII and history of his pontificate*. New York, NY: Catholic Educational Company.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.
- Garibaldi, G. (1889). *Autobiography of Giuseppe Garibaldi*. (A. Werner, Trans.). London, UK: Smith & Innes.

- Gargan, E. T. (1961). Introduction. In E. T. Gargan (Ed.), *Leo XIII and the modern world* (pp. 3-14). New York, NY: Sheed & Ward.
- Glossary of commonly used terms. (2013). Retrieved from National History Education Clearinghouse website: <http://www.teachinghistory.org/outreach/glossary>
- Godkin, G. S. (1880). *Life of victor Emmanuel II: First king of Italy*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Graham, J. W. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5(1), 43-54. doi:10.2307/3857271
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. L. C. Spears (Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness, 25th anniversary edition*. L.C. Spears (Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hall, A. D. (1899). *A life of the Pope: Leo the thirteenth*. New York, NY: Street & Smith.
- Hayes, C. J. H. (1920). *A political and social history of modern Europe* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Hayles, E. E. Y. (1958). *The Catholic Church in the modern world: A survey from the French Revolution to the present*. London, UK: Eyre & Spottiswoode.
- Healy, R. (2001). *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany*. H. W. Smith (Ed.). Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Hennesey, J. (1988). Leo XIII: Intellectualizing the combat with modernity. *U.S. Catholic Historian*, 7, 393-400. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/>

- Henriot, P. J., DeBerri, E. P., & Schultheis, M. J. (1989). *Catholic social teaching: Our best kept secret* (2nd ed.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Herbert, B. (1951). The Kolping Society and its founder. *The Irish Monthly*, 79(194), 443-445.
- Hild, M. (2012). "Workingmen's democracy" in the Deep South. In J. M. Beeby (Ed.), *Populism in the South revisited: New interpretations and new departures* (pp. 36-55). Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Hill, H. (1998). French politics and Alfred Loisy's modernism. *Church History*, 67(3), 521-536.
doi:10.2307/3170944
- Hitchcock, J. (2012). *History of the Catholic Church: From the apostolic age to the third millennium*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press.
- Holosko, M. J., & Thyer, B. A. (2011). *Pocket glossary for commonly used research terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howell, M., & Prevenier, W. (2001). *From reliable sources: An introduction to historical methods*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hunter, J. C. (2004). *The world's most powerful leadership principle: How to become a servant leader*. New York, NY: Crown Business.
- International Labour Organization. (2013). *Hazardous child labour*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilo.org/ipec/facts/WorstFormsofChildLabour/Hazardouschildlabour/lang--en/index.htm>
- Ip, G. (2011, April 5). America's budget deficit: Mr. Ryan makes his mark. *The Economist*. Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2011/04/americas_budget_deficit/print

- Ireland, J., Coleman, L., Thomas, J. B., Gladden, W., Johnston, J. W., Mendes, H. P., & Coyle, R. F. (1903). Leo XIII: His work and influence. *The North American Review*, 177(562), 321-364. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/25119443
- Jaffe, M. (2010, September 30). R.I.P., TARP: Government rescue ends Sunday. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/tarp-government-bailout-ends-sunday-started-bush-gop/story?id=11765955>
- Janson, A. (2008). Extracting leadership knowledge from formative experiences. *Leadership*, 4(1), 73-94. doi:10.1177/1742715007085770
- John XXIII. (1963). *Pacem in terris*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem_en.html
- John Paul II. (1991). *Centesimus annus*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html
- Jupp, V. (2006). *The sage dictionary of social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Keller, J. E. (1882). *The life and acts of Pope Leo XIII preceded by a sketch of the last days of Pius IX and the origins and laws of the conclave*. New York, NY: Benziger Brothers.
- Keys, D. (2010, August 02). Revealed: Industrial Revolution was powered by child slaves. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/revealed-industrial-revolution-was-powered-by-child-slaves-2041227.html>
- Kiefer, W. (1961). *Leo XIII: A light from heaven*. Milwaukee, WI: Bruce.
- King, B., & Okey, T. (1901). *Italy today*. London, UK: Nisbet.
- Krason, S. M. (2009). *The public order and the sacred order: Contemporary issues, Catholic social thought, and the Western and American traditions*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

- Kraynak, R. P. (2007). Pope Leo XIII and the Catholic response to modernity. *Modern Age*, 49, 527-536. Retrieved from http://www.mmisi.org/ma/49_04/kraynak.pdf
- Latourette, K. S. (1961). The church and the world in the nineteenth century. In E.T. Gargan (Ed.), *Pope Leo XIII and the modern world* (pp. 51-64). New York, NY: Sheed & Ward.
- Leo XIII. (1879). *Aeterni patris*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/Leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_04081879_aeterni-patris_en.html
- Leo XIII. (1888). *Libertas*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/Leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_20061888_libertas_en.html
- Leo XIII. (1891). *Rerum novarum*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_15051891_rerum-novarum_en.html
- Leo XIII. (1901a). Epistola encyclica re economica. *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 24, 300-311.
- Leo XIII. (1901b). *Graves de communi re*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18011901_graves-de-communi-re_en.html
- Leo XIII. (1943). On the condition of workers. In *Two basic social encyclicals: On the condition of workers, Leo XIII, and forty years after, on reconstructing social order, Pius XI*. (Catholic Church, Trans.). New York, NY: Benziger. (Original work published 1891)
- Leo XIII: The new pope. (1878, April 13). *Harper's Bazaar*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/>
- Levi, D. (2010). *Group dynamics for teams* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lewenson, S. B., & Herrmann, E. K. (2007). *Capturing nursing history: A guide to historical methods in research*. New York, NY: Springer.

- Luxmoore, J., & Babiuch, J. (1999). The Catholic Church and communism, 1789-1989. *Religion, State, & Society*, 27, 301-313. doi:10.1080/096374999106502
- MacIntyre, A. (2009). *God, philosophy, universities: A selective history of the Catholic philosophical tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Manning, S. (2003). *Ethical leadership in human services: A multi-dimensional approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Martinez, M. (2013, March 14). CNN Vatican analyst: Pope Francis' name choice "precedent shattering." *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/13/world/pope-name>
- Marx, K. (2002). *Marx on religion*. J. C. Raines (Ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1888). *The Communist Manifesto*. (F. Engels, Trans.). Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/61/pg61.html> (Original work published 1848)
- The Massacre at Perugia: The outrage to Mr. Perkins and his party. (1859, July 19). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F00A12FB34551B7493CBA8178CD85F4D8584F9>
- The massacre of Perugia. (1859). In *The Dublin Review* (Vol. 47, November 1859 and February 1860, pp. 168-264). London, UK: Richardson.
- Massaro, T. (2011). *Living justice: Catholic social teachings in action* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McBrien, R. P. (2010, January 22). What effective leadership looks like. *National Catholic Reporter*.
- McCarthy, J. (1899). *Pope Leo XIII* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Warne.

McCool, G. A. (1978). Twentieth-century scholasticism. *The Journal of Religion*, 58, S198-

S221. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/page/journal/jreligion/>

McCool, G. A. (1994). *The neo-Thomists*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.

McDermott, T. (2013). *Filled with all the fullness of god: An introduction to Catholic spirituality*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

McDowell, W. H. (2002). *Historical research: A guide for writers of dissertations, theses, articles, and books*. London, UK: Longman.

McGovern, J. J. (1903). *The life and life-work of Pope Leo XIII*. Chicago, IL: Catholic Publications.

McMillan, J. F. (2006). Catholic Christianity in France from the restoration to the separation of church and state, 1815-1905. In S. Gilley & B. Stanley (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of Christianity: World Christianities c. 1815-c. 1914* (pp. 217-232). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Meng, G. (2012). Cultivating fear: The vulnerability of immigrant farmworkers in the U.S. to sexual violence and sexual harassment. *Human Rights Watch*. Retrieved from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2012/05/15/cultivating-fear>

Merton, T. (1967). *No man is an island*. Garden City, NY: Image Books.

Merton, T. (1979). *Love and living*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Mich, M. L. K. (2011). *The challenge and spirituality of Catholic social teaching* (2nd ed. rev.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*, 555-570. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.009
- Molony, J. (2006). Catholic social thought. In S. Gilley & B. Stanley (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of Christianity: World Christianities c. 1815-c. 1914* (pp. 142-163). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Moon, B. M., Hoffman, R. R., Novak, J. D., & Canas, A. J. (2011). *Applied concept mapping: Capturing, analyzing, and organizing knowledge*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Morris, J., & Berkes, H. (2013, March 29). Worker suffocations persist as grain storage soars, employers flout safety rules. *Center for Public Integrity*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2013/03/24/12327/worker-suffocations-persist-grain-storage-soars-employers-flout-safety-rules>
- Mulcahy, B. (2011). *Aquinas's notion of pure nature and the Christian integralism of Henry de Lubac: American university studies. Series VII, Theology and religion* (Vol. 314). New York, NY: Lang.
- Nichols, A. (1991). *The shape of Catholic theology: An introduction to its sources, principles, and history*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- O'Byrne, P. J. (1903). *The life and pontificate of Pope Leo XIII*. New York, NY: Benziger.
- Oldcastle, J. (1899). *Life of Leo the thirteenth*. New York, NY: Catholic Publication Society.
- O'Malley, C. J. (1903). *The great white shepherd of Christendom: His holiness Pope Leo XIII: His life, poems, encyclicals, and public documents*. Chicago, IL: Hyland.
- O'Reilly, B. (1903). *Life of Leo XIII from an authentic memoir furnished by his order: The complete life of the venerable father*. Chicago, IL: Winston.
- O'Reilly, K. (2008). *Key concepts in ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Patterson, M. E., & Williams, D. R. (2002). *Collecting and analyzing qualitative data: Hermeneutical principles, methods, and case examples*. Champaign, IL: Sagamore.
- Paul VI. (1967). *Populorum progression*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html
- Pecci, J. (1878). *The church and civilization: Pastoral letters for Lent 1877-1878*. New York, NY: O'Shea
- Perreau-Saussine, E. (2012). *Catholicism and democracy: An essay in the history of political thought*. (R. Rex, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2013, April 3). *First reactions more positive than for Pope Benedict: U.S. Catholics express favorable view of Pope Francis*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org>
- Phelan, C. (2000). *Grand master workman: Terence Powderly and the Knights of Labor*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Pirie, M. (2009). *101 great philosophers: Makers of modern thought*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Pius XI. (1931). *Quadragesimo anno*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html
- Pope, S. J. (2005). Natural law in Catholic social teachings. In K. R. Himes (Ed.), *Modern Catholic social teaching: Commentaries and interpretations*. (pp. 41-71). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Puppets. (1878, February 28). In J. Noyes (Ed.), *The American Socialist: Devoted to the enlargement and perfection of home*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/>
- Quardt, R. (1964). *The master diplomat: From the life of Leo XIII*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House.

- Rae, J. (1901). *Contemporary socialism*. New York, NY: Scribner's.
- Reese, T. J. (2012). *Dear Rep. Paul Ryan*. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/a/fordham.edu/document/d/1JRLM7Jh9PnrxtafWYENXdAmxnXd4gQJMYTu3H4TFHA/edit>
- Riall, L. (1994). *Italian risorgimento: State, society, and national unification*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Riccards, M. P. (2012). *Faith and leadership: The papacy and the Roman Catholic Church*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. R. (2009). *Essential research methods for social work* (2nd ed.). Independence, KY: Cengage Learning.
- Rucker, P., & Farenthold, D. A. (2011, April 4). Overhauls on entitlements and taxes, \$6.2 trillion in cuts over decade. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2011-04-04/politics/35262214_1_big-budget-fight-budget-plans-house-republicans
- Saldana, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schmandt, R. H. (1961). The life and work of Leo XIII. In E.T. Gargan (Ed.), *Pope Leo XIII and the modern world* (pp. 15-50). New York, NY: Sheed & Ward.
- Schmidlin, J., & de Waal, A. (1904). *Life of his holiness Pope Pius X, Together with a sketch of the life of his venerable predecessor, his holiness Pope Leo XIII: Also a history of the conclave, giving a full account of the rites and ceremonies connected with the election of a successor to the see of St. Peter*. New York, NY: Benziger.

- Schmidt, P. (2013, May 3). Georgetown U. adjuncts vote to unionize. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Georgetown-U-Adjuncts-Vote-to/139069/>
- Serafini, M. W. (2012, March 20). New Ryan budget would transform Medicare and Medicaid. *Kaiser Health News*. Retrieved from <http://www.kaiserhealthnews.org/Stories/2012/March/20/ryan-budget-medicare-medicaid-republicans.aspx>
- Shannon, T. A. (2005). *Rerum novarum*. In K. R. Himes (Ed.), *Modern Catholic social teaching: Commentaries & interpretations* (pp.127-150). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Sipe, J. W. & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Smith, J. T. (1903). The papacy in the new century. In W. C. Martineau (Ed.), *A memento of the death of the holy father Pope Leo XIII* (pp. 19-21). Albany, NY: Martineau.
- Sombart, W. (1902). *Socialism and the social movement in the 19th century*. (A. P. Atterbury, Trans.). Chicago, IL: Kerr.
- Southern Poverty Law Center. (2007). *Close to slavery: Guest worker programs in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.splcenter.org>
- Spalding, R. (2000). The Communist Manifesto. *History Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.historytoday.com/roger-spalding/communist-manifesto>
- Spears, L. C. (2001). Introduction: Tracing the past, present, and future of servant leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Wiley.

- Sperber, J. (2005). *The European revolutions, 1848-1851* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stout, D. (2008, September 20). The Wall Street bailout, explained. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/21/business/21qanda.html>
- Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Talbot, J. F. (1886). *Pope Leo XIII: His life and letters, from recent and authentic sources*. Boston, MA: Garrison.
- T'Serclaes, C. D. (1903). *The life and labors of Pope Leo XIII with a summary of his important letters, addresses, and encyclicals*. (M. F. Egan, Trans.). New York, NY: Rand.
- United States Catholic Conference. (1994). *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Doubleday.
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2013). *H-2b temporary non-agricultural workers*. Retrieved from <http://www.uscis.gov>
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2013a). *Morality*. Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/morality/>
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2013b). *Seven themes of Catholic social teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/seven-themes-of-catholic-social-teaching.cfm>

- U.S. Department of Labor. (2010). *U.S. Department of Labor's list of goods produced by child labor or forced labor*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/pdf/2010TVPRA.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2013). *Work authorization for non-us citizens: Temporary agricultural workers (H-2A visas)*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/compliance/guide/taw.htm>
- Vatican Radio Print Service. (2013, June 16). *Pope to G8: Money, politics and economics must serve, not rule*. Retrieved from <http://en.radiovaticana.va/articolo.asp?c=702044>
- Ventresca, R. A. (2009). "A plague of perverse opinions:" Leo XIII's *aeterni patris* and the Catholic encounter with modernity. *Logos*, 12(1), 143-168. doi:10.1353/log.0.0022
- Wallace, L. P. (1966). *Leo XIII and the rise of socialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ward, J. E. (1966). Leo XIII: "The diplomat pope." *The Review of Politics*, 28(1), 47-61. doi:10.1017/S0034670500005933
- Watt, L. (1929). *Catholic social principles: A commentary on the papal encyclical rerum novarum*. London, UK: Burns, Oates, & Washbourne.
- Weir, R. E., & Hanlan, J. P. (2004). *Historical encyclopedia of American labor*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- What is an encyclical? (2013). *Papal Encyclicals Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/encyclical.htm>
- Wooden, C. (2013, March 13). White smoke: Cardinals elect new pope on fifth ballot. *The Catholic Sun*. Retrieved from <http://www.catholicsun.org/2013/03/13/white-smoke-cardinals-elect-new-pope-on-fifth-ballot/>

Woodward, E. L. (1924). The diplomacy of the Vatican under Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII.

Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs, 3(3), 113-138.

doi:10.2307/3014608

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

APPENDIX

IRB EXEMPTION LETTER FOR HISTORICAL ANALYSIS



FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Michele Kuchera
IRB Manager
mkuchera@fordham.edu; xxx-xxx-xxxx

Office of the Institutional Review Board for Research on Human Subjects
Report of Action: IRB Approval Not Needed

Review Date: 10/10/2013
Project Title: Historical Analysis of Documents Written by Pope Leo XIII
Investigator: Henry Davis
School/Department: GSE

Your study as described in your email of October 2, 2013 does not require IRB review and approval. Since the study does not involve human subjects but rather the analysis of documents written by Pope Leo XIII from 1878 to 1903 no further action is required.

Please contact me if you have any questions.