

UDC 330.131.5

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SOCIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS

S. V. LUKIN^a

^aBelarusian State University, Niezaliežnasci Avenue, 4, 220030, Minsk, Belarus

The article examines the Old Testament and the New Testament representation of and patristic ideas on social protection and social responsibility, ways to the sustainable well-being of every member of society, modern Catholic doctrine of social responsibility of business, contemporary Orthodox authors' view of this question, and the motives of socially responsible business in the modern market economy.

Key words: Christian; social responsibility; market; corporate; private; Catholic; Orthodox.

Acknowledgements. The author is very grateful to V. L. Dudkin, postgraduate student at the department of international management of the faculty of economics for the great assistance in preparing the text for publication.

ХРИСТИАНСКАЯ ДОКТРИНА СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ЗАЩИТЫ И СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТИ БИЗНЕСА

С. В. ЛУКИН¹⁾

¹⁾Белорусский государственный университет,
пр. Независимости, 4, 220030, г. Минск, Беларусь

Анализируется христианское учение о социальной защите и социальной ответственности бизнеса. Исследуются пути к устойчивому благосостоянию каждого члена общества, представленные в книгах Ветхого и Нового Завета, святоотеческих трудах, современных католических и православных доктринах социальной ответственности бизнеса. Рассматриваются мотивы социально ответственного бизнеса в современной экономике.

Ключевые слова: христианский; социальная ответственность; рынок; корпоративный; частный; католический; православный.

Благодарность. Автор выражает признательность аспиранту кафедры международного менеджмента экономического факультета БГУ В. Л. Дудкину за неоценимую помощь в подготовке текста к публикации.

Introduction

Ideas on the social protection of the weak and disadvantaged and the social responsibility of those more successful in economic sense, on ways to sustainable well-being of every member of society are found in many books of the Old Testament. This was the subject of many detailed provisions of the Law contained in the Pentateuch; many verses of the Psalms, Proverbs, Sirach and historical books also contain such ideas.

Образец цитирования:

Лукин С. В. Христианская доктрина социальной защиты и социальной ответственности бизнеса // Журн. Белорус. гос. ун-та. Экономика. 2017. № 1. С. 27–38 (на англ.).

For citation:

Lukin S. V. Christian doctrine of social protection and social responsibility of business. *J. Belarus. State Univ. Econ.* 2017. No. 1. P. 27–38.

Автор:

Сергей Владимирович Лукин – доктор экономических наук; заведующий кафедрой международного менеджмента экономического факультета.

Author:

Siarhei Lukin, doctor of science (economics); head of the department of international management, faculty of economics.
lukin@bsu.by

In the New Testament teaching strap, the ante of moral norms is raised even higher. Jesus Christ elevates caring for others, especially the weak and disadvantaged, to the level of the most important moral requirements to his disciples. The early Christians are attempting to solve the issue of property inequalities and poverty in their communities, as is witnessed by the Acts and some of the Epistles of St. Paul.

Caring for the poor and social responsibility were considered as the most important Christian virtues by many Holy Fathers of the first millennium of Christianity. Among them St. Clement of Rome, Origen, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Gregory the Theologian, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine.

The basis of the modern Catholic teaching on social responsibility of business and the wealthy, in addition to the New Testament and patristic ideas, was formed by the writings of the Catholic saint Thomas Aquinas, by his idea of the common good. The modern Catholic doctrine is the most developed Christian teaching in this area. It is revealed in many works dedicated to the Christian view of social responsibility of business. This question is a subject matter of studies at several Catholic universities in the United States and Europe.

In recent decades, an Orthodox doctrine of social responsibility as a ministry began to evolve. The modern Catholic doctrine and the Orthodox view of social responsibility are similar in many ways; essentially similar, one may say, although there are certain differences in emphasis and approach.

According to the Christian faith, God has given people the capability of creative labour, to the creation of some or other useful goods. Thanks to the labour, a person can ensure the welfare of his family and increase the public weal. People are endowed with talents different by their extent and diversity. According to the Christian doctrine, it is the basis of the division of labour. In addition, after the Fall of our first parents, this inevitably leads to the property and social inequalities. Both the division of labour and the property inequalities create a possibility of mutual ministry of people to each other. The accumulated wealth, in addition, can be a means of the rich serving to the weak and disadvantaged members of society pursuant to God's Commandments by a voluntary redistribution of wealth. The Christian ministry of the strong may be effected also by creating a possibility for the weaker to secure their wealth through labour. Social responsibility in the Christian sense is the responsibility of everyone to all and, in the first place, of those who are given more to those who are given less.

Social protection in the Old Testament laws and in the traditions of Ancient Israel

Socially responsible behaviour was perceived in Ancient Israel as a divinely instituted norm. The Mosaic dispensations became the normative core of social protection, around which the numerous Old Testament traditions grew. The law, however, was aimed at protecting not only the poor and disadvantaged. Its provisions were aimed at sustainable well-being of each family, each member of the Israelite society. The basis of this well-being was formed by the Old Testament law and tradition with the property, especially the family allotment sufficient to provide this family with food, clothing and shelter and to ensure its expanded reproduction. In addition, work on the land made it possible for an Israelite to maintain his freedom and dignity.

Two of the Ten Commandments of Moses forbade offences on property and possessions of the Israelites, that is, the Eighth Commandment: "Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20: 15, Leviticus 19: 11, Deuteronomy 5: 1, Zechariah 5: 3–4) and the Tenth Commandment – prohibition of coveting of a neighbour's wife or property (Exodus 20: 17, Deuteronomy 5: 21). The Tenth Commandment thus enhances the Eighth one, extending the ban not only to the action, but also to wishes and intentions.

As regards the land allotments of Israelite families and the protection of the Israelite society members' property, there were more detailed provisions of the Law. It was prohibited to remove one's neighbour's landmark set by the ancestors: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it" (Deuteronomy 19: 14). The author of Proverbs draws attention to this commandment, noting that the plot of land is a means of social protection of the economically weakest members of the Israelite society: "Remove not the old landmark; and enter not into the fields of the fatherless: for their redeemer is mighty; he shall plead their cause with thee" (Proverbs 23: 10–11). Hosea the Prophet refers to the actions of those who remove the bound as an example of extreme wickedness: "The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound: I will pour out my wrath upon them like water" (Hosea 5: 10). In other detailed requirements, the property lost by a neighbour should be returned to the owner as soon as possible (Deuteronomy 22: 1–3). Moreover, it was prescribed to take care of the preservation of the property of one's enemy: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him" (Exodus 23: 4–5). The law on the jubilee year was also aimed against the poorest families' dispossession of land. The law limits the terms of transactions of land purchase and sale by 49 years. In the Old Testament jubilee year, all sold land (with some specific exceptions) had to be restored to their former owners or their heirs. In fact, almost every sale of land

was transformed into its long-term lease until the jubilee year (Leviticus 25: 10–13). Regulations on the release of debt in the sabbatical year were also intended to serve the saving of property as the family welfare foundation. Every creditor should forgive his neighbour's debt as "the Lord's release" but might recover it, however, from a foreigner (Deuteronomy 15: 1–3; Nehemiah 10: 31). Notably, it was pointed out that refusing to borrow to one's neighbour in connection with the approach of the seventh year is sinful (Deuteronomy 15: 9).

Normal socially responsible behaviour of the employer under the Law implies a timely and full payment of the agreed amount to an employee. "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbour, neither rob him: the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning" (Leviticus 19: 13), "At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it: lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee" (Deuteronomy 24: 14–15). It is referred to workers – day laborers hired for the daylight hours. The daily fee was, apparently, a small and for many day laborers, it was the only source of livelihood. The Prophets have repeatedly reminded employers of the dangers to which they expose themselves by delaying and not paying the hired servants' board: "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbour's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work" (Jeremiah 22: 13). The same is said by Malachi the Prophet (Malachi 3: 5).

In turn, the employee's duty, first and foremost to God, is a conscientious and diligent labour. It is, above all, the work on one's own land, but work for the employer is also implied. Very often it is spoken about in the Book of Proverbs (Proverbs 10: 5; 12: 11, 24; 28: 19).

These provisions of the Law were aimed at the social protection of Israelite families with different levels of income and accumulated property, ensuring the possibility of obtaining essential goods by their own work. Its other provisions were intended to protect the poor, economically weak and disadvantaged members of the Israelite society. By Sinai's legislation, in the sabbatical year one should not sow the fields, nor prune the vineyards. All that would grow by itself during this year should come into common use for the nourishment of the owner and his family, a well as slaves and strangers, and "the poor of thy people". Remnants could be eaten by the "the beasts of the field" (Exodus 23: 10–11; Leviticus 25: 1–7). There is an environmental aspect here as well, namely, the concern for the preservation of soil fertility.

Any crop in the field, according to the Law, should not be taken in harvest in full, a part of it had to be left for the destitute: "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I am the Lord your God" (Lev 19: 9–10; 23: 22). It should be noted that this provision of the Law shows, among other things, respect for the human dignity of the poor. They could take the unharvested grain and fruit in the absence of the owners. In other books of the Old Testament, there are examples of how economically weak Israelites and newcomers enjoyed this right (Ruth 2: 2, 15–17). To those having no food, the Law allowed to satisfy hunger before grain crop or grape harvesting in the vineyard and field of one's neighbour but forbade to take grapes or grain at that (Deuteronomy 23: 24–25).

Another way to help the economically weak, according to the Old Testament legislation, was loans. To lend one's neighbour, especially the poor, meant to have mercy on him, and to act according to the commandment (Sirach 29: 1, 11–16). The more wealthy Israelites were ordered, at the issuance of a money loan or at giving out bread to feed the poor, not to impose growth on them, as such a loan is aimed at backing up an impoverished tribesmen (Exodus 22: 25, Leviticus 25: 35–37). It was forbidden to take millstones of a hand mill as a pledge, as they were a vital means of production for of the family: "No man shall take the nether or the upper millstone to pledge: for he taketh a man's life to pledge" (Deuteronomy 24: 6). Respect for the human dignity of the poor was manifested in the prescriptions on a security for the loan. When lending out something, one should not go to the borrower's house for a pledge; the one taking a loan should bring out the pledge himself. The collateral was supposed to be returned to a poor before sundown (Deuteronomy 24: 10–13, 17). As is mentioned above, the Law required to forgive debt in the sabbatical year and not to deny a loan in connection with an approach of the seventh year. Among other things, this was another form of poor relief.

Godly tradition of the ancient Israelites was debt forgiveness and assistance to the poor in commemoration of holidays and major events. This, in particular, is narrated in the book of Nehemiah (Nehemiah 5: 10–11, 8: 10). Mutual exchange of gifts and alms gift to the poor became one of Purim celebration traditions (Esther 9: 19, 22).

In the books of the Old Testament, there is a repeated idea that the beneficent gets in return an even greater benefit from the Lord acting as a kind of representative of the favoured man in this exchange. The author of Proverbs says that "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again" (Proverbs 19: 17). Moreover, Proverbs contain the idea that a greedy person often becomes the unwitting benefactor, not getting, however, nothing in return, "He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor" (Proverbs 28: 8). The 41st psalm says: "Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble. The Lord will preserve him, and keep

him alive; and he shall be blessed upon the earth: and thou wilt not deliver him unto the will of his enemies. The Lord will strengthen him upon the bed of languishing: thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness” (Psalms 41: 1–3). The author of the Book of Jesus the Son of Sirach repeatedly returns to the idea of benefactor’s reward. According to him, alms free from sins just as water extinguishes flame (Sirach 3: 31). Alms are the best protection against misfortune and the scheme of the enemy: “Lose thy money for thy brother and thy friend, and let it not rust under a stone to be lost. Lay up thy treasure according to the commandments of the most High, and it shall bring thee more profit than gold. Shut up alms in thy storehouses: and it shall deliver thee from all affliction. It shall fight for thee against thine enemies better than a mighty shield and strong spear” (Sirach 29: 10–13), “Brethren and help are against time of trouble: but alms shall deliver more than them both” (Sir 40: 24). The idea of charity and philanthropy as a sure sign of correction and departing from a life of sin was not alien to the Old Testament either. Daniel the Prophet advised the king Nebuchadnezzar to redeem lawlessness with mercy to the poor: “Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquility” (Dan 4: 27).

According to the author of the Book of Jesus the Son of Sirach, charity should be accompanied by a respectful and attentive attitude to those who need help. One should do good without reproach and insults to someone the good is done to: “My son, blemish not thy good deeds, neither use uncomfortable words when thou givest any thing. A fool will upbraid churlishly, and a gift of the envious consumeth the eyes” (Sirach 18: 15, 18). The same author considers unreasonable, unhelpful and even hated by the Lord and people the one who says a lot of his benefaction, requires gratitude and, at the same time, barely having time to borrow, begins to demand the debt back “The gift of a fool shall do thee no good when thou hast it; neither yet of the envious for his necessity: for he looketh to receive many things for one. He giveth little, and upbraideth much; he openeth his mouth like a crier; to day he lendeth, and to morrow will he ask it again: such an one is to be hated of God and man. The fool saith, I have no friends, I have no thank for all my good deeds, and they that eat my bread speak evil of me” (Sirach 20: 14–16).

Thus, already in the Old Testament the tradition of philanthropy and socially responsible behaviour was considered as the performance of God’s commandments.

The New Testament doctrine of social protection and social responsibility

Christian teaching opens the way for further spiritual growth and suggests a transition to a more perfect state of man, especially in the aspect of his socially responsible behaviour. According to the evangelists, at the beginning of his public ministry, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus speaks of covert alms, that is, sincere and free from vanity (Matthew 6: 1–4). The secret alms are visible only to God, who, as is said in that great sermon, “which seeth in secret himself shall reward <...> openly” (Matthew 6: 4). Such alms assimilate material goods to spiritual ones, which are indivisible, equal and cannot be bought and sold. It is not always possible to keep the alms or, understanding this in a broader sense, socially responsible behaviour secret. Nonetheless, the philanthropist who seeks to act in a Christian manner should do for this all in his power. In another sermon, Jesus pointed out that charity is critically important for salvation (to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, dress the one having no clothes, give shelter to strangers, visit the sick and imprisoned) (Matthew 25: 34–46). Charity, diverse caring about one’s neighbour should be regarded by a Christian as a kind of spiritual investments giving infinite returns. “Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again” – these words sum up the Sermon on the Mount. Give means also forgiveness, and charity, and giving a loan (not expecting to get it back), and blessing those who curse you – almost everything Jesus is talking about before. It is natural for a Christian to have the desire to give to others more than to take from them. According to Paul the Apostle, the norm for the Christian should be to support the weak with the facilities procured by labour: “I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive” (Acts 20: 35).

In the apostolic community of Jerusalem, according to the two fragments of the book of Acts, the attempt to remove the problem of social protection of the community members was undertaken by the voluntary renunciation of the exclusive right to one’s property and spreading it to all members of the community: “And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. <...> And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common” (Acts 2: 44–45, 4: 32). According to St. John Chrysostom, the members of the apostolic community sought to make the material wealth an image of spiritual goods: “they saw that spiritual things are common,

and no one there has more than other, and they speedily came together, to the same thing in common, even to the imparting to all” [1]. Such a property system, however, judging from the book of Acts and some fragments of St. Paul’s epistles given below, lasted for a short period of time. It is most likely that the refusal of it was due to the following reasons. Members of the community could give up private property rights on their own property. So did, for example, Josiah-Barnabas who sold his land and gave the proceeds to the community (Acts 4: 36–37). In case the land or other property was owned by the family, not all the members of which were fully sharing the convictions of one of them, that would inevitably lead to a conflict. The story of Ananias and Sapphira set forth in the fifth chapter of the Acts (remarkably, immediately after the story about the abandonment by community members of their property) shows that not all were sincere in such abandonment and placed on themselves a burden they couldn’t bear. In addition, the community grew rapidly which complicated the task of distribution of funds within it. Due to the coordination problems, the aid does not always reach those who were most in need of it. The Apostles were forced to choose deacons whose function was the distribution of food and other essentials (Acts 6: 1–6). Seven deacons were chosen which means that the apostolic community of Jerusalem was quite large at that time.

In the following centuries of Christianity, such property order, close to the pattern of the Jerusalem community, existed only in such small economies as coenobitic monasteries and pious families. In most Christian communities, a practice of allocating the church property, which is replenished by contributions from community members and external donors, was established (and exists today). Community members donated, as a rule, only a part of their property. At the same time they owned its remaining part as private property owners. This system created an opportunity for community members to commensurate their sacrifice with their spiritual forces. For the social protection purposes, funds were donated either directly or indirectly, through the church property.

In his epistles, St. Paul gives a lot of space to alms, social protection, intra and inter-communal redistribution of material resources. According to him, the confidence in the reward for generosity, especially in the life of the age to come, contributes to the generous and joyful charity. “This I say, He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully” (2 Corinthians 9: 6). In the following verses, however, he speaks about the earthly life of Christians and their abundance, which is not decreasing because of alms: “God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work” (2 Corinthians 9: 8). Here the Apostle wrote about, if we may say so, an additional effect of alms-giving: thanks to God by those who received it: “For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; Whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men” (2 Cor 9: 12–13). Here and in other passages of his epistles, Paul the Apostle develops the idea which is met as early as in the Old Testament and which we have discussed above. This refers to the point that both the favoured and the benefactor have kindness to each other and need each other. With regard to this idea, St. John Chrysostom writes that “all of us are in need one of another? The soldier of the artisan, the artisan of the merchant, the merchant of the husbandman, the slave of the free man, the master of the slave, the poor man of the rich, the rich man of the poor, he that works not of him that gives alms, he that bestows of him that receives. For he that receives alms supplies a very great want, a want greater than any. For if there were no poor, the greater part of our salvation would be overthrown, in that we should not have where to bestow our wealth. So that even the poor man who appears to be more useless than any is the most useful of any” [2].

In his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul the Apostle clearly is in favour of redistribution of material resources within the community and between the Christian communities for the purpose of social protection. The extent of this redistribution, as noted above, depends on the internal disposition of those who sacrificed. At the same time, many Christians since early Christian times were happy to give their last property to their brothers. For this reason, Paul the Apostle says that uniformity in consumption is quite an acceptable redistribution limit. Addressing the Corinthians, the Apostle says that not should be that “other men be eased, and ye burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality: as it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack” (2 Corinthians 8: 13–15). A prerequisite of such Christian reallocation should be voluntariness springing from a loving heart: “Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful give” (2 Corinthians 9: 7).

Thus, according to the New Testament, the fundamental answer eliminating the social protection issue is a voluntary renunciation of property, of one’s exclusive right to property for the benefit of the community of fellow believers and associates. The welfare of this community will continue to grow if each member will follow the principle of giving more than taking. A necessary condition for the existence of such a community

is a sufficient spiritual age of its members. In the absence of spiritual strength to live in such a community, Christians are called upon to serve their less secured co-religionists and other people with their property. This service of Christians living in the neighbouring community of families can take the form of intra-and inter-communal redistribution of the products of labour, donations in one form or another.

Patristic view on the social responsibility of Christians

The basis of the views of the Fathers of the first millennium of Christianity on the property and the social responsibility of the owner is the idea that God is the supreme owner of the world created by Him. The man is just a manager, a steward of the property entrusted to him which he should dispose of in accordance with the will of the Owner. Many of them considered the property system of the apostolic community of Jerusalem discussed above to be close to the Christian ideal. At the same time, they were not supporters of the abolition of private property. Those who were able to give up their property had, in their view, to do so on the basis of their personal voluntary decisions. Those who were yet unable were called to dispose of their property in accordance with the God's will, i. e., responsibly in relation to other people, because, through the God, their private property belongs to everyone. St. Gregory the Theologian formulated the Christian principle of socially responsible behaviour in the following way: to serve one's neighbour with one's property to the extent of internal readiness for such service: "Give up all, and acquire the one God, because you are a dispensator of the property of another. If you do not want to leave it, then give the major part. If you do not want this either, then at least use the excess piously" [3].

The Christians of the first centuries did not oppose private property, seeing it as a means of getting rid of extreme poverty coming to the lack of the most basic means of subsistence. Thus, Hermas who lived in the II century AD, author of *The Shepherd*, believed that a poor man is like a shackled and this condition can bring him to a grave sin. The duty of a wealthy man is to save him from this danger: "he who is harassed by misfortune of this sort is afflicted and tortured with equal torment as one who is in chains. For many men on account of calamities of this kind, because they can bear them no longer, lay violent hands on themselves. He then who knows the calamity of a man of this kind and rescueth him not, committeth great sin, and becometh guilty of the man's blood" [4]. Hermas is also one of the first Christian writers considering business and economic activities as a service to God. "Spend your riches and all your displays, which ye received from God, on fields and houses of this kind. For to this end the Master enriched you, that ye might perform these ministrations for Him" [4]. Many early Christian writers, including St. Clement of Rome, Origen, St. Clement of Alexandria, called to perceive the material wealth as a gift of God. The latter, as is well known, paid especially a lot of attention to economic issues. In the context of our question, his view of the property and real wealth is particularly interesting. Only fellowship with God makes a man truly rich: "if what belongs to friends be reckoned common property, and man be the friend of God-for through the mediation of the Word has he been made the friend of God – then accordingly all things become man's, because all things are God's, and the common property of both the friends, God and man. It is time, then, for us to say that the pious Christian alone is rich and wise, and of noble birth" [5].

St. John Chrysostom emphasizes that a sin can be the source of both wealth and poverty. An example of sinfully acquired property can be wealth acquired by deception, theft, witchcraft, etc. Poverty resulting from a dissolute life is also a consequence of sin. Wealth, as St. John Chrysostom puts it, is not a bad thing in itself. These are the ways to acquire and use it that may be bad. "And these things I say, not because riches are a sin: the sin is in not distributing them to the poor, and in the wrong use of them. For God made nothing evil but all things very good; so that riches too are good" [6]. In another text, he points out: "...we forbid not riches, but ill-gotten riches. For it is lawful to be rich, but without covetousness, without rapine and violence, and an ill report from all men" [7]. An idea similar to John Chrysostom's is expressed by St. Augustine: "Things, therefore, that have been called into being both in praise of their author and for the proving of the good and the punishment of the bad cannot in any way rightly to be disparaged. <...> God, the author and controller of things, has so distributed gold and silver among men and women, that on the one hand they may be appreciated as good in their own way and by nature, though not the highest good or even a particularly important one" [8].

The uneven distribution of wealth was regarded by patristic thought as a means for Christians' mutual service. According to St. Basil the Great, "Where have the things you now possess come from? If you say they just spontaneously appeared, then you are an atheist, not acknowledging the Creator, nor showing any gratitude towards the one who gave them. But if you say that they are from God, declare to us the reason why you received them. Is God unjust, who divided to us the things of this life unequally? Why are you wealthy while that other man is poor? Is it, perhaps, in order that you may receive wages for kindheartedness and faithful stewardship, and in order that he may be honored with great prizes for his endurance?" [9]. At the same time, the Fathers noted that only the transformed inner world of a man can transform the property relations between

people. According to Lactantius: “He, therefore, who wishes to place men on an equality, ought not to take away marriage and wealth, but arrogance, pride, and haughtiness, that those who are powerful and lifted up on high may know that they are on a level even with the most needy <...> nothing but reverence towards God can produce this result” [10]. A Christian, therefore, can use his wealth piously under any economic system.

St. John Chrysostom not only expresses the normative ideas, but offers to take measures aimed at strengthening the social protection of the poor. Still serving in Antioch, in one of his sermons St. John gave a detailed account of a particular project. He noted that the Antioch society was divided, by property status, into three classes: the rich, the poor and the middle class, the majority belonging to the middle class. “As, for instance, a tenth part is of rich, and a tenth of the poor that have nothing at all, and the rest of the middle sort. <...> For the very rich indeed are but few, but those that come next to them are many; again, the poor are much fewer than these” [11]. The rich and the middle class, according to the holy hierarch, could feed the hungry without incurring large costs. as an example for wealthy Antioch Christians, St. John adduces the charity of the Church, noting that neither the capital, nor the revenue of the beneficent is depleted. However, he does not oblige his listeners to do the same, but, condescending to their weakness, calls for a reasonable socially responsible behaviour. “For neither do I constrain you to lessen your possessions, not because I do not wish it, but because I see you very backward. It is not then this I say, but spend of your fruits, and treasure up nothing from these. It is enough for you to have the money of your income pouring in on you as from a fountain; make the poor sharers with you, and become a good steward of the things given you of God” [11]. To increase the power of his argument, St. John Chrysostom responds to an imaginary opponent claiming that he is paying tribute for the maintenance of the soldiers who are fighting for him with the enemy: “...there is here too a camp, that of the poor, and a war, which the poor are waging for you. <...> Seeing therefore these soldiers every day fighting in your behalf with the devil by their supplications and prayers, demand of yourself this good contribution, their nourishment. For this King being mild has not assigned you any to demand it of you, but desires you should give it willingly” [11]. It is noteworthy that in many of his sermons St. John Chrysostom speaks about the social responsibility of individuals, not of corporations or the state. He represents this as a kind of investment process, the aim of which is to save souls. Here is how he develops the idea of “heavenly investment” in his interpretation of the XXI chapter of the Gospel According to Matthew: “There is no need here to find one to carry in what you have contributed; contribute only, and straightway it goes up <...> that it may remain for you with great profit. <...> For here whatsoever you may have given, it is not possible to recover; but there you will receive them again with much honor, and shall gain greater, and more spiritual gains. <...> Yea farther, God has given you bonds. For “he that shows mercy to a poor man”, it is said, “lends to the Lord” (Proverbs 19: 17). He gave you also an earnest, and bail, and this being God! What sort of earnest? The things in the present life, the visible, the spiritual things, the foretaste of the things to come. <...> Let us not then be beggarly; neither be inhuman and savage towards ourselves, but let us traffic in that good merchandise; that we may both ourselves take it away with us when we depart, and leave it to our own children, and attain to the good things to come, by the grace and love towards man of our Lord Jesus Christ” [11]. The corporate social responsibility, if we continue his logic, is an investment through an intermediary. These are the main features of the patristic view of the social responsibility of Christians.

Catholic teaching on the social responsibility of business

The Catholic doctrine of the socially responsible business is largely based on Thomas Aquinas’ teaching on the priority for a Christian of the common good over the private one. According to the author of “*Summa Theologiae*”, “the common good of many is more Godlike than the good of an individual” [12]. According to his thought, man is in error in wanting a particular good if he does not see the common good as the ultimate goal [12]. Backing up his point with the arguments of reason, Thomas Aquinas points out that, firstly, the benefit of the individual is impossible without a common good of his family, community, country as a whole. He quotes the ancient Roman thinker Valerius Maximus that it is better to be poor in a rich country than rich in a poor country. Secondly, according to Thomas Aquinas, since man is a part of the family and society, he must consider his own good as deriving from the good of the many. Favourable condition of parts is often dependent on their relationships to the whole. In support of this argument, Thomas quotes St. Augustine that any part that is not harmonized with the whole is disgusting [12].

The basis of the modern Catholic social doctrines is made up of a number of encyclicals beginning with *Rerum Novarum* by Pope Leo XIII published in 1891. Here Thomas Aquinas’ idea of the priority of the common good is further developed when considering a company’s activity, the interaction of an individual, corporation and society a whole. In addition to the idea of the common good, the ideas of subsidiarity and solidarity are at the basis of the modern Catholic social teaching as well. It is no coincidence, therefore, that when considering the social responsibility of an individual, a corporation and the state the focus is on the first two. Here the

Catholic doctrine of social responsibility substantially differs from the modern Orthodox view and is fundamentally different from the Communist views.

According to the Catholic social doctrine, the existence of private property gives rise to the owner's responsibility for its pious management. At the same time, this institution creates a possibility of such management. Private ownership allows people to do good to others selflessly helping them. Cardinal Joseph Höffner, referring to St. Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, Ambrose and Thomas Aquinas, says that "without the Fall a communist community of goods might have been realized in paradise, since in paradise the negative spirit of discord and greed would have been lacking". In the era after the Fall, an economy based on the common property can only lead to disastrous consequences and transform into a kind of a concentration camp [13]. Thomas Aquinas makes two statements: man is first of all justified in taking earthly goods into his possession in order to procure and dispense them – a right which man would have possessed even in the paradisiacal state. Second, in the fallen age, that right becomes a necessity and an obligation because otherwise the disinclination to work, disorder, and unrest would frustrate the attainment of the material end of the economy. Thus, according to Thomas Aquinas, with respect to the realm of consumption, man should consider earthly goods not as his own, but as common, so that, to wit, he is ready to communicate them to others in their need. The accumulation of consumer goods by the owner, therefore, cannot be regarded as a virtue. As for investment goods, their accumulation and productive use by the owner contributes to the economic development and public welfare, and therefore should not be equated to the accumulation of consumer amenities [13].

As noted above, one of the fundamental principles of Catholic social teaching is the principle of subsidiarity. Cardinal Höffner emphasizes that "state welfare is cold and impersonal" [13]. It is no accident, therefore, that Catholic authors warn of the dangers of excessive transmission of social protection functions to the state. Catholic authors note that in the modern world, even in countries where the market economy is dominant, negative trends began to emerge. Workers not having a significant, first of all, capital, property expect economic security not from the property but from the salary and the social security system. This is contrary to the principle of subsidiarity. Ownership of investment resources in the modern world, in turn, passes more and more to institutional investors and legal entities. Among the forms of private property, the role of current consumption goods, durable goods, and rights to social security is strengthening and the role of savings and participation in the productive capital is declining. The way for overcoming the crisis is seen by Catholic authors in the widest possible "participation [of citizens] in capital formation" [13]. Two forms of such participation are identified: employees' ownership of the company shares; participation in capital formation of workers, civil servants and other categories of citizens through the ownership of shares of investment funds and of other institutional investors. The idea of capital property, ownership of the means of production as the basis of social protection of families is rooted as back as in the Old Testament, as discussed above. Catholic social teaching takes this idea and appreciates not only direct but also indirect participation of citizens in capital formation. Such participation, according to this doctrine, conforms to the principle of subsidiarity and is a solid foundation of social self-protection of families and individuals. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the governmental social policy complete this 'social protection pyramid'.

Corporations, organizations and private companies, according to the Catholic doctrine, should also be part of a social protection system. A corporation complying with the Christian principle is regarded as a Community of Work focused on the achievement of the common good [14]. A separate company or organization is harmonized as part of the whole (society) not only as a subject which produces goods and services for the society, but also as a socially responsible entity. The maximum responsibility arises in relation to the 'neighbours' of an organization: its customers, suppliers, shareholders, local community and employees. In turn, the employees are also harmonized with the company as a part with the whole, and not just as a part with the whole. According to Michael Naughton, "a person becomes a person within a community not simply as a part to a whole, but as a whole to a whole; a community is a true community only if it is made up of responsible persons who give of themselves by serving those outside the community, which is the basis of developing those within it" [14].

Modern Catholic scholars conduct both normative and positive research in the field of CSR¹ [15; 16]. And the findings of researchers who use these different approaches are, in many respects, very close. Normative views on the responsible behaviour of entrepreneurs and managers prevailing in the society influence their actions. Rival corporations, small and medium-sized firms are seeking to meet public expectations regarding their socially responsible behaviour. During the Fall semester 2014, the author of this article studied the theory

¹One of the best normative studies by Catholic authors on corporate social responsibility is the work by Michael Naughton and Helen Alford "Managing As If Faith Mattered" (Helen J. Alford, O.P. & Michael J. Naughton, *Managing As If Faith Mattered: Christian Social Principles in The Modern Organization*. Notre Dame, 2001). By the same token, one of most extensive and fundamental positive studies of CSR experience of American corporations is the book: *Corporate Responsibility: The American Experience*. Carroll, Archie B., Kenneth J. Lipartito, James E. Post, Patricia H. Werhane, and Kenneth E. Goodpaster, executive editor. Cambridge, 2012.

and practice of socially responsible business at the University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota. Among other things, he interviewed several representatives of top management of American corporations with headquarters in Minnesota, including Eric S. Rangen, Vice President of UnitedHealth Group (# 14, Fortune 500, at the time of study), Paul W. Johnson, Vice President of Ameriprise Financial, and others. These corporations pay much attention to CSR. On the question of why the management of these corporations attaches such great importance to this, all the interviewees gave similar responses. The subject of their concern is a good corporate reputation. To a large extent, socially responsible behaviour contributes to that.

Normative ideas, including the social doctrines of different Christian denominations, may have a significant impact on public expectations for CSR. In turn, social expectations influence the behaviour of companies' management taking care of the good reputation of their firms. At the same time, personal views of managers and shareholders affect companies' activities in the field of CSR in a much lesser degree. Comparing CSR reports of corporations included in the Fortune 500, we can see that they are fundamentally similar and differ only in the details.

Orthodox view of the socially responsible business

Orthodox socio-economic theory in general and the concept of social responsibility of business in particular are developed to a much lesser extent, in comparison with the Catholic social doctrine. This applies both to the church-wide documents and works by individual authors.

During the period of the communist dictatorship and the continuing persecution of the Church in the Soviet Union, almost all the efforts of the clergy and laity were aimed at preserving the liturgical life of the Church. Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia was in a better position as regards external persecution. In addition, most of its members found refuge in the most economically developed countries of the world. All this created more favourable conditions for the development of the Orthodox socio-economic thought. One of its brightest representatives is St. Archbishop John (Shakhovskoy) of San Francisco, a representative of an ancient noble family who has long carried a pastoral service in Nazi Germany and then moved to California.

In his "Foundations of Pastoral Sociology", Archbishop John focuses on Christian understanding of poverty and wealth, ownership issues, corporate social responsibility, which is regarded as the service of the rich. Noting the moral neutrality of wealth, Archbishop John points out that neither wealth is harmful in itself, nor is poverty beneficial in itself <...> but lust, wealth deification (both by the rich and the poor) is a personal and social poison [17]. On the ethical world map, according to Archbishop John, there are three camps: 1 – the irreligious poor, 2 – the irreligious rich and 3 – poor and rich (in an economic sense) Christians. For the Church of Christ there are rich and poor in another capacity, "the rich" are those poor in spirit, "the poor" – those enriching themselves with earthly values [17].

With regard to the (economically) rich, according to Archbishop John, the Church has the following custom: they serve it. With regard to the poor: it serves them. The poor are considered to be deserving help, the rich – to be worthy to serve. "In a purely earthly sense of wealth, power and position are, for the Christian consciousness, always related to the principle of service, not <...> of enjoying the earthly life (which is the principle not just of paganism, but of the lower paganism, because the higher one towered above this principle of epicurism)" [17]. Then Archbishop John develops his thought in the following way: "Telling to the world "he that is greatest among you shall be your servant", the Lord Jesus Christ meant by the "greatest" a rich, whether with money, position, talent. <...> The "greatest" is to serve, not to dominate through those gifts (material or spiritual) which are given to him only for a time" [17]. What is given to man as a "talent", according to Archbishop John, has to be put into circulation for the benefit of the whole world and not buried for oneself. Burying for oneself means egoistic use of one's wealth. It may be added that making profit for oneself, from a Christian point of view, is not putting into circulation but rather burying one's "talent". Circulation, on the contrary, is a gracious wealth management, which, according to the Archbishop, is possible in two ways: some are distributing their property at once or gradually. Others maintain a facade of possession, but in their hearts sincerely give it to God, caring only about its right distribution. This right distribution may be "normal economic management, building a good earthly factory or agricultural enterprise". However, as is noted by Archbishop John: "In appearance, it will be as "all things of this world", but in its internal content, it will be some implementation of the Kingdom of God..." [17]. Wealthy Christians – landowners and entrepreneurs – being formal owners become, in fact, caring fathers or even servants to the people working for them.

A little more than a decade later after the end of persecution of the Church in Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union, a Council of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church was convened at the turn of the millennium. The most important document adopted by the Council was the "Foundations of the Social Concept of the Russian Orthodox Church" (Foundations). The issues of the social responsibility of business found their place in the section devoted to economic problems. The outline of the Russian Orthodox Church's

view of these issues is contained in the “Code of Ethical Principles and Rules of Economic Management”. Both documents represent a normative doctrine, a description, as is stated in the Preamble to the Code, of an ideal economic model which does not exist now but which we may and should seek in everyday life.

The Foundations’ and the Code’s emphasis is on the personal social responsibility of an entrepreneur. It is noteworthy that the entrepreneurship is seen as a kind of work, though very specific. “The Church blesses every work aimed to benefit people; it does not give preference to any of the types of human activities if it conforms to the Christian moral standards” [18]. The Foundations state that our Lord Jesus Christ does not highlight any of them in his parables referring to various professions, including those related to business and management (merchant, steward). In the Code, entrepreneurial activity is equivalent to labour as well: “The welfare of honest entrepreneurs and workers must comply with their labour input. Expressing this view, the Church explicitly seeks to overcome the stereotype of irreconcilable contradictions between labour and capital formed and rooted over the years of Communist rule. The Church sees, first of all, the common goals of the business and the employees. In Christ, there is neither a businessman nor an employee. If “there is neither bond nor free”, as St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Galatians (3: 28), the more this applies to free employers and employees [19].

Social responsibility rests with each worker, both with an entrepreneur and an employee. This idea is gaining importance in the modern world, and especially for the residents of the Gigapolis¹, in which the proportion of income derived from labour in total income has exceeded 60 % and continues to grow. Moreover, the income of many formal employees (representatives of the top management of corporations, successful athletes, popular musicians and others) is several times higher than the income of entrepreneurs who pursue an occupation in the field of small and medium-sized businesses, as well as shareholders’ stock yield.

The Foundations highlight the idea that the Holy Scripture points to the two moral motives of labour: work to sustain oneself and work to give to the needy; it is also noted that the God’s commandment orders the workers to take care of those people who, for various reasons, cannot earn a living for themselves: the weak, the sick, strangers (refugees), orphans and widows, and share with them the fruits of labour, “that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands” (Deuteronomy 24: 19) [18]. The Code further develops this idea: “Allocation of a fraction of revenue to help the elderly and the sick, disabled and disadvantaged children should be the norm for any profitable enterprise, as well as for any wealthy working person, including employees” [19]. Entrepreneurs, due to the specifics of their activities related to the use of hired labour, are responsible to the workers employed by them. First of all, it is expressed in the timely payment of honest labour. The Foundations state that the refusal to pay for honest work is not only a crime against man, but also a sin against the God [18]. Labour is the main source of livelihood of an employee, the Code continues, therefore unjustified dismissal, low pay, untimely and incomplete payment of wages (a very common phenomenon in the 1990s in Russia) strangle his life [19]. The Code calls entrepreneurs’ failure to pay decent salaries to their employees a plunder which dooms them to poverty and rancor, depriving of joy of labour. The Code determines qualitatively the cost of living, the lower limit of wages. Wages must not just allow a person to afford adequate nutrition, but also to acquire the necessary household items, to raise children, to provide themselves with housing [19]. This is a major, but not the only obligation of the employer, in terms of the Foundations and the Code. Economic management in all its forms is a socially responsible activity. The Foundations and the Code identify a number of aspects of this responsibility of business: responsibility for the spiritual, intellectual and physical development of employees and management, care about their proper recreation, participation in the programs of social and pension insurance of employees, development of partnership programs, involvement of employees in company management, environmental commitment, responsibility for public morals. It is particularly noted that fair competition is also a socially responsible behaviour.

These are the foundations on which, we hope, the Russian Orthodox Church’s concept of socially responsible business will be evolved.

Conclusion

The Mosaic dispensations became the normative core of social protection, around which the numerous Old Testament traditions grew. The law, however, was aimed at protecting not only the poor and disadvantaged. Its provisions were aimed at sustainable well-being of each family, each member of the Israelite society. The basis of this well-being was formed by the Old Testament law and tradition with the property, especially the family allotment sufficient to provide this family with food, clothing and shelter and to ensure its expanded reproduction.

According to the New Testament, the fundamental answer eliminating the social protection issue is a voluntary renunciation of property, of one’s exclusive right to property for the benefit of the community of fellow

¹The most developed countries of the modern world, which are home to about 1 billion people, are increasingly representing a single city due to the development of means of communication and the unification of lifestyle.

believers and associates. The welfare of this community will continue to grow if each member will follow the principle of giving more than taking. A necessary condition for the existence of such a community is a sufficient spiritual age of its members. In the absence of spiritual strength to live in such a community, Christians are called upon to serve their less secured co-religionists and other people with their property.

The basis of the views of the Fathers of the first millennium of Christianity on the property and the social responsibility of the owner is the idea that God is the supreme owner of the world created by Him. The man is just a manager, a steward of the property entrusted to him which he should dispose of in accordance with the will of the Owner. Those who were able to give up their property had, in their view, to do so on the basis of their personal voluntary decisions. Those who were yet unable were called to dispose of their property in accordance with the God's will, i. e., responsibly in relation to other people, because, through the God, their private property belongs to everyone. St. Gregory the Theologian formulated the Christian principle of socially responsible behaviour in the following way: to serve one's neighbour with one's property to the extent of internal readiness for such service.

The Catholic doctrine of the socially responsible business is largely based on Thomas Aquinas' teaching on the priority for a Christian of the common good over the private one. According to this author, the Christian norm is the perception by the owner of its consumer goods as intended not only for its own consumption, but also for helping those in need. The accumulation of consumer goods by the owner cannot, therefore, be regarded as a virtue. As for investment goods, their accumulation and productive use by the owner contributes to the economic development and public welfare, and therefore should not be equated to the accumulation of consumer goods. Corporations, organizations and private companies, according to the Catholic doctrine, should also be part of a social protection system. A corporation complying with the Christian principle is regarded as a Community of Work focused on the achievement of the common good. According to the Catholic social doctrine, the existence of private property gives rise to the owner's responsibility for its pious management. At the same time, this institution creates a possibility of such management. Private ownership allows people to do good to others selflessly helping them. One of the fundamental principles of the Catholic social teaching is the principle of subsidiarity. The Catholic social doctrine appreciates not only direct but also indirect participation of citizens in the capital formation. Such participation, according to this doctrine, is a solid foundation of social self-protection of families and individuals. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the governmental social policy complete this 'social protection pyramid'. A separate company or organization is harmonized as part of the whole (society) not only as a subject which produces goods and services for the society, but also as a socially responsible entity. The maximum responsibility arises in relation to the 'neighbours' of an organization: its customers, suppliers, shareholders, local community and employees.

One of the most prominent representatives of the Orthodox socio-economic thought is St. Archbishop John (Shakhovskoy) of San Francisco. In his "Foundations of Pastoral Sociology", Archbishop John focuses on Christian understanding of poverty and wealth, ownership issues, corporate social responsibility, which is regarded as the service of the rich. With regard to the (economically) rich, according to Archbishop John, the Church has the following custom: they serve it. With regard to the poor: it serves them. The poor are considered to be deserving help, the rich – to be worthy to serve. According to its modern doctrine, the Orthodox Church explicitly seeks to overcome the stereotype of irreconcilable contradictions between labour and capital formed and rooted over the years of Communist rule. The Church sees, first of all, the common goals of the business and the employees. According to the modern doctrine of the Russian Orthodox Church, the allocation of a revenue fraction to help the elderly and the sick, disabled and disadvantaged children should become a norm for any profitable enterprise, as well as for any wealthy working person, including employees. Entrepreneurs, due to the specifics of their activities related to the use of hired labour, bear responsibility to the workers employed by them.

References

1. St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. Homily VII. *Documenta Catholica Omnia*. URL: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0345-0407,_Iohannes_Chrysostomus,_Homilies_Of_The_Acts_Of_The_Apostles,_EN.pdf (date of access: 15.02.2017).
2. St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. Homily XVII. *Documenta Catholica Omnia*. URL: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0345-0407,_Iohannes_Chrysostomus,_Homilies_on_First_Corinthians,_EN.pdf (date of access: 02.02.2017).
3. St. Gregory of Nazianzus. *Carmina Moralia*. Moscow, 1889 (in Russ.).
4. The Shepherd of Hermas. Transl. by J. B. Lightfoot. *Early Christian Writings*. URL: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/shepherd-lightfoot.html> (date of access: 11.02.2017).
5. Clement of Alexandria. *Early Christian Writings*. URL: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/clement-exhortation.html> (date of access: 12.02.2017).

6. St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. Homily XIII. *Documenta Catholica Omnia*. URL: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0345-0407,_Iohannes_Chrysostomus,_Homilies_on_First_Corinthians,_EN.pdf (date of access: 28.02.2017).
7. St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on First Corinthians. Homily XI. URL: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/0345-0407,_Iohannes_Chrysostomus,_Homilies_on_First_Corinthians,_EN.pdf (date of access: 11.02.2017).
8. St. Augustine. Sermon 50. *The works of Saint Augustine*. A translation for the 21st century. URL: <https://books.google.by/books?id=Z3XYAAAAMAAJ&pg=PA344&lpg> (date of access: 12.02.2017).
9. St. Basil on stealing from the poor. *De unione ecclesiarum*. URL: <https://bekkos.wordpress.com/2009/10/08/st-basil-on-stealing-from-the-poor/> (date of access: 13.02.2017).
10. Divine Institutes, Book III (of the False Wisdom of Philosophers). URL: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/07013.htm> (date of access: 14.02.2017).
11. St. John Chrysostom. Homilies on Matthew. Homily LXVI. URL: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/200166.htm> (date of access: 15.02.2017).
12. St. Thomas Aquinas. The Summa Theologica. Transl. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. *Documenta Catholica Omnia*. URL: http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1225-1274,_Thomas_Aquinas,_Summa_Theologiae_%5B1%5D,_EN.pdf (date of access: 16.02.2017).
13. Höffner J. Christian Social Teaching. *Ordo socialis*. 2nd ed. Cologne, 1997.
14. Naughton M. The Corporation as a Community of Work: Understanding the Firm Within the Catholic Social Tradition. *Ave Maria Law Rev.* 2006. Vol. 33. P. 33–75.
15. Alford H. J., Naughton M. J. Managing As If Faith Mattered. Christian Social Principles in the Modern Organization. Notre Dame, 2001.
16. Carroll A. B., Kenneth J. L., James E. P., et al. Corporate Responsibility: The American Experience. Cambridge, 2012.
17. *Archbishop John of San Francisco* [Selected works]. Petrozavodsk, 1992 (in Russ.).
18. The basis of the social concept. The Russian Orthodox Church. URL: <http://mospat.ru/documents./social-concepts/vi/> (date of access: 28.02.2017).
19. [Code of Ethical Principles and Rules of Economic Management]. *Orthodox Conversation*. 2004. No. 2 (in Russ.).

Received by editorial board 10.02.2017.