Work, Spirituality, and the Moral Point of View

KENNETH E. GOODPASTER
University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, U.S.A.

1. Introduction

Many observers have remarked about a new emphasis on spirituality in the workplace. In what follows, I offer a philosophical interpretation of this phenomenon that connects it to what I have called the "normative core" of business ethics.[1] I argue that the stimulus to which the new emphasis on spirituality and work is a response is present *thoroughly* in business life, i.e., at the nested and interacting levels of person, organization, and socio-economic system. This stimulus, a pathology rooted in profoundly misplaced devotion, calls for levels of understanding from executives and students of business seldom demanded in the past. If we are not simply seeing a fad or a fashion in current popular literature on work and spirituality, we may be confronting a somewhat mysterious aspiration articulated in 1981 by Richard Pascale and Tony Athos:

> By an accident of history, we in the West have evolved a culture that separates man's spiritual life from his institutional life. This turn of events has had a far-reaching impact on modern Western organizations. Our companies freely lay claim to mind and muscle, but they are culturally discouraged from intruding upon our personal lives and deeper beliefs ... *What we need in the West is a nondeified, nonreligious 'spiritualism' that enables a firm's superordinate goals to respond truly to the inner meanings that many people seek in their work – or, alternatively, seek in their lives and could find at work if only that were more culturally acceptable.*[2] (emphasis added)

I shall conclude with some practical questions for leaders in business, education, and government who would respond thoughtfully to this new emphasis on workplace spirituality – aware that it is a multi-leveled challenge calling for multi-leveled response.

2. A new emphasis on spirituality and work

Despite talk of the 80s as a "decade of greed", there appears to have been a growing interest during this period among academics, consultants, and best-selling business authors on the topics of work, spirituality, and ethics. This interest has continued and even increased in the 90s. The buzzwords and phrases are everywhere: "servant leadership", "stewardship", "empowerment", "Zen management", "managing from the heart", "value-based management", "sensitivity" and "vulnerability". Editors Chris Lee and Ron Zemke of *TRAINING* Magazine recently summarized the situation this way:

> In an environment racked with stress, insecurity, tough decisions and 60-hour weeks, you might expect a resurgence of a management model based on Machiavelli's Prince, Leona Helmsley or some other Theory-X icon. Instead, there's a stirring in the opposite direction: A flood of management books, articles and musings try to make sense of the current chaos by proposing a management model filled with heart – and soul.[3]

They quote Stephen R. Covey, author of *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People,* a book that has been on *Publisher's Weekly's* top-10 best-selling nonfiction books for well over two years. Says Covey: "Something very, very profound is going on. It is a true metamorphosis inside our society. I haven't any question about it at all. People have had it with giving their whole lives to a business. I'm sensing a lot of imbalance, an awareness of a hollowness in people's lives.[4]

"Covey sees a trend", say Lee and Zemke, "People are determinedly seeking spiritual and moral anchors in their lives and in their work." And these two writers speculate along with major media commentators about why this is happening in the current business climate:

> A recent cover story in Time magaziine, "The Church Search", examined the baby-boom generation's quest for a spiritual home. It seems that mid-life crises combined with economic insecurity are persuading some boomers to return to their childhood religions, some to turn to unconventional churches and some to the various 12-step programs of the "recovery" movement.[5]

But there is, predictably, some skepticism about the new emphasis on spirituality in the workplace – not about the *accuracy* of the observation but about its *desirability*. If these skeptics do not see the work/spirituality linkage as a "fad", they see it as a dangerous and imperious intrusion, an invitation to inefficiency and unaccountability in private sector economic activity. None other than management guru Tom Peters laments that "By getting overtly into

the spiritual stuff, the pendulum is swinging too far". Peters apparently fears the loss of a safe secularity in the quest for ethical values in business. In his less-than-eloquent phrasing: "When you cross the line between the secular and the spiritual you're edging up on something that bugs me."[6]

What, then, are we to make of all the "trend" data? *Is* this a fad, even if "one of the more enduring management fads of the past decade" as *The Economist* recently observed?[7] And whether or not it is a fad, or a pendulum swing, or what some like to call a "new paradigm", is it to be lamented, tolerated, or celebrated? What has work to do with ethics, or ethics with spirituality, that consultants, trainers, writers, and educators should be so active on the subject? More importantly, what can we discern about the lives of persons, the values of organizations, and the cultures of whole socio-economic systems that might help us to understand the relationship between work, spirituality, and the moral point of view?

3. A parable and a pathology: roots of a spiritual response

A decade ago, I was pleased to recommend to the editors of the Harvard Business Review an essay entitled "The Parable of the Sadhu" by Bowen McCoy, for the first *HBR Ethics Prize*. The award was for a practitioner-written reflection on the relationship between ethics and business. Not only did this essay win the prize and merit the publication it was given, it was subsequently produced by WGBH in Boston as a half-hour video that has for years been used in classrooms and training rooms to initiate discussions of leadership and ethical values.

I have elsewhere gone into some detail in analyzing McCoy's essay.[8] For present purposes, I simply wish to call attention to the fundamental pathology that the story helps us to identify. "Buzz" McCoy was managing director of Morgan Stanley in New York, a Wall Street investment banking firm. He and an anthropologist friend named Stephen decided to go mountain climbing in the Himalayas as a six-month sabbatical "soul search" in 1982. After 30 days of climbing, and as they neared the snowy 20,000 foot summit, they were presented (by the climbing group ahead of them) with an unconscious "sadhu" (an itinerant holy man) who was dying of exposure. McCoy was willing to give the sadhu some blankets and food, but insisted on moving ahead due to threatening weather conditions. Stephen, however, felt obliged to so something to help the sadhu to safety, which he attempted during the next several hours. Ultimately, Stephen himself left the sadhu beside the trail – with remorse and anger – rejoining McCoy.

McCoy reflected later that "in some ways, I never left home". He does not know to this day whether the sadhu lived or died. But he acknowledges candidly that he missed an opportunity to get what he went on the sabbatical to find in the first place: perspective, balance, spiritual growth. He explains (but does not excuse) his moral failure in terms of several factors: superordinate goals, lack of explicit attention to shared values before the climb, less than full regard toward the sadhu as an equal, and a tendency to "pass the buck" when responsibility interfered with the achievement of urgent and risk-laden objectives.[9]

McCoy probably described these true events as a "parable" because he thought the story had the potential, like parables used by moral teachers through the ages, to offer a lesson of lasting value. In this case, the lesson has to do with the mesmerizing effects of goals – the fact that goals can distort our judgement at critical moments unless disciplined by clear values. Some years ago, I named the "syndrome" that McCoy exhibited on the mountain: *teleopathy – the unbalanced pursuit of purpose.* I argued that teleopathy is the single most significant stimulus to which business ethics is and must be a practical response. It is at the "normative core" of business ethics as a discipline. While not a physical or mental illness – like heart disease or manic depression, teleopathy (I continue to believe) would be as central in any diagnostic manual of ethics as heart disease and manic depression are, respectively, in *their* manuals. The principal symptoms of teleopathy can be described under three headings: *fixation, rationalization,* and *detachment.* A few words about each are in order.

Fixation. The difference between determination, courage, perseverance, and tenacity – each a virtue to be applauded in persons, organizations, and societies – and addiction, dependency, or fixation – which are not to be applauded – lies in

(a) the *intensity* of a *narrow goal focus* rather than a broad one; [10]

(b) the *urgency* of the pursuit of short-term goals rather than long-term ones; and

(c) the thoughtlessness or even *recklessness* of seeking objectives whose full implications are underexamined.

When determination is celebrated, we are confident that the person owns the goal; when fixation is lamented, we sense that the goal owns the person. The difference between management by objectives and being managed by one's objectives is all the difference in the world. Investment in goals beyond our capacity for critical appraisal and judgement indicates, in the language of Kant, that the self has *become a means, not an end.* The unworthy somehow becomes a master, as history reminds us in accounts of slavery and idolatry.

Examples of the "harvest" of fixation are plentiful – at the level of the person when urgent, reckless careerism drives a Martin Siegel to cooperate with Ivan Boesky in insider trading; at the level of the organization when NASA overrides a safety recommendation against launching the Challenger, leading to fatal results, or when corporate scandals reach some of the most well-known and admired firms in the U. S. (General Electric, E. F. Hutton, Dow Corning, Sears Roebuck).

Rationalization. The human psyche seems attuned to the problem of fixation at some fairly deep level – both individually and institutionally – else how can we explain the persistence of denial and "reinterpretation" so characteristic of addicts and other fixated actors? The New Zealand climber who passed the sadhu off to McCoy on the mountain said, "Damned irresponsible of him for being here, half-dressed like this, at 18,000 feet!" Perhaps the sadhu *was* irresponsible, but he was unconscious and there was no reason to *assume* that he was irresponsible – without communicating with him. Other hypotheses were at least as plausible. So why "irresponsibility"? Was it not a form of rationalization, making abandonment somewhat easier?[11]

Two types of rationalization dominate the landscape in the context of business and worklife: *loyalty* (appealing to fiduciary obligations to shareholders in the face of market competition) and *legality* (appealing to the permissibility of a behavior or policy within the constraints of the law). Each provides a justifying lens through which to view almost any business decision – perhaps not plausibly defending the decision, but usually helping explain it.

Detachment. Repeating the fixation-rationalization "loop" leads eventually to a kind of callousness, what some observers have called a separation of head from heart.[12] Competitiveness and goal seeking eventually drive out compassion and generosity, making more serious compromises easier as time goes on. A kind of isolation from moral responsiveness sets in, dignified by metaphors like "jungle", "toughness", and "real world". The detached organization, like the detached individual, loses the ability to connect its behavior to the larger human picture. The division of labor becomes the division of responsibility – and the division of responsibility becomes the fragmentation or dilution of responsibility beyond recognition. Cigarette companies insist that *responsibility* means *responding* to the market. The detached socio-economic system, like the detached individual or organization, exhibits indecisiveness in the face of the needs of its former (communistic) enemies.

To summarize, then, teleopathy is a moral condition in which the unbalanced pursuit of purpose makes itself manifest through three symptoms: fixation, rationalization, and detachment. Teleopathy is, in my opinion, the most significant stimulus to which business ethics in this century has been

a response. It is the principal occupational hazard of business leadership in a relatively free market economy. And its consequences for lives, companies and society at large can be devastating: alienation, stress, unreasonable demands on work time, loss of creativity, and loss of community.

Additionally, teleopathy has a feature that other diseases seem not to have: *individuals* may find themselves displaying this malaise *as the result of* their regular active participation in an *organization* that exhibits it. Conversely, organizations can "contract" teleopathy because of certain key *individuals'* managerial values. And Karl Marx seems to have believed that the *capitalistic system itself* was fundamentally hostage to something like this pathology, conferring it inevitably on institutions and individuals within. This feature of teleopathy – its nested interactions among units of analysis from individuals to whole cultures – makes it particularly salient in the context of spirituality in the workplace.[13] For it helps us to see that if the *disease* is structured in this complex way – *so, probably, is the cure.*

4. Spirituality as balancing the pursuit of purpose

If teleopathy is, at root, a form of "goal sickness" – an addiction to the single-minded pursuit of purpose, rationalized and detached – it is natural to ask about prophylaxis. Where does the balance come from if *lack of balance* is so easy to fall into and so hazardous? One tempting strategy is to try to "neutralize" the symptoms of teleopathy by cultivating *opposing* traits. For each characteristic in Table 1, we can fashion an opposing characteristic in Anti-T.

Instead of fixation on goals that are narrow, urgent, etc., we might suggest a more dispassionate posture, broad and long term. Instead of rationalization, an attitude of impartiality and immunity, exemption from conventional norms, Instead of detachment of head from heart, an assimilation of the two that essentially avoids the distinction in theory and in practice. It is evident, however, that this approach lands us in as difficult a place as teleopathy itself – in a neutral posture no closer to personal, organizational, or societal balance than before.

In the end, the search for balance in the context of business life seems to mean developing virtues that Aristotle would have called "golden means" at several levels and in several key decision-making arenas:

(1) prudence – neither too short-term nor too-long term in time horizon;
(2) temperance – neither too narrowly materialistic (want-driven) nor too broadly dispassionate (idea-driven);
(3) courage – neither reckless nor too risk-averse;

Table 1.

Teleopathy			Neutrality
Basic symptoms	List T	Anti-T	Anti-symptoms
fixation	intensity narrow focus urgency recklessness	insensibility broad sweep long term risk aversion	dispassion
rationalization	loyalty legality	impartiality immunity	exemption
detachment	of head from heart	of head to heart	assimilation

(4) justice – neither too anarchic regarding law nor too compliant;

(5) loyalty – neither too shareholder-driven (private sector thinking) nor too driven by other stakeholders (public sector thinking).

Understanding that each of these "golden means" is exactly that, *a mean between two excesses*, may not seem very significant, but it is. For it is often one of these very excesses that masquerades *as itself a source* of moral balance: the long run, entrepreneurialism, satisfying wants, altruism, compliance, shareholder return. How often have we heard observations like these?

    – Ethics and good business converge *in the long run*, or

    – Business ethics is about satisfying people's *desires and wants*, or

    – *Risk taking* and *entrepreneurialism* are keys to ethical character in business, or

    – Business ethics has to do with *altruism, not selfishness*, or

    – The key to ethical business behavior is *obedience to the law*, or

    – The social responsibility of business is to *increase its profits* (for shareholders).

The term "counterfeit" seems apt for describing these and other surrogates for right-making characteristics. Contrary to their pretensions, they are *not* balancers. They are themselves in need of *being* balanced. In the language of G. E. Moore, we might apply an "open question test" to determine authenticity here. Does it *make sense* to ask whether a policy or action is right even if the following propositions are accepted as true: "It is good business in the long run;" "It satisfies consumer desires and wants;" "It is entrepreneurial;" "It is selfless;" "It is legal;" or "It is profitable for the corporation or for

shareholders". If, as I think, these questions *do* make sense, then Moore would have argued that their "touchstones" are flawed.[14]

5. Spirituality and the moral point of view

So let us take stock. I have argued that the normative core of business ethics contains a hazard called teleopathy, the unbalanced pursuit of purpose. The symptoms of this malaise are fixation, rationalization, and detachment – and the root cause behind the symptoms lies in adopting counterfeit sources of moral legitimacy. Spirituality, on this interpretation of business thought and action, is *not* a matter of replacing one set of surrogates with another set – enthroning some kind of disinterested values in place of an existing employee personality or culture. Instead, spirituality may consist in cultivating virtues, policies, and practices that reflect a *balanced* mindset in Aristotle's sense. What Tom Peters apparently fears or is "bugged" by is a swing in the direction of spirituality as an unrealistic ideology (whether it takes the form of religiosity or some other form) in the workplace, administrated without respect for the "pluralism" he considers essential. Peters may be over-reacting, but there is something to his concern.[15]

The key to sanity here lies in avoiding a move from frying pan to fire. We must not renounce one set of inadequate moral panaceas (the "old" paradigm: narrowly focused, legalistic, material, short-term, etc.) only to adopt another set equally inadequate (a "new" paradigm: unfocused, empowering, ethereal, and long-term).[16] Teleopathy is born of an addictive single-mindedness. The moral point of view – and the spirituality it invites – is born of an appreciation of the elusiveness of wisdom, its resistance to capture by *any* paradigm, old, new, or in between.[17]

Despite frequent misinterpretations, including the editorial referred to earlier in *The Economist*, the moral point of view is not just a cerebral or even a romantic stand-in for *altruism*. It provides, rather, the cognitive and affective foundations of mature conscience – a disposition rooted in nature and nurture to take seriously both the partial imperatives of self-interest and the impartial ones of benevolence and justice. Turn-of-the-19th-century Harvard philosopher Josiah Royce described its working in terms of an insight that lay beneath the Golden Rule. And while his observations have the ring of a lament, they also have the ring of a realistic appraisal of the moral life:

> The moral insight is the realization of one's neighbor, in the full sense of the word realization; the resolution to treat him unselfishly. But this resolution expresses and belongs to the moment of insight. Passion may cloud the insight after no very long time. It is as impossible for us to

avoid the illusion of selfishness in our daily lives, as to escape seeing throught the illusion at the moment of insight. We see the reality of our neighbor, that is, we determine to treat him as we do ourselves. But then we go back to daily action, and we feel the heat of hereditary passions, and we straightaway forget what we have seen. Our neighbor becomes obscured. He is once more a foreign power. He is unreal. We are again deluded and selfish. This conflict goes on and will go on as long as we live after the manner of men. Moments of insight, with their accompanying resolutions; long stretches of delusion and selfishness: That is our live.[18]

Royce here points to a phenomenon that other moral philosophers, including Kant and Henry Sidgwick, and in our time, Thomas Nagel, think of as deeply rooted in ethics. Nagel puts it this way:

Each of us is not only an objective self but a particular person with a particular perspective; we act in the world form that perspective, and not only from the point of view of a detached will, selecting and rejecting world-states. So our choices are not merely choices of states of the world, but of actions. Every choice is two choices.[19]

The tension between the two horses pulling the moral chariot – partiality (self-fulfillment) and impartiality ("objective") – must be *managed* so that we can remain whole on the journey. Appearances sometimes to the contrary, this balancing act *can* be performed.[20] The call for spirituality in the workplace, I believe, is a call for the moral point of view understood as the harmonizing of these two perspectives.

Teleopathy needs to be avoided, but not simply by embracing its opposite. Leaders who understand this will no doubt seek to be servant leaders – but they will not relinquish their responsiblity to guide those they serve. They will listen and empower, but they will not hide behind these ideals and shields against accountability. Psychiatrist M. Scott Peck puts it in both personal and organizational terms:

Flexibility is one of the primary characteristics of mental health in organizations as well as individuals. An organization flexible enough to vibrate between hierarchical and community modes of functioning will be particularly vibrant one. Indeed, when it so evolves it becomes a higher organizational life-form.[21]

6. Some practical questions for leaders

Sam Goldwyn is alleged to have said once: "For your information, let me ask you a question." In like spirit, I conclude with some questions which may offer practical insight. Since, as we have seen, a re-integration or balancing is needed on three levels – person, organization, and social system – these questions for leaders reflect this fact.[22]

Level I – The Person. (1) Is temporal as well as physical "space" provided workers in Company X to permit – no, *encourage* – balancing, perspective, reflection, dialogue, and community service? Some companies provide quiet rooms for employees, regular opportunities for dialogue about ethics and excellence, and released time for service activities.

(2) Do workers and executives in Company X indicate not only a willingness, but a desire to develop themselves in a balanced way? How does this manifest itself? Has our collective attitude toward sacrifice, for example, lost ground? Philosopher Richard Norman wrote insightfully ten years ago that:

> [T]he sacrificing of one's own interests need not be a sacrificing of oneself to something external. My commitment to my friends or my children, to a person whom I love or a social movement in which I believe, may be a part of my own deepest being, so that when I devote myself to them, my overriding experience is not of sacrificing myself but of fulfilling myself.[23]

(3) Apart from willingness to sacrifice for others, is there a willingness to cultivate leisure for oneself? Harvard economist Juliet Schor recently observed that "For the first time in fifteen years, people have cited leisure time as the "more important" thing in their lives than work. The nation needs to slow down, unwind, and recover from its ordeal of labor." Then she asks: "But can we handle leisure time?"[24]

Level II – The Organization. (4) Are recruitment, hiring, and promotion mindful of business schools and management education programs that integrate ethical values into the curriculum, avoiding those that don't seem to care? Internal executive development as well as externally supported programs usually indicate the culture priorities of an organization, by default if not by design. Where *are* Company X's focal values? Are technical competence and competitiveness enough?

(5) What are the company's policies and attitudes toward work and family issues? Meaningful part-time work, flex-time, day care, parental leave, job-

sharing – all of these innovations are opportunities for *corporate* balancing that may well turn out to be, in Norman's words "not sacrificing but fulfilling".

(6) What about balanced policies toward the "troubled employee"? Employee Assistance Programs and other commitments to the physical, mental, and emotional health of employees both *foster* personal balance and *exhibit* organizational balance. The moral point of view is manifested *on two levels of analysis at once.*

(7) Finally, and perhaps most centrally, what is the corporate posture regarding time, overtime, effort, reward, and disincentives? To what extent does the value of competitiveness trump other values in the ideology or culture of the organization? Juliet Schor reminds us starkly of the Japanese situation:

> The irony of corporate America's position is that excessive hours are a serious *problem,* in Japan. Consider the white collar "salarymen" as they are called, who adhere to grueling schedules in a pressure-cooker environment. They face arduous commutes, an extended workday, and obligatory "after work" socializing. They are strongly discouraged from taking their vacations. In recent years, Japan's vibrant economy has brought overtime hours near their all-time high. The result: thousands of workers have become victims of *karoshi,* or "death by overwork". Otherwise perfectly healthy, they keel over at their desks, usually after a prolonged stretch of overtime or a particularly high-pressure deal.[25]

It may sound paradoxical that *less is more*; that a business might be more healthy by being less competitive; that corporate leadership might believe, if balanced, that the shortest distance between here and a goal is not the path that includes *karoshi* either for employees or for sadhus. It may sound paradoxical, but spirituality is almost definitionally paradoxical – seeking as it does a living golden mean.

Level III - The social system. (8) To what extent does public policy actually sow the seeds for teleopathy in subtle ways? Do tax policies, for example, and laws governing fringe benefits and collective bargaining, create strong incentives for companies to get more from fewer workers through overtime than to foster balanced lives and less unemployment?[26]

(9) Have we in Western capitalist countries fashioned a positive alternative for those in the former communist states? Or have we complacently achieved a pyrrhic victory? One pair of researchers suggests that the answer may be *no* to the former question and *yes* to the latter:

> The revolutions of Eastern Europe are incomplete; people are very clear about what they don't want, but far less than explicit about what they do want. We in the modern capitalist countries are in a similar situation. It is

rapidly becoming clear what is not working; we have yet to form a vision of the global society that does.[27]

(10) Finally, have we nurtured a culture that, in important ways, has lost touch with wholeness and balance? Winston Churchill is supposed to have said, "First we shape our institutions; then they shape us." Is it possible that we have created a capitalist culture that, even though democratic, has shaped us in such a way that the quest for a union of work and spirituality is futile? Consider the meditation of Pope John Paul II in his recent encyclical:

> In singling out new needs and new means to meet them, one must be guided by a comprehensive picture of man which respects all the dimensions of his being and which subordinates his material and instinctive dimensions to his interior and spiritual ones. If, on the contrary, a direct appeal is made to his instincts – while ignoring in various ways the reality of the person as intelligent and free – then *consumer attitudes* and *lifestyles* can be created which are objectively improper and often damaging to his physical and spiritual health. Of itself, an economic system does not possess criteria for correctly distinguishing new and higher forms of satisfying human needs from artificial new needs which hinder the formation of a mature personality. Thus a great deal of educational and cultural work is urgently needed, including the education of consumers in the responsible use of their power of choice, the formation of a strong sense of responsibility among producers and among people in the mass media in particular, as well as the necessary intervention by public authorities.[28]

In an increasingly global marketplace, conviction about the core values and virtues that we all need to embrace is not optional. Now is the time to mobilize the dialogue that can lead to such shared convictions.[29]

7. Conclusion

Barry Commoner once observed that the first law of ecology was "Everything is connected to everything else." The second law, he added, was that "You can't do just one thing." Human action is inevitably action along several dimensions simultaneously. For this reason, we cannot cleave off work life from the rest and treat it simply as resource or "factor of production" like electrical energy.[30] If Adam Smith's "division of labor" carried in its belly *this* kind of outlook, then it was a Trojan Horse indeed. For implicit then was not simply a productivity-enhancing rationalization of workplace tasks (as in the pin factory), but also a humanity-eroding evacuation of spirituality from

work. What we seem to be hearing as we approach the 21st century is a call for the reintegration of work and spirituality through a reaffirmation of the moral point of view in business decision making: balancing the pursuit of purpose in the face of tendencies toward teleopathy. While there will surely be faddish and superficial manifestations of this call, we can hope that its deeper significance will take hold for all seasons. It is no more and no less than the human face of capitalism that is at stake.

Notes

1. See Goodpaster, K. Ethical imperatives and corporate leadership, in Andrews, K., ed., *Ethics in Practice*, Harvard Business School Press, 1990.
2. Pascale and Athos, The Art of Japanese Management (1981). "Mysterious" in its call for spiritualism without deity and religion – no doubt in an effort to avoid denominational religious issues. But why insist *a priori* upon what might be a self-defeating set of constraints on spirituality? In any case, the cultural change that these authors are inviting would be striking counterpoint to so-called "Enlightenment" thinking. If the eighteenth century Enlightenment was about celebrating reason, science, and a secular self-sufficiency of humankind, a fair question might be: Has this conceit run its course to the point that on entering the 21st century, we do so with humility – deflated, and grateful for such a spiritual "door prize"?
3. See the cover story in the June 1993 issue of *Training* Magazine. "The Search for Spirit in the Workplace", by Chris Lee and Ron Zemke, pp. 21–28.
4. Covey quoted in Lee and Zemke, p. 25.
5. Lee and Zemke, p. 24. Besides boomers' mid-life crises and general economic insecurities, we might add to the list of contributing trends: downsizing and "delayering" as a result of global competition, decisional and informational overload, social disintegration through crime, broken marriages and families, and fractured urban education systems.
6. Peters quoted in Lee and Zemke, p. 26.
7. *The Economist*, June 5, 1993, p. 7.
8. Goodpaster, "Ethical Imperatives and Corporate Leadership".
9. McCoy, Bowen, "The Parable of the Sadhu," *HBR* September–October 1983.
10. Market-valued goals, while broad in one sense, are narrow when compared with goods and services that are often not prized by capitalist economic systems, e.g., music and the fine arts.
11. Saul Gellerman, author of "Why 'Good' Managers Make 'Bad' Ethical Choices," (*Harvard Business Review* 1987) argued that the common denominator in white collar crime during the last decade was rationalization in its many forms. When conscience "can't take 'no' for an answer," it finds a way not to have to ask.
12. Maccoby, Michael, *The Gamesman* (Simon and Schuster, 1976).
13. I have called this the Moral Fractal principle. See Goodpaster, "Toward an Integrated Approach to Business Ethics," *Thought* (1985).
14. Moore, G. E., *Principia Ethica* (1920).
15. Pluralism, the view that ethics calls for balancing multiple *prima facie* values and virtues, must be distinguished from relativism, the view that there is simply no basis for a moral community in nonarbitrary convictions.
16. Anthony DeMello, S. J., wrote in his last meditations: "You may have your preferences for drum or violin or piano; no harm in these, for a preference does not damage your capacity to hear and enjoy the other instruments. But the moment your preference turns into an attachment, it hardens you to the other sounds, you suddenly undervalue them.

And it blinds you to its particular instrument, for you give it a value out of all proportion to its merit." He then goes on. "When you see this you will feel a yearning to rid yourself of every attachement. The problem is, how? Renunciation and avoidance is no help, for to blot out the sound of the drum once again makes you as hard and insensitive as to concentrate solely on the drum. What you need is not renunciation but understanding, awareness." (*The Way to Love*, 1993, posthumous.)

17. Someone suggested that I subtitle this paper: "Hey buddy, could you spare me a paradigm?"
18. Royce, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (Glucester: Peter Smith, 1965).
19. Nagel, *The View from Nowhere* (1986).
20. Confidence on this point may be of a piece with confidence that the various motivatinal "wellsprings" in human nature are in some ultimate way convergent, that we are not "wired for contradiction." A belief in a Creator or Higher Power relates so intimately to this confidence that moral philosphers over the centuries have often seen it as the principal link between ethics and theology.
21. M. Scott Peck, *A World Waiting to be Born* (1993).
22. Without a three-leveled approach, "reinfection" probabilities rise, since the best-intentioned organizations and individuals cannot single-handedly transform the other levels.
23. Norman, Richard, *The Moral Philosophers* (1983).
24. Schor, Juliet, *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure* (Basic Books 1992).
25. Schor, Juliet, *The Overworked American* (pp. 153–54).
26. Schor, *op. cit.*, argues that "key incentive structures of capitalist economies contain biases toward long working hours. As a result of these incentives, the development of capitalism led to the growth of what I call 'long hour jobs.'" (p. 7).
27. Harman, W. and Hormann, J., *Creative Work* (1990).
28. John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus* (May 1991).
29. The Minnesota Center for Corporate Responsibility, housed at the University of St. Thomas, has recently developed a document called "The Minnesota Principles," which has become the basis for dialogue not only in the U. S., but in Europe, Japan, China, Africa, and (we hope) South America.
30. At *any* level: there is work in a person's life, work in an organization's life, and work in the life of a culture. If a proper balance is not kept, work can lead to sickness at any of these levels of analysis.