

# **LEISURE - Leisure in the economic thought of John Paul II**

Gerard Stockhausen

*Department of Economics and Finance, Creighton University, Omaha,  
Nebraska, USA*

Modern rationalism does not tolerate mystery. It does not accept the mystery of man as male and female nor is it willing to admit that the full truth about man has been revealed in Jesus Christ. In particular, it does not accept the great mystery proclaimed in the Letter to the Ephesians, but radically opposes it. It may well acknowledge, in the context of a vague deism, the possibility and even the need for a supreme or divine being, but it firmly rejects the idea of a God who became man in order to save man. For rationalism it is unthinkable that God should be the redeemer, much less that He should be the bridegroom, the primordial and unique source of human love between spouses. Rationalism provides a radically different way of looking at creation and the meaning of human existence. But once man begins to lose sight of a God who loves him, a God who calls man through Christ to live in Him and with Him and once the family no longer has the possibility of sharing in the great mystery, what is left except the mere temporal dimension of life? Earthly life becomes nothing more than the scenario of a battle for existence, of a desperate search for gain and financial gain before all else (Letter to Families for the International Year of the Family, February 24, 1994, reprinted in *The Wisdom of John Paul II*).

In standard economics, human beings are consumers and producers. Economics leaves it to psychology to explain why people consume what they do and economics assumes that the effects of consumption are positive, or else people would not consume; the effects of consumption on the person, however, are outside the scope of economics. Similarly, in standard economics, people give up some of their non-work time to produce goods and services. In return they get compensation that includes wages and working conditions. The net benefits of work must outweigh the costs, or else people would not work; the effects of production on the person, however, are outside the scope of economics.

By thus narrowing the field of inquiry to the kinds of "rational choice" involved in production and consumption, standard economics aims to be a value-free science of applying economic resources to economic goals. The effects of production and consumption on human beings presumably enter into the individual's decision process, but the effects themselves are outside the scope of economic inquiry. By contrast, John Paul II always locates economic choices within the larger context of the meaning of human life and the effect that economic behavior has on human life for good or ill. Since John Paul II considers the whole human person rather than the individual consumer or worker, what a person does when not working is at least as important as what one does when working, whether or not a person is consuming during that time.

---

Because the economic and the human are so closely linked, how people spend their non-work time can reveal what is happening in the world of work. In particular, this paper will focus on leisure, using leisure in the restricted sense of non-work that nourishes the health, happiness and fulfillment of the whole human person. It is time and activity that is not driven by duty, accomplishment, or productivity, time and activity that celebrate being human rather than having and consuming material things. It thus includes such things as quiet time alone, “quality” time with family and friends and engagement with the arts. This paper will use this restricted sense of leisure as a way to enter into the economic thought of John Paul II on the connections between work, consumerism and the environment especially as that is found in *Centesimus Annus (CA)*, *Laborem Exercens (LE)* and *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis (SRS)*. Consequently, I will first place economics in its broader human context, then highlight the role of leisure in human life. This will lead to an exploration of the human and economic consequences of living without leisure.

### **The economic is embedded in the human**

In the thought of John Paul II, which is solidly in the tradition of social ethical thought developed in the Catholic Church over the last century, economic conditions and relationships are a subset of human conditions and relationships and so can be fully understood only within the context of humanity and its relationship to creation and the creator. Healthy and whole arrangements and relationships in the economic sphere will be those that reflect a healthy and whole understanding of what it is to be human and how healthy and whole human beings relate to one another, to creation and to the transcendent element of human life – to God.

Another way to say this is that human beings are not just labor inputs or factors of production or consumption agents and any economic system or arrangement that considers only that limited side of human beings will end up closing off a whole range of human possibility, leaving the human beings in that economy unhealthy and only partially developed. Human beings are not automatically whole and complete. Their lives are more like works of art, in process toward becoming something whole and beautiful. If a work of art is left unfinished or removed from the artist’s touch, if it is marred or vandalized, it becomes a grotesque caricature of what it could be. In the same way, human beings can break their relationship with their creator, or be disfigured by dysfunctional relationships, by substance abuse, or by seeing future possibilities closed off in dead-end jobs and inhumane working conditions.

That is why John Paul II holds that economic institutions and systems are not ends in themselves, but are means or tools to be used by human beings and human societies for their own ends – to improve human health and wholeness so that human works of art can better reflect the beauty of their creator. Thus economic institutions and systems are not to be judged solely in their own terms (for example, how efficiently they operate), but are to be judged in terms of how

well they fulfill the goals of a society as a whole and of its members – what is referred to as the “common good”.

[The common good] is not simply the sum total of particular interests; rather it involves an assessment and integration of those interests on the basis of a balanced hierarchy of values; ultimately, it demands a correct understanding of the dignity and the rights of the person (*CA*, 47).

In John Paul II's thought, a full understanding of the human person involves several things that are true even if the individual's words and actions deny their truth. First, the human person is open to the transcendent; that is, the person has a final direction that is beyond the present material world and that final direction – the transcendent or spiritual – determines the value and relative importance of all things in the present material world.

...development cannot consist only in the use, dominion over and indiscriminate possession of created things and the products of human industry, but rather in subordinating the possession, dominion and use to man's divine likeness and to his vocation to immortality. This is the transcendent reality of the human being, a reality which is...fundamentally social (*SRS*, 29).

Second, the person lives and functions within family and society; that is, the person cannot be viewed in isolation, but exists in relationship with other persons and has rights and duties resulting from those relationships.

A man is alienated if he refuses to transcend himself and to live the experience of self-giving and of the formation of an authentic human community oriented towards his final destiny, which is God. A society is alienated if its forms of social organization, production and consumption make it more difficult to offer this gift of self and to establish this solidarity between people (*CA*, 41).

Third, the person has free will; that is, within the context of these relationships to society, family and the transcendent, each person creates an identity – develops as a work of art – through an ongoing series of conscious, free choices.

Man has to subdue the earth and dominate it, because as the “image of God” he is a person, that is to say, a subjective being capable of acting in a planned and rational way, capable of deciding about himself and with a tendency to self-realization (*LE*, 6).

Human work is best understood within this view of the human person. A healthy attitude toward work begins by acknowledging that creation is a gift. As a result, work is performed with the respect and care needed to preserve that gift. Because it involves working on creation, human work imitates and shares in the divine work and creativity of the creator.

Work is a good thing for man – a good thing for his humanity – because through work man not only transforms nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfillment as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes “more a human being” (*LE*, 9).

As with any human activity, work is not neutral. It either contributes to human wholeness or leaves the person fragmented; it either enhances the person's relationship to the transcendent or blocks it; it either supports the person's role in family and society or impedes it. Thus, among situations that disfigure the human work of art would be degrading working conditions, work hours that do

---

not leave appropriate time for family or societal obligations and wages that are insufficient to support a family. Pushing the concept even further, participation in production or consumption that cuts short the development of or disfigures the work or art that is a human being would fit in this category.

### **Leisure**

Just as human work contributes to the health and wholeness of the person, so does human non-work. It, too, matters for the person's relationship with family, society and the transcendent. Among situations that work against the full development of the person in this realm would be using non-work time for activities that contradict human wholeness or are selfishly directed solely to the individual, without reference to that individual's role and responsibility within family and society.

Even though he does not use the term in this context, the concept of leisure captures John Paul's thought here[1]. In contrast to the neo-classical economic definition of leisure as non-work (as in the "labor-leisure trade-off" that underlies the supply curve of labor), here leisure will be taken to mean non-work activity that contributes to the health and wholeness of a person. One could object that at its best work also contributes to the health and wholeness of the person, so there is nothing unique about leisure. However, leisure differs from work in that it is done for its own sake and is not ordered to duty, accomplishment, or productivity. One cannot be quietly alone, give full attention to significant human relationships, or to one's relationship to God within the world of work. Without leisure, the instrumental culture of work expands to fill all of life. Instead of the economic being embedded in the human, the economic takes over the human and even replaces it.

At heart leisure is wasting time in the sense that it is activity (or rest) that is done for its own sake without being a means to some other end; it thus does not involve obligation or calculation. And, importantly, since it is not a means to another end, leisure is not aimed at recovering from work or preparing for more work. As Joseph Pieper says,

...leisure does not exist for the sake of work... The point and the justification of leisure are not that the functionary should function faultlessly and without a breakdown, but that the functionary should continue to be a man (Pieper, 1963, pp. 40-4).

Using the biblical account of creation, John Paul II often describes work as participating in the creative activity of God during the first six days. Leisure, then, would be participating not only in the resting of God on the seventh day, but especially in the contemplation of creation at the end of each of the first six days that results in God seeing that creation is good, or in Adam walking with God in the cool of the evening. Leisure can thus involve play, quiet, "quality time" with family and friends and cultivation of the liberal arts. The contemplation of what is good results in celebration of its goodness and, ultimately, worship of God as the source of that goodness. Leisure described this way is thus crucial for keeping the whole of human life in proper perspective –

for keeping the world of work in its place, for recognizing rights and duties regarding family and the larger society and for being at home with the transcendent. When people do not make a place for leisure in their lives, it will show up in unhealthy or even destructive relationships in these other spheres as well.

If economic life is absolutist, if the production and consumption of goods becomes the center of social life and society's only value, not subject to any other value, the reason is to be found not so much in the economic system itself as in the fact that the entire socio-cultural system, by ignoring the ethical and religious dimension, has been weakened and ends by limiting itself to the production of goods and services alone (CA, 39).

Two counter examples may illustrate this point. Workaholics get their identity from their work. They are unable to invest themselves in relationships that are not connected to work. Their exclusive focus on work leaves whole areas of human life and relationship undeveloped and stunted. A capacity for leisure would allow them to enjoy and celebrate all that life has to offer outside the world of work and accomplishment. On the other hand, compulsive shoppers are never satisfied with what they have and who they are. They get their identity from getting and having more material possessions. Their exclusive focus on the material world also leaves whole areas of human life and relationship undeveloped and stunted. A capacity for leisure would allow them to enjoy and celebrate all that cannot be bought – other people, the world of ideas, the transcendent.

### **Loss of leisure**

People may be deprived of leisure because no time is left after work and family obligations. They can also miss out on leisure because work and family obligations leave them so physically or spiritually drained that they are incapable of leisure. Finally, people can fail to make room for leisure because, although they have the time, they use it in non-leisurely ways. The first two situations are more in the hands of the employer than the employee. Employers certainly have an obligation to recognize that their workers are not just factors of production, but are human beings. Long hours or enforced overtime, low pay that forces individuals to hold multiple jobs or forces both spouses to work<sup>[2]</sup> and mind-numbing work and dehumanizing working conditions can all rob people of the capacity for leisure.

Loss of leisure can occur across the whole range of economic systems, from Marxist and Communist regimes to those that opposed them. Authentic leisure should open people up to truth about human life and to the human dignity of all people. However, while Marxist and Communist regimes claimed to free people from becoming means to the end of the market, they instead made them means to the end of the state. John Paul II points out the fault in both.

Life in society has neither the market nor the State as its final purpose, since life itself has a unique value which the State and the market must serve (CA, 49).

---

National security states oppose Marxist and Communist approaches, but embody the same error, treating their citizens as means to the end which is the preservation of the state (and the government in power).

By emphasizing and increasing the power of the State, they wish to protect their people from Communism, but in doing so they run the grave risk of destroying the freedom and values of the person, the very things for whose sake it is necessary to oppose Communism (CA, 19).

The materialist-consumer state, on the other hand, aims to outdo the Marxist-Communist model in the sheer volume of material production and consumption. This approach implies that the value of an economic system lies in the sheer quantity of its material output rather than the extent to which it makes it possible for human beings to live more whole, healthy and happy lives. So it does not matter how workers are treated or what values are embedded in the products, as long as the production grows.

It seeks to defeat Marxism on the level of pure materialism by showing how a free-market society can achieve a greater satisfaction of material human needs than Communism, while equally excluding spiritual values....Insofar as it denies an autonomous existence and value to morality, law, culture and religion, it agrees with Marxism, in the sense that it totally reduces man to the sphere of economics and the satisfaction of material needs (CA, 19).

The same results obtain in economies based on a trickle-down model where more production is expected to make more available for everybody, providing the poor with basic needs while providing the non-poor with some luxuries. More production and consumption then become the means to the end which is greater happiness for everybody. However, the link between these two easily gets broken; people presume that growth automatically benefits everyone. They forget about the end – the benefit to all – and focus on the means, insisting on growth at all costs. The pursuit of growth justifies behavior that destroys the benefits growth is supposed to bring. It becomes acceptable to force down wages, raise hours, impose dehumanizing working conditions, further skew the distribution of income and wealth and destroy the environment – all in the name of increased production and consumption that will somehow benefit all.

This state of affairs was favored by the liberal socio-political system, which, in accordance with its “economistic” premises, strengthened and safeguarded economic initiative by the possessors of capital alone, but did not pay sufficient attention to the rights of the workers, on the grounds that human work is solely an instrument of production and that capital is the basis, efficient factor and purpose of production (LE, 8).

### **Difficulties with the consumer model**

#### *Confusion of ends and means*

The first difficulty with the consumer model is the confusion of human and material and of ends and means, something John Paul II says is at the root of alienation in modern society. Material things can satisfy only those needs and wants that arise from humans’ physical nature. But humans are embodied spirits; they have needs that cannot be satisfied by material things. To see increased production as the end of human activity is doubly confused. On the one hand, it reduces human beings to the material level alone. On the other

hand, instead of economic activity serving human ends, human beings become the means to be used and manipulated in order to increase production. The economy then becomes an end in itself and economic decisions and policies end up being judged by whether they further production rather than whether they result in more whole and healthy human beings, families and society. Conversely, people are no longer valued because of their dignity as human beings – as ends – but only to the extent that they produce and consume – as means to the “success” of the economy.

[Alienation] happens in consumerism, when people are ensnared in a web of false and superficial gratifications rather than being helped to experience their personhood in an authentic and concrete way. Alienation is found also in work, when it is organized so as to ensure maximum returns and profits with no concern whether the worker, through his own labor, grows or diminishes as a person, either through increased sharing in a genuinely supportive community or through increased isolation in a maze of relationships marked by destructive competitiveness and estrangement, in which he is considered only a means and not an end (CA, 41).

Working harder and having more things – getting more immersed in the world of production and consumption – will only continue the hold of this perverse logic on the person. To apprehend and affirm the truth that humans beings have existence and needs that go beyond the purely physical, one must step back from the world of work, must have leisure. The point of leisure (if one can even speak that way!) is that human beings do not have to be accomplishing something to have value. Leisure implies an affirmation that the creator is quite capable of sustaining creation even if human beings put down their tools for a moment. This affirmation of the one creator who sustains creation for all people and of the creaturehood of all else, helps to clear up the confusion of material and spiritual, of ends and means.

*Being more versus having more*

A second difficulty of the consumer model is that somebody has to be persuaded to purchase the ever-increasing production. Consumers must be taught to want everything that producers can come up with. Of course it is even better if consumers come to think they need these things. The more yesterday's luxuries can be transformed into today's necessities, the more output and profits can grow. But the material and spiritual necessities of human life have not changed greatly. People still need food, shelter, clothing, security, love, companionship and a relationship with God. It requires a huge sales effort to persuade people that meeting their basic needs requires an ever wider and more expensive assortment of products. They are encouraged to confuse wants and needs until they need everything imaginable and to think that material things can satisfy their non-material needs. John Paul II would say that they are led away from the truth about what it is to be human.

A given culture reveals its overall understanding of life through the choices it makes in production and consumption. It is here that the phenomenon of consumerism arises. In signaling 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 life-styles 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 (CA, 36).

The perversity of this sales effort is even more obvious when one puts it in a global context of massive poverty and starvation, of billions of people whose material needs are not being met by the world economy. People must be persuaded that their increasing consumption is justified even though the basic needs of other human beings have not been met.

All this is happening against the background of the gigantic remorse caused by the fact that, side by side with wealthy and surfeited people and societies, living in plenty and ruled by consumerism and pleasure, the same human family contains individuals and groups that are suffering from hunger (*Dives in Misericordia*, 113).

This works only if people confuse wholeness with consumption so that they attempt to be more complete, more fully developed, by having more material things. John Paul II says that they confuse being more with having more. This sets up a vicious cycle since material possessions alone can never satisfy the deepest of human hungers; people will be frustrated, consume more, be frustrated and consume more, continuously.

It is not wrong to want to live better; what is wrong is a style of life which is presumed to be better when it is directed towards “having” rather than “being” and which wants to have more, not in order to be more but in order to spend life in enjoyment as an end in itself (CA, 36).

The perverse result is that the endless consumption actually arrests the development of the human work of art and disfigures it. In fact, we need continuous warnings from the medical world that too much of anything – smoking, drinking, eating, working, dieting – can endanger our physical well-being. At the same time, trying to satisfy spiritual needs with material things eats away our spiritual sides in the form of boredom, seeking out ever-new sensations in the vain attempt to fill the void.

A striking example of artificial consumption contrary to the health and dignity of the human person and certainly not easy to control, is the use of drugs. Widespread drug use is a sign of a serious malfunction in the social system; it also implies a materialistic and, in a certain sense, destructive “reading” of human needs... Drugs, as well as pornography and other forms of consumerism which exploit the frailty of the weak, tend to fill the resulting spiritual void (CA, 36).

Maintaining pockets of increasing consumption in the midst of global poverty also requires an ideology that justifies a situation in which some have much more than they can ever use while others have much less than they need. This ideology divides human beings into those who are sufficiently productive to have their basic needs met and those who, because they are not sufficiently productive, do not deserve to have their needs met. The justification usually



involves some sense that the system will not work unless this distinction is made. Such a distinction might be overlooked if an economy founded on it met the needs of all, but it clearly does not. We are left with a setting in which the survival of the system is made a higher priority than the survival of the human beings the system is supposed to serve.

This then is the picture: there are some people – the few who possess much – who do not really succeed in “being” because, through a reversal of the hierarchy of values, they are hindered by the cult of “having”; and there are others – the many who have little or nothing – who do not succeed in realizing their basic human vocation because they are deprived of essential goods (SRS, 28).

Once again a sense of leisure gives the lie to this elaborate framework. In leisure people can find value and happiness without consuming mass quantities of material things. Leisure can show that ever increasing consumption is neither necessary nor sufficient for human wholeness and happiness. Thus one no longer needs either to justify an economic system in which some have more than enough while others are in want nor to continue a value system that decides that those who are in want do not deserve to have their needs met.

It is therefore necessary to create life-styles in which the quest for truth, beauty, goodness and communion with others for the sake of common growth are the factors which determine consumer choices, savings and investments (CA, 36).

The true character of this system based on ever increasing production and consumption becomes clear when one realizes that it has no use for leisure. Even though standard economics refers to the “leisure industry” as a major area of growth, truly leisurely activities such as time with one’s family, conversation, reading, prayer and quiet enjoyment of art and natural beauty involve very little consumption. Just as the great human value of these activities is ignored because they do not pass through a market, the great value of human beings is ignored if they do not participate in the market, if they do not prove their deservingness by their productivity.

[Market] mechanisms carry the risk of an “idolatry” of the market, an idolatry which ignores the existence of goods which by their nature are not and cannot be mere commodities (CA, 40).

#### *Environmental destruction*

The final difficulty with the consumer model is its effect on the created world – that gift of the creator to human beings. The endless thirst for more consumption in the hopes that it will bring fulfillment makes whole nations willing to put up with environmental destruction in the hopes of attaining more. Ever increasing production requires ever more raw materials and energy and produces ever more industrial waste and toxic by-products. Ever increasing consumption generates a huge amount of waste as things are used up or as the good and useful is tossed away as a better and more useful version becomes available.

This is the so-called civilization of “consumption” or “consumerism”, which involves so much “throwing-away” and “waste”. An object already owned but now superseded by something

---

better is discarded, with no thought of its possible lasting value in itself, nor of some other human being who is poorer (*SRS*, 28).

The current concern for the air, water, soil and even ozone gives voice to the strain that continual growth puts on the earth.

Equally worrying is the ecological question which accompanies the problem of consumerism and which is closely connected to it. In his desire to have and to enjoy rather than to be and to grow, man consumes the resources of the earth and his own life in an excessive and disordered way. At the root of the senseless destruction of the natural environment lies an anthropological error, which unfortunately is widespread in our day. Man, who discovers his capacity to transform and in a certain sense create the world through his own work, forgets that this is always based on God's prior and original gift of the things that are. Man thinks that he can make arbitrary use of the earth, subjecting it without restraint to his will, as though it did not have its own requisites and a prior God-given purpose, which man can indeed develop but must not betray. Instead of carrying out his role as a cooperator with God in the work of creation man sets himself up in place of God and thus ends up provoking a rebellion on the part of nature, which is more tyrannized than governed by him (*CA*, 37).

Leisure again offers an antidote to the poison and questions the assumptions on which continuous growth is built. If human beings can achieve happiness and wholeness without ever greater consumption, then continually expanding production, pollution and waste are not necessary either. The more that creation is recognized for the gift it is, the less willing people will be to tolerate its destruction in the name of progress.

In all this, one notes first the poverty or narrowness of man's outlook, motivated as he is by a desire to possess things rather than to relate them to the truth and lacking that disinterested, unselfish and aesthetic attitude that is born of wonder in the presence of being and of the beauty which enables one to see in visible things the message of the invisible God who created them. In this regard, humanity today must be conscious of its duties and obligations toward future generations (*CA*, 37).

### **Leisure and development**

In speaking to developing countries John Paul II insists that their goal should be the goal of any economy, providing human work and meeting human physical needs so that people can pursue their spiritual growth in healthy relationships with self, with family and society and with God. This goal will not be achieved by simply "catching up to" or imitating the industrialized economies, since the industrialized economies often seek materialistic goals while ignoring the spiritual side of the person.

[Development] is not only a question of raising all peoples to the level currently enjoyed by the richest countries, but rather of building up a more decent life through united labor, of concretely enhancing every individual's dignity and creativity, as well as his capacity to respond to his personal vocation and thus to God's call (*SRS*, 29).

John Paul II encourages the developing countries not to adopt an extreme capitalist ideology that would look to free markets as the only solution to social and economic ills.

Indeed, there is a risk that a radical capitalistic ideology could spread which refuses even to consider these problems[marginalization, exploitation and alienation], in the a priori belief

that any attempt to solve them is doomed to failure and which blindly entrusts their solution to the free development of market forces (CA, 42).

The danger is that in embracing such an ideology the peoples of developing countries abandon what is most whole and healthy in their cultures in favor of economic institutions that have proved to be alienating in the industrialized world. In fact, preserving traditional cultures, especially those aspects that value communal time and celebration over efficiency and productivity, will do more for human development than the wholesale or uncritical adopting of Western ways. In other words, the danger is that these societies abandon the leisure that allows them to be more in order to produce more and have more.

John Paul II insists that those in wealthy countries also have a role to play in the development process.

It is not merely a matter of "giving of one's surplus", but of helping entire peoples which are presently excluded or marginalized to enter into the sphere of economic and human development. For this to happen, it is not enough to draw on the surplus goods which in fact our world abundantly produces; it requires above all a change of life-styles, of models of production and consumption and of the established structures of power which today govern societies (CA, 58).

### **Conclusion**

In the thought of John Paul II, economic considerations are always subordinate to larger human considerations. Thus, one cannot ask simply how to achieve growth. One must ask what kind of growth is best for human beings and how to achieve that growth in ways that maintain or build up the whole human person in dignity and in relationship with family, society and God. When means and ends are confused, people pursue material means to achieve spiritual ends and economic growth becomes an end in itself while human beings become objects used to achieve growth and discarded when they are not sufficiently productive.

In the developed countries the confusion of the economic and the human is often masked. People try to achieve human fulfillment through consumption and so are led to see ever-increasing production and consumption as a good thing. Some attain a level of overconsumption, but at the expense of others who cannot even meet their basic needs. In the international arena, the developing countries seek to imitate the levels of consumption of the developed countries. They take on the same confusion of ends and means, of material and spiritual and seek growth at any price. People come to accept all sorts of abuses – low wages, massive layoffs, working conditions that threaten the health and safety of workers and even the destruction of the environment if only it will yield more consumption.

Though not developed explicitly in the thought of John Paul II, leisure serves to counterbalance these confusions. Leisure involves stepping back from the world of work where human beings are valued according to their productivity and accomplishments. It involves stepping away from the world of materialism where fulfillment is sought in ever-increasing levels of consumption. When

individuals and societies fail to recognize the need for leisure or fail to make room for it, they end up confusing what really matters – the full development of the human work of art – with what is at best only a partial means to that – increased consumption and economic growth. Leisure involves time spent alone and with other people, building up the whole human being in relationship to family, society and God.

#### Notes

1. The author outlined some of the ideas included here in “Comments on *Centesimus Annus*” in Stockhausen (1994, pp. 335-9). A fuller development of the concept of leisure in a different setting is contained in Stockhausen (1995). The original inspiration for speaking of leisure in the sense used here comes from Joseph Pieper’s *Leisure, the Basis of Culture*.
2. The emphasis here is on forces. Whole and healthy family relationships suffer when economic need takes away the freedom of parents to decide what is best for themselves and their children and instead constrains both spouses or a single parent to work long hours outside the home.

#### References

- John Paul II (1980), *Dives in Misericordia*.
- John Paul II (1981), *Laborem Exercens*.
- John Paul II (1987), *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*.
- John Paul II (1991), *Centesimus Annus*.
- Pieper, J. (1963), *Leisure, the Basis of Culture*, Scarborough, Ontario, Mentor, New American Library.
- Stockhausen, G.L. (1994), “Comments on *Centesimus Annus*” in Nitsch, T.O., Phillips, J.M. and Fitzsimmons, E.L. (Eds), *On the Condition of Labor and the Social Question One Hundred Years Later*, Proceedings of Sixth World Congress of Social Economics, Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, New York, NY.
- Stockhausen, G.L. (1995), “I’d love to but I don’t have the time: Jesuits and leisure”, *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, Vol. 27 No. 3.