

The Marikana Massacre: The problem of embedded anthropological reductionism in modern economic philosophy

JF Boëttger
10408185

Dissertation submitted in *partial* fulfillment of the requirements for the degree *Magister in Philosophy* at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University

Supervisor: Dr M Rathbone

October 2015



The Marikana massacre: The problem of embedded anthropological reductionism in modern economic philosophy

Jaco Francois Boëttger
Student number: 10408185

Email: jaco@jacoboettger.com

Cell: 082 651 9349

Tel (w): 012 329 2594

Tel (h): 012 329 2594

Fax: 086 671 3432

Address for sending offprints: PO Box 6796 Pretoria 0001

Research proposal submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
***Magister Philosophiae* at the Potchefstroom campus of the North-West University**

(Hoffman Street, NWU-Potchefstroom Campus, Potchefstroom 2520

Private Bag X6001, Noordbrug 2520)

Supervisor: Dr M. Rathbone

October 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
JACO BOËTTGER: BIOGRAPHY	iv
PREAMBLE.....	1
RESEARCH ARTICLE	3
Abstract	3
Abstrak	4
Introduction	5
Is there an alternative to this embedded anthropological view?	12
CONCLUSION.....	16
CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
1. Purpose of the study and conclusions	21
2. Limitations of this research.....	21
3. Contributions of this study	21
4. Recommendations for further research	22
APPENDIX	23

DECLARATION

I confirm that this paper is not currently being reviewed by any other journals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Dr M. Rathbone for guidance, support and patience.

JACO BOËTTGER: BIOGRAPHY

Jaco Boëttger is a change management, leadership and organisational development consultant. He is a director at the Human Resources Empowerment Group. Over the last decade, Boëttger has worked in 23 countries.

He is the author of *Breakfast with Leonard*, a book on making Africa a winning continent, and co-authored *Visual knowledge management*, a book on change and inspirational leadership. His most recent book, *The messenger*, is a work on liberation management and future fitness.

PREAMBLE

The Marikana massacre of August 2012 at the Lonmin mine is a practical manifestation of the frustration and resentment caused by the reductionist anthropology inherent in modern economic philosophy. This modern economic philosophy and the accompanying reductionist anthropology can be traced back to the father of modern economics, Adam Smith. Maximum profit at any cost is often wrongly associated with Smith and defended by referring to him. But, although Smith's work is often misquoted and misinterpreted, it is nevertheless used to justify the brutal misuse of people in the cycle of supply and demand. The problem is that the current economic philosophy as embraced by most corporates in South Africa is perpetuating an untenable inequality in income, fuelling social and labour unrest and instability to the point of anarchy.

The above makes it abundantly clear that a new approach is needed in dealing with the frustrations and complexity of an extremely inequitable distribution of wealth caused by an outdated economic philosophy and reductionist anthropology. The purpose of this study is to explore the more comprehensive philosophical anthropology of Paul Ricoeur as an alternative to the dysfunctional reductionist anthropology driven by the current economic philosophy. Ricoeur (1986) is of the opinion that our destinies can only be understood through each other because we are, as humans, a plural and collective unity. In all of this, Ricoeur (1978) argues that respect becomes the fragile bond between morality and sensibility. A lack of respect was cited by the mineworkers as a core factor causing the Marikana massacre (Alexander, 2013). Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology provides the openness and possibility for creating a new narrative based on respect and inclusivity.

In this context, the study aims to research the following: Firstly, the link between the Marikana massacre and an outdated economic philosophy and its implied reductionist anthropology. Secondly, Ricoeur's more comprehensive philosophical anthropology as a workable alternative in providing practical solutions to the dysfunctional and destructive labour situation in South Africa.

In order to reach these goals, a methodology is followed where the Marikana incident — as a practical example of the implosion of an unworkable economic philosophy and its accompanying outdated anthropology — is used as a point of departure. This implies a need to research an alternative and more workable complex and comprehensive anthropology. To do this, a study of Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology follows to enable positioning of a possible alternative practical solution for the untenable labour situation in South Africa.

The following resources were consulted in the research: Library catalogue of the North-West University, research articles through the database of Ebsco-host, the internet and newspaper articles.

This mini-dissertation is presented in the form of an article, in accordance with rule A.7.2.5 of the general academic rules of the North-West University. The article will be presented for publication in the journal *Acta Academica* at a later stage. In this regard, the guidelines for publication of this journal are included in the appendix. The article contains the following subdivisions:

1. Introduction
2. The anthropological view embedded in modern economic philosophy
3. Consequences of this reductionist anthropological view
4. Is there an alternative to this embedded anthropological view?
5. The implications of Ricoeur's anthropological view for business
6. Conclusion

In the next section, the research article is presented with a bibliography and an abstract of the article in English and Afrikaans, in accordance with the prescriptions of *Acta Academica*. In the final sections of the document, some general conclusions, the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research are presented. This is followed by the appendix with prescriptions for research articles submitted to *Acta Academica*.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

“More and more far-sighted companies are putting the customers and their employees at the top of the list of their priorities, followed by their obligations to society. The old idea that companies exist to make money for their so-called owners is slowly going out of fashion. A business is, properly, a servant of society, a society of which the owners are a part but not necessarily the main part.”

Charles Handy (2007:141)

Abstract

The Marikana massacre in August 2012 at the Lonmin mine was primarily a consequence of the modern economic philosophy and its embedded reductionist anthropology, as it manifests in the South African context. This reductionist view of people ignores what is at the core of being human — to be recognised and respected as an individual. A perceived complete lack of respect by Lonmin for its workers was a major cause of the Marikana massacre.

Paul Ricoeur’s more comprehensive philosophical anthropology, as an alternative, opens up new possibilities in addressing the current dysfunctional view of labour and its dire consequences. Lack of respect for the person is inherent in the modern global economic philosophy and its implied reductionist anthropology. Ricoeur on the other hand, cannot even contemplate personhood without respect. With the unfairness of our economic system and the destruction of the middle class leading to unprecedented levels of social unrest, it is indeed time to embrace a new economic philosophy based on a more comprehensive anthropology.

Keywords: Marikana massacre, economic philosophy, anthropology, Paul Ricoeur, respect

Abstrak

Die Marikana-slagting in Augustus 2012 by die Lonmin-myn was grootliks die gevolg van moderne ekonomiese filosofie en gepaardgaande reduksionistiese antropologie soos dit in praxis in die Suid-Afrikaanse konteks manifesteer. Hierdie reduksionistiese siening van mense ignoreer die kern van wat dit beteken om mens te wees en as 'n individu erken en gerespekteer te word. 'n Klaarblyklik algehele gebrek aan respek van Lonmin vir die werkers was 'n hooforsaak van die Marikana-slagting.

As alternatief bied Paul Ricoeur se meer omvattende filosofiese antropologie nuwe moontlikhede om aandag te gee aan sodanige disfunksionele siening van arbeid en die gepaardgaande negatiewe gevolge. 'n Gebrek aan respek vir die persoon is inherent deel van die moderne globale ekonomiese filosofie en geïmpliseerde reduksionistiese antropologie. Ricoeur vind dit egter onmoontlik om menswees en respek van mekaar te skei. Met die onregverdigheid van ons ekonomiese stelsel en die vernietiging van die middelklas wat tot ongekende vlakke van sosiale onrus lei, is dit nou tyd vir 'n nuwe ekonomiese filosofie, geskoei op 'n meer omvattende antropologie.

Sleutelwoorde: Marikana-slagting, ekonomiese filosofie, antropologie, Paul Ricoeur, respek

Introduction

According to the report of the Marikana Commission of Inquiry (2015), the tragic incidents at the Marikana Lonmin mine that occurred from Saturday 11 August to Thursday 16 August 2012 led to the deaths of approximately 44 people, more than 70 people injured, approximately 250 people arrested and damage and destruction of property.

This incident, where the most lethal force was used since the Sharpeville shootings in the apartheid South Africa of 1960, is now known as the Marikana massacre. Chinguno (2013:1). One of the primary causes of these events was a wage demand of R12 500 per month by the mineworkers. Lonmin management considered the R12 500 increase to be completely unrealistic and the miners responded by engaging in violent protest and strike action.

The abovementioned took place against a backdrop in South Africa where the income gap or wage disparity between rich and poor is the second highest in the world. Piketty (2014:1) highlights the phenomena of inequality as being at the core of the problems facing *Capital in the twenty-first century* (the title of his book) when he starts his introduction with the following sentence: "The distribution of wealth is one of today's most widely discussed and controversial issues" (2014:1). Piketty's opinion on the Marikana incident (2014:39) is:

This episode reminds us, if we need reminding, that the question of what share of output should go to wages and what share to profits – in other words, how should the income from production be divided between labour and capital? – has always been at the heart of distributional conflict.

But what is at the deepest philosophical roots of the tragic events at Marikana? How can something like this happen in the country, heralded as a true miracle and rainbow nation for its peaceful transformation, with the so-called best constitution in the world? Is it possible that a deeply flawed anthropological view implied by modern economic philosophy is one of the root causes? It is important to state that it is accepted that many and diverse factors led to the tragic events at Marikana, but it is the singular focus of this study to explore and investigate the possible role that modern economic philosophy¹ and anthropological reductionism played.

It will be argued here that the problem is that the anthropology associated with modern economic philosophy perpetuates a reductionist view of human beings. Up to this day people who work for international corporates are often merely viewed as labourers and an aspect of the production cost of business. In other words, people are reduced to factors in the production of

¹The use of the phrase 'modern economic philosophy' in this article refers to the economic philosophy widely applied and used in the modern global, largely free market, economy that is primarily associated with the capitalist system.

utility, with a particular monetary value that must be kept as low as possible to ensure maximum profit, as was, I will argue, apparent in the Lonmin scenario. This reductionist anthropology entrenched in modern economic philosophy can be traced back to Adam Smith as the father of modern economics. Folbre, as cited by Rathbone (2012:20) is of the opinion that for Smith “..self-interest was a main spring of a well-contrived machine”. According to Rathbone (2012:20) Smiths views on self-interest was informed by the mechanical cosmology of Hobbs.

Although Smith is, from a popular perspective, undoubtedly seen as the father of reductionist modern economic philosophy it might be an over simplification of his work. .Smith did state that self-love was at the core of all economic interactions and supported the much written about invisible hand concept of market forces but nevertheless, according to Rathbone (2015:19), clearly stated that sympathy guides how self-love functions in society with the possibility of benevolence. Rathbone (2015:20) points out that Smith even conceded that interventions might be needed under certain circumstances. Sen (2010:52) also explains that Smith pointed out that markets need restraint and correction through other institutions to prevent inequity and poverty. It seems that the self-love theory and invisible hand concepts of Smith have been used to champion the causes of many writers without them understanding the complexity and moral basis of much of his writings. As Sen (2010:54) puts it: “This is indeed the standard view of Smith that has been powerfully promoted by many writers who constantly invoke Smith to support their view of society.” Despite their ambiguous understanding of Smith it seems that people will always link him to the greed in the current economic system.

In the article I will argue that a more encompassing anthropology than the Adam Smith based one is required in order to avoid incidents like the Marikana massacre. An anthropology is needed that respects the complexity of human beings, especially in business. This requires that the philosophical origins of reductionist anthropology and its link to economic philosophy must first be understood. A more encompassing anthropology will be beneficial for labour relations, wage negotiations and society as a whole, because people will not only be viewed as technical aspects of utility production.

The atomism and rationalism of modern economic theory since Smith can be directly linked to a reductionist anthropology. In Smith’s view, mainly self-interest and the relationship between humans and things drive the economy and not their relationship with other people.

Of course, as argued above, this needs to be seen in context, but Smith’s (2013:Chapter 2) own words give neo-liberal economists and philosophers a field day in misusing it. He said:

But man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is in vain for him to expect it from heir benevolence only. He will be more likely to

prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them ...

The implication is that business can reduce the full complexity of human beings to a single element related to economic activity. In the case of labour, people are reduced to production factors. The work of Ricoeur, *Fallible man* (1986), provides a philosophically based alternative to the reductionism of the anthropology embedded in modern economic philosophy.

Unlike Smith, Ricoeur believes that our efforts are not naturally good and beneficial to society and other individuals. Danhauer and Pellauer (2014:1) remind us that Ricoeur called his anthropology the anthropology of the “capable human being”, in which he endeavours to give an account of the fundamental capabilities and vulnerabilities of human beings in the activities that make up their lives.

Ricoeur does not deny humankind’s propensity for evil and goodness, to be capable or incapable. He therefore does not reduce humans to one or the other, but suggests that we can choose how we act. In this article it will be argued that Ricoeur’s philosophical anthropology of viewing humankind as fundamentally fallible but also as responsible agents with choice and vast possibilities, offers better solutions to the dilemma of inequality than Smith’s perceived *laissez faire* providence-driven view of people.

With this article, I will endeavour to show the link between the violent incident at Marikana and an outdated anthropological view associated with modern economic philosophy. Then I will address the question of a possible and workable alternative to this embedded anthropological reductionism. Ricoeur’s philosophical anthropology and its possible implications for business will also be investigated as a possible alternative.

The anthropological view embedded in modern economic philosophy

Although not all scholars, for example Sen (2010), will agree with this statement, it will be argued that Smith’s position of humans being controlled by providence and market forces also lies at the core of the anthropological view embedded in modern economic philosophy. Goudzwaard (1979:22) argues that for Smith the idea of the ‘invisible hand’ governing the economy is nothing but God’s providence. He supports his argument by referring to Smith writing in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759): “by acting according to the dictates of our moral faculties, we necessarily pursue the most effectual means of promoting the happiness of mankind, and may therefore be said in some sense to co-operate with the Deity and to advance, as far as in our power, the Plan of Providence”.

Goudzwaard (1979:22), writing about Smith's economic theory, describes the role of this invisible hand as follows: "An invisible hand guides man to serve the general good even when he thinks he is engaged only in the pursuit of private interests." Goudzwaard further notes that Smith also wrote in his *Theory of moral sentiments* (1795) that even though the rich have only their own interest at heart by employing thousands of workers to make them richer, the poor share in the produce of their improvements. Smith, as referred to by Goudzwaard (1979:22), remarkably wrote the following:

The rich are led by an invisible hand to make nearly the same distribution of the necessaries of life, which would have been made, had the earth been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants; and thus, without intending it, without knowing it [they] advance the interest of society.²

It is acknowledged that Smith is usually treated and interpreted in an over simplistic way but the abovementioned very specific statements by him , makes it clear why Smith's writings can be, and are, misused in defending brutally unfair business practices.

It is important to remember that modern economic philosophy is a child of the modernistic project. Rathbone (2012:19) suggests that: "The unnatural view of self-interest goes back to the classical liberalism of Locke and Hobbes who viewed self-interest as a rational – and even male pre-disposition". But instead of following the modernistic approach of the all-conquering scientific reasonable man liberating the masses from their irrational, mystical and metaphysical enslavement, modern economic philosophy paradoxically and ironically mostly reduces the person to a small dehumanised cog in a super-rational money-driven machine.

With this statement an intentional reduction of people to the role of slaves, serving the monster machine they have created is not suggested, but rather an accidental outcome of an envisioned modernistic and perfectly rational humanist-driven utopia gone wrong. This linear and rational view of labour by capital can simply not accommodate the real complexity of the organic, systemic and dynamic nature of the human being at work in the global village. The fact is that people are working not only in, but also for a system that is not working for them.

²Compare this position to Tarnas' view on the influence of Calvinism on capitalism. Goudzwaard and Tarnas correctly point out that capitalism is deemed by many to be God's preferred economic ideology. Hence the moral high ground of capitalists in believing that it is implicitly a good system by default and not choice. This, I argue, is a reduction of humans to being pawns in the system and not free agents.

In endeavouring to understand the anthropological view of capitalism on an even deeper level, one should take note of Tarnas's (1991:388) observation:

The great overriding impulse defining Western man since the Renaissance — the quest for independence, self-determination and individualism — had indeed brought those ideas to reality in many lives; yet it had also eventuated in a world where individual spontaneity and freedom were increasingly smothered, not just in theory by a reductionist scientism, but in practice by the ubiquitous collectively and conformism of mass societies. The great revolutionary political projects of the modern era, heralding personal and social liberation, had gradually led to conditions in which the modern individual's fate was ever more dominated by bureaucratic commercial and political superstructures. Just as man had become a meaningless speck in the modern universe, so had individual persons become insignificant ciphers in modern states, to be manipulated or coerced by the millions.

In the mechanistic, rationalist worldview of the modernist thinker, reality was explored in always smaller parts, to enable better understanding of how everything functioned. The mental and physical tools created by man made it possible to understand things at the atomic level.

The same liberalism that was supposed to enable man to conquer nature for the ultimate good of the human race, left man as a reduced victim of this very atomism. Tarnas (1991:357) also brilliantly describes this dilemma, induced by the impact of the quantum-relativistic revolution, when he writes:

The deep interconnectedness of phenomena encouraged a new holistic thinking about the world, with many social, moral, and religious implications. Increasing numbers of scientists began to question modern science's pervasive, if often unconscious, assumption that the intellectual effort to reduce all reality to the smallest measurable components of the physical world would eventually reveal that which was most fundamental in the universe. The reductionist program, dominant since Descartes, now appeared to many to be myopically selective, and likely to miss that which was most significant in the nature of things.

It isolated and dehumanised the individual to enable the deployment of this so-called human resource as only one more part of a modernistic, liberal wealth-creating machine. This very reductionist tendency, I will explain later, is one of the core factors that had a direct impact on causing the Marikana incident's eruption of human emotions and frustration. The obsession with profit at all cost by most multinational organisations surely contributed to this situation. As stated

before, modernists like Karl Marx's and Adam Smith's economic theories seemed to have failed us in creating a sustainable future for humankind. The impact of the Calvinistic idea that the creation of wealth is commanded by God can also not be underestimated.

Tarnas (1991:246) partly places the failure of the current system at the door of the Reformation when he observes that "the striving Christian, deprived of the Catholic's recourse to sacramental justification, could find signs of his being among the elect if he could successfully and unceasingly apply himself to disciplined work and his worldly calling".

It is therefore argued that capitalism in the Anglo-American and also, to a large extent the South African context, has always been justified and driven by an underlying and even sub-conscious religious zealotry. The processes and structures of the mining houses are, according to Goudzwaard and De Santa Ana (2005:8), deeply rooted in the Anglo-Saxon culture of free markets and "progressive society", as per Adam Smith. Lonmin, for example, is listed on the London Stock Exchange.³ It can therefore be said that mining houses are a manifestation of the mechanistic and hierarchical structure of a rationalistic modern world view. A critical view of capitalism would then historically in South Africa not even reach the agenda. The spotlight will now shift to the consequences of the modern economic philosophy as it manifests in praxis in the South African context, the system in which the Marikana tragedy occurred.

Consequences of this reductionist anthropological view

If divine providence guides the business person's activities to ultimately benefit the whole of humankind in a free market, as Smith suggests, then interfering with the economy or even questioning any capitalist or free market-driven intervention's moral motives can be seen as tantamount to working against God's providence. The zealous and fervent defence of capitalism as the saviour of modern economic man might just have its very roots in Smith's economic philosophy, as pointed out before. Clearly this can lead to a serious reduction of economic possibilities and alternatives available to build a better and more just society for all.

Goudzwaard (1979:24) describes the implications of Smith's view as follows:

Specifically, for Adam Smith, economic value can only be achieved by way of man's active struggle with nature – in other words, by means of labor. Hence there is no value other than labor value, elicited from nature by man. This

³ Alexander (2013) reminds us that as far back as 1973, Lonmin, then called Lonrho, was described by Edward Heath, the Conservative prime minister, as an unacceptable face of capitalism. A portrayal Alexander thinks many will still find apt today.

economic value is tangible in the goods produced. Thus, production is the result of labor; it is the most important expression of human dignity.

Goudzwaard further explains that this clearly implies that people's destiny is actually primarily realised by their relation to things and not their fellow humans. This reductionist view of people ignores what is at the core of being human — to be recognised and respected as an individual.

A perceived complete lack of respect by Lonmin for its workers is listed numerous times by Alexander *et al.* (2013) as a major cause of the Marikana massacre. The workers interviewed by Alexander and his team after the Marikana incident also repeatedly referred to not being treated as human beings by their employer Lonmin. A mineworker quoted by Alexander *et al.* (2013) said that they were closed in with wire like they were cows. One of the miners' wives said she felt that fencing was for rats and dogs. A miner sadly recounted how he explained to the employer that they (the miners) were also human.

An example of the indifference to recognising and respecting the person in a modern economic system is found in the Marikana Commission of Inquiry (2015:542) statement about Lonmin's supply of decent housing to its workers: "The commission is satisfied that Lonmin's failure to comply with its housing obligations created an environment conducive to the creation of tension, labour unrest, disunity among its employees or other harmful conduct." Lonmin argued that providing 5 500 houses to its workers would not have stopped the Marikana incident from happening ... to which, according to the Marikana Commission of Inquiry (2015:540), Mr Chaskalson SC replied:

... quite a breathtaking argument for Lonmin to make. It amounts to an argument that Lonmin has been so neglectful of the housing needs of its workforce that the 5 500 houses in their SLP would have been no more than a drop in the ocean of squalor in which they expect their workers to live. That's what the argument is.

With the above mentioned in mind, it is very easy to see why the disenfranchised and marginalised masses in the world and in South Africa can feel frustrated, angry and dehumanised by the modern economic philosophy and its practical implications; ultimately resulting in the Marikana and other similar incidents.

I therefore argue that from a causal perspective, the tragic incidents that happened at Marikana have at their deepest and obviously mostly hidden core, an implosion of the mechanistic view of labour in the reductionist anthropology embraced by modern economic philosophy. At the very visible and practical level, Marikana was simply miners claiming back their collective and individual humanity and personhood. In fact, in his analysis and conclusion of the book

“Marikana: Voices from South Africa’s mining massacre”, Alexander (2013) clearly states that ‘worker self-respect was at the very core of the issues fuelling the situation that erupted at the mine.’

This, though, does not imply that there were no other contributory factors to Marikana. The Marikana massacre can also possibly be linked to the effects of globalisation on the “real economies of the south”, as explained by Goudzwaard and De Santa Ana (2005:13). The belief in the free flow of capital and optimisation thereof seemed to have also played a part in the impoverishment of the mineworkers.⁴

With the destructive implications of reductionist anthropology abundantly clear, it is important to consider alternatives.

Is there an alternative to this embedded anthropological view?

Perhaps one should rephrase the above question into a statement that reads: *if we do not find an alternative to the embedded anthropological view in modern economic philosophy, we are going to be in even deeper trouble than we already are.* It will be argued that Ricoeur’s philosophical anthropology opens up new possibilities in addressing our current dysfunctional view of labour and its dire consequences because it addresses the core element lacking in the current reductionist anthropology: respect. A more in-depth understanding of Ricoeur’s anthropology is needed before we can explore that further.

Unlike Smith, Ricoeur believes that we are indeed fallible, as the title of his 1960 book, *Fallible man*, clearly indicates. He concedes that people can be, in agreement with the Kantian perspective, radically evil, misuse their freedom and have a bad will. This is a completely different point of departure than that of Smith, who believes that people’s economic activity will ultimately lead to the best result for everyone, leaving intentions, egos and agendas of individuals and collective entities unchecked.

Ricoeur sees our potential to be evil as grounded in a basic disproportion that characterises the finite and infinite dimensions of a human being. According to Dauenhauer and Pellauer (2014:3), “This disproportion is epitomised by the gap between bios, or one’s spatio-temporally located life, and the logos, one’s use of reason that can grasp universals.”

⁴The influence of the natural liberty of individuals and the sound judgement of the ordinary human being that Smith propagated can be seen in the modern global economy’s language of open trade, free markets. This implies that respect and fairness is outweighed by the belief in the inherent fairness of global market forces.

This much more complex and multidimensional view of people, fallible at the core, but yet full of possibility and able to choose their actions, liberates us from the reductionist and one-dimensional economically driven view of people. Where Smith focuses on the individual's well-being as a point of departure and even excuses self-centeredness and egoism as a tool in the invisible hand of the market forces, Ricoeur underlines the importance of complexity and interconnectivity.

For Ricoeur (1978:30), the dialectic tension between the finite and infinite, the polarity that causes the fragility of the human being, can and should be addressed in the synthesis of understanding and sensibility, of character and happiness. He refers to, and supports, Kant's position that the person is then a task rather than a reality. This task is then according to Ricoeur, a reconciliation of the longing towards the infinite happiness and the finite reflections of our own character. This reconciliation or mediation takes place through respect. Respect is for Ricoeur then the ability to see the other in myself. This concept of respect and what a person is does not however cancel out the dialectic tension between happiness and character, between infinity and the finite, but rather presupposes it. Ricoeur (1978:25) emphasises humankind's ability to achieve an intentional synthesis of finite and infinite, meaning and presence.

Crucial; for the purpose of this article, Ricoeur (1978:30) writes that this synthesis of happiness and character can only happen through the notion of respect. In Ricoeur's (1978:30) own words: "Indeed I do not see the person. I am not a person by imminent right; I ought to *respect* the person 'in' the other and 'in' myself." He continues to say about respect: "respect reconciles the finitude of desire and the infinitude of reason and happiness only by making possible the very idea of man which serves as the ideal mediator between practical reason and sensibility." For Ricoeur (1978:31), respect becomes the fragile bond between morality (the recognition of the other longing for happiness), and sensibility (my own narrow and limited perspective and character). Verhoef (2014:777) concludes that for Ricoeur respect simply is the recognition of the human characteristic in every individual person.

Juxtaposed with the above, Alexander (2013:153), as already noted above, points out that the lack of respect of the employer for the mineworkers was at the core of causing the Marikana incident. I would add that the perceived lack of respect for the person is inherent in the modern global economic philosophy and its implied reductionist anthropology. Ricoeur with his philosophical anthropology, on the other hand, cannot even contemplate personhood without respect!

Explaining his point of view in *Fallible man*, Ricoeur (1986:138) writes: "Man is the plural and collective unity in which the unity of destination and the difference of destinies are to be understood through each other." Dauenhauer and Pellauer (2014:3) describe Ricoeur's

philosophical anthropology as a quest for genuine mutuality and esteem for the worth we have as unique beings.⁵ In his final book, “The course of recognition” (2004), Ricoeur specifically points out that this recognition must go beyond the mere reciprocal recognition found in commercial transactions.⁶

Waddock (2014:2), Galligan chair of strategy, Carroll School scholar of corporate responsibility and professor of management at Boston College, cuts to the root of the problem of reciprocal recognition in the current predominant economic philosophy, when she writes:

Finally, post-conventional reasoning involves an ability to think systemically, in paradigms and across systems, really being able to understand that there are multiple ways of viewing things, none of which has all the answers or is fully ‘right’. It involves having the ability to put oneself in the position of the other.

She further explains that most people, including many leaders, do not reach this post-conventional level of cognitive development and that in the context of the complexity of a planetary society and ecology with its numerous systems and perspectives, this inability becomes problematic.

Ricoeur’s philosophical anthropology provides an alternative to addressing these issues raised by Waddock. According to Kearny (2011:5), Ricoeur believed that: “exposing myself to the textual horizons of ‘other’ meanings, I transcend the familiar limits of subjective consciousness and open myself to possible new worlds.” Although Kearny here specifically refers to Ricoeur’s view on hermeneutics, his (Ricoeur’s) ever present belief in human possibility and new understanding becomes abundantly clear.

Wallock’s view seems close to that of Capra (1996:4) when he describes our situation as a crisis of perception: “... that our world, our reality are incapable and inadequate to deal with overpopulation and the destruction of biodiversity.” He further points out that we need a new paradigm, which he refers to as “deep ecology” to come to a new scientific understanding of the integration of life at all levels — a concept he calls “The web of life”.

He goes on to say:

So, deep ecology asks profound questions about the very foundations of our modern, scientific, industrial, growth-orientated, materialistic (capitalist)

⁵Unlike Ricoeur, Smith was sceptical and suspicious of a philosophical vantage point that would interfere in man’s natural sounds judgement. See Fleischacker (2013:1).

⁶Compared to Ricoeur’s “plural” view of man, Smith’s reductionism really becomes abundantly clear. See Dauenhauer and Pellauer (2014:3)

worldview and way of life. It questions this entire paradigm from an ecological perspective: from the perspective of our relationships to one another, to future generations, and to the web of life of which we are part.

Again, Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology seems to invite exactly what Capra calls for.⁷ Ricoeur's anthropology is rather more workable in our complex world than that of Adam Smith which is currently the foundation of the reductionist economic philosophy and anthropology. The main and most important implication of an encompassing anthropology is that it opens up a new world of possibilities and mutually created narratives, not only for the way we do business but also for creating a sustainable future.

This, I argue, is the case because it fundamentally represents a different and inherently more respectful view of what humans are and what we can accomplish. It is invitational and prepares the way for an inclusive and caring, action-based relationship in working towards a better and sustainable society for everyone. It also closes the door on making the invisible hand the scapegoat for not taking personal and collective responsibility for our economic actions. It is sad that the Marikana massacre had to remind us of the urgency of this matter.

The implications of Ricoeur's anthropology for business

In concluding what led to the Marikana massacre, Alexander (2013:152) writes: "It is clear that management's refusal to talk was a crunch issue." In this case, the management did not respect the workers enough to talk to them. The Marikana massacre and its aftermath could clearly have been prevented if Lonmin embraced a different view of their workers.

According to Crispen Chinguno (2013:1) of the Global Labour Column, the Marikana massacre was actually caused by the breakdown of the institutional structures of collective bargaining in South African labour relations.

If Ricoeur's (1986) philosophical anthropology is embraced by business as the foundation for its relationships with its workers, society and consumers, it will imply that they always first recognise that all collective entities are but the plural of what it means to be human and that we can only be understood through each other. Mutual respect and esteem would be the foundation of all human interaction. Ricoeur specifically pointed out that we should go beyond

⁷Compare Ricoeur's writing on the "openness of thinking and acting" in *Fallible man* (1986:1-37) where he writes: "Feeling alone, through its pole of infinitude, assures me that I can 'continue my existence in' the openness of thinking and acting; the originating affirmation is felt here as the Joy of 'existing in' the very thing that allows me to think and to act; then the reason is no longer another: I am it, you are it, because we are what is."

the mere reciprocal recognition found in commercial transactions (Dauenhauer & Pellauer, 2014). In praxis, this will translate to stakeholder engagement and inherent respect for society and communities. Corporate social responsibility then becomes an extension and function of a deeply held conviction of what makes us human. And this, in Ricoeur's (1987:30) own words, "serves as the ideal mediator between practical reason and sensibility". For Ricoeur (1978), respect is the glue that keeps morality and sensibility together. If Lonmin's leadership embraced the anthropology of Ricoeur in praxis, it becomes difficult to see how a Marikana scenario could have happened.

Hamel (2009:91) gives the following advice to companies that want to survive in the complex and unpredictable global environment: "humanize the language and practice of business". He goes on to add: "What companies once regarded as merely a moral imperative — creating organizations that are genuinely human — has become an inescapable business imperative." Hamel also specifically encourages businesses to reflect the ethos of community and also that of citizenship, recognising the interdependence of all stakeholders. Although Hamel (2009) does not refer to any philosopher or anthropology in his article, it does illustrate the importance of embracing a more encompassing anthropology like Ricoeur's in praxis and also suggests that the survival of businesses might depend on it.

Freeman *et al.* (2004:364) writes: "Today's economic realities underscore the fundamental reality we suggest is at the core of stakeholder theory: Economic value is created by people who voluntarily come together and cooperate to improve everyone's circumstance". They then also highlight the fact that companies and managing them are first about purpose and human relationships after which profit should follow. The point is also made that firms that really perform well are following this more ethical approach of stakeholder engagement. Ricoeur's notion of respect at the core of his philosophical anthropology can add even more depth and impetus to the growing momentum of sound value driven business practices.

It is neither too late nor too complicated to implement labour relations frameworks in business guided by Ricoeur's anthropology.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion: the Marikana tragedy was primarily a consequence of the modern economic philosophy and its embedded reductionist anthropology, as it manifests in the South African context. According to Muller and Roberts (2015), the businessman Johann Rupert commented on our current economic thinking at the Financial Times Business of Luxury summit in Monaco

in June 2015, saying: “We cannot have 0,1% of 0,1% taking all the spoils. It is unfair and not sustainable.” Rupert⁸ added:

How is society going to cope with structural unemployment and the envy, hatred and the social warfare? We are destroying the middle classes at this stage and it will affect us. It’s unfair. So that’s what keeps me awake at night.

If people like Rupert cannot sleep at night because of the unfairness of our system and the destruction of the middle class, it is indeed time to embrace a new economic philosophy based on a more comprehensive anthropology. As suggested in this article, Ricoeur’s anthropological philosophy provides the openness and possibility for creating a new narrative based on respect and inclusivity.

This view also echoes the sentiment of Goudzwaard and De Santa Ana (2005:23) that a conversation and engagement at that level can steer us in a direction of the “way” in which we do business and interact as capital and labour instead of the “goal” of only making profit at any cost.

Again, Ricoeur’s (1978:30) philosophy provides a sound foundation for Goudzwaard and De Santa Ana’s suggestion when he states: “I am not a person by imminent right; I ought to respect the person ‘in’ the other and ‘in’ myself.” In order to avoid incidents like Marikana, hope of a better way must be rekindled. We cannot use Smith’s reductionist and simplistic view of humans as a tool of the invisible hand that will inevitably work towards everyone’s good. Neither can we simply see the human race as forever fallen, inherently evil and incapable of creating a better future.

Ricoeur’s (1979:145) more humble philosophical anthropology offers an alternative. Fallible humans have the primordial possibility for evil; but the primordial possibility as it existed before the fall of humankind must be even greater! If there was no goodness, there could have been no fall. Positing of good or evil is a choice. How we choose our way can be a conscious and ethical choice with limitless possibilities — exactly, in my opinion, what is needed to create a new, inclusive and un-divisive view of human beings in the economy.

Lastly, it is important to remember that any critique of an ideology, as indeed in this article, should in the words of Ricoeur, quoted by his admiring student Kearny (2011:90), be a task that “must always begin, but which in principle can never be completed”.

⁸ Muller and Roberts estimates Rupert’s fortune at \$7,5 billion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander P *et al.* (2013) *Marikana. Voices from South Africa's mining massacre*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Andersen K. (2011) *The protester*. *Time Magazine*, 178(25):54-89.

Canada. *The natural step sustainability primer* (2011) Step by natural step. Available at <http://dl.dropbox.com/u/7959984/Mphil%20reading%20list/LPR2010.pdf> [Accessed: 15 January 2011].

Capra F (1996) *The web of life: A new synthesis of mind and matter*. London: Harper Collins.

Chinguno C (2013) *Unpacking the Marikana massacre*. Global labour column. Available at <http://column.global-labour-university.org/2013/02unpacking-marikana-masacre.html>. [Accessed: 5 May 2013].

Dauenhauer B and Pellauer D (2011) *Paul Ricoeur*. In: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/ricoeur/> [Accessed: 28 May 2015].

Du Plessis W and Ismail T (2014) *Reinventing capitalism*. *Acumen: Gordon School of Business Science; University of Pretoria*, 7(1):57-60.

Fleischacker S (2013) *Adam Smith's moral and political philosophy*. In: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/smith-moral-political> [Accessed:28 May 2015].

Freeman R, Wicks A and Parmar B (2004) Stakeholder Theory and "The Corporate Objective Revisited". *Organization Sciences*.15(3):364-369.

Goudzwaard B (1979) *Capitalism and progress*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Goudzwaard B (2013) MPhil Lecture. 20th April. Potchefstroom: NWU.

Goudzwaard B and De Santa Ana J (2005) *Globalisation and the spirit of modernity*. In: De Santa Ana J (ed.) *Beyond idealism: 2005*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hamel G (2009) *Moon shots for management*. *Harvard Business Review* 87(2):91-98.

Handy C (2007) *Myself and other more important matters*. London: Arrow Books.

Kearny R (2011) *On Paul Ricoeur. The owl of Minerva*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Marikana Commission of inquiry (2015) *Report on matters of public, national and international concern arising out of the tragic incidents at the Lonmin Mine in Marikana, in the North West Province*. Available at <http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/marikana-report-1.pdf> [Accessed: 3 August 2015].

Muller T and Roberts (2015) *A billionaire Rupert sees wealth gap fuelling social unrest*. Available at <http://www.moneyweb.co.za/category/news/economy> [Accessed: 11 June 2015]

Piketty T (2014) *Capital in the twenty-first century*. London: Belknap Harvard.

Qalan I (2013) *South African miners speak on Marikana massacre*. World socialist website. Available at: <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2012/09/saiq-s11.html> [Accessed: 5 May 2013].

Rathbone M (2012) Unemployment and “the gift” in the South African context. Mini-Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree *Magister Philosophiae* at the Potchefstroom campus of the North-West University.

Rathbone M (2015) *Love, money and madness: money in the economic philosophies of Adam Smith and Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 34:3, 379-389

Ricoeur P (1978) *The philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: An anthology of his work*, (ed.) Charles E. Reagan and David Stewart. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ricoeur P (1986) *Fallible man*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Sen A (2010) *Adam Smith and the contemporary world*. *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 50-67. Available at <http://ejpe.org/pdf/3-1-art-3.pdf>

Smith A (2013) *The invisible hand of the market: The theory of moral sentiments + the wealth of nations* (2 pioneering studies of capitalism) [Kindle ed.] Available at <http://www.amazon.com>.

Tarnas R (1991) *The passion of the Western mind, understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Urbach J (201) *Income inequality – should we mind the gap?* Available at <http://www.moneyweb.co.za/moneyweb-soapbox/income-inequality--should-we-mind-the-gap>. [Accessed: 5 May 2013].

Verhoef. A (2014) *Paul Ricoeur and the importance of a transcendent nature of happiness*.
Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe, 54 (4):771-786.

Waddock S (2014) *Wicked problems*. Reflect, 3. Pretoria: The Albert Luthuli Centre for
Responsible Leadership, UP.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Purpose of the study and conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the role that anthropology associated with modern economic philosophy played in causing the Marikana massacre. It became clear that the current reductionist view of people ignores what is at the core of being human — to be recognised and respected as an individual. The conclusion was reached that a perceived complete lack of respect by Lonmin for its workers was a major cause of the Marikana massacre.

Paul Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology, presented in the article as an alternative, opens up new possibilities in addressing the current dysfunctional view of labour and its dire consequences. Lack of respect for the individual is inherent in the modern global economic philosophy and its implied reductionist anthropology. Ricoeur, on the other hand, cannot even contemplate personhood without respect. With the unfairness of our economic system and the destruction of the middle class leading to unprecedented levels of social unrest, it is indeed time to embrace a new economic philosophy based on a more comprehensive anthropology.

2. Limitations of this research

This research only focused on the possible link of anthropology associated with modern philosophy with the Marikana massacre. The multiple other factors that also caused the Marikana incident can still be researched. Only Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology was considered as a possible alternative to the currently embedded anthropological view of business in South Africa. This obviously suggests vast opportunities for exploring and researching more alternatives.

3. Contributions of this study

Firstly, the contribution of this study is to provide a perspective on the role that the currently predominant economic philosophy's embedded reductionist anthropological view played in causing the Marikana massacre.

Secondly, this study suggests that as an alternative, Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology provides the openness and possibility for creating a new narrative based on respect and inclusivity.

Thirdly, this research addresses the current dysfunctional view of labour and its dire consequences from a deeper ontological perspective; at the core of what causes the massive rift between labour and business.

4. Recommendations for further research

Further research can be done on the following:

1. A broader study into the causation of the Marikana incident can be undertaken.
2. How currently applied economic philosophy and its associated anthropology impacts on stability in South Africa/globally.
3. The possibility of applying Ricoeur's philosophical anthropology in South African industry and business.
4. Respect as the glue that unites society and humanity: A moral approach to labour relations based on Ricoeur's philosophy.

APPENDIX

***Acta Academica* guidelines for authors**

Acta Academica is an academic journal dedicated to scholarship in the humanities. The journal publishes scholarly articles that examine society, culture and politics past and present from a critical social theory perspective. The journal is also interested in scholarly work that examines how the humanities in the 21st century are responding to the double imperative of theorising the world and changing it. The journal appears four times a year and two of its issues are thematically focused.

General considerations for publication

Papers submitted to *Acta Academica* will only be considered for possible publication if the author(s) have certified in writing that the paper in question is not under consideration by another journal, and will not be submitted to such a journal until and unless a final, written rejection decision from the present journal has been received.

Papers submitted to the journal must ensure that the existing relevant literature is appropriately and fairly cited. Efforts should always be made to ensure that reference is made to the first report of a finding or conceptual insight rather than a later elaboration.

The journal indicates in all cases the date of reception of the manuscript and the date of acceptance by peer review.

Practical considerations

Word length of manuscripts should be 5 000 to 8 000 words, including notes and references with an abstract of up to 150 words and five keywords. Authors should supply a biography of 50 to 100 words.

A cover sheet should accompany the manuscript providing full name, institutional address, email address, telephone and fax numbers and the address where proofs and offprints should be sent if different from the above.

Authors should allow three months for consideration of their paper, but upon acceptance, they will be asked to make any necessary corrections and submit a final hard copy as well as an electronic copy.

Titles and section headings should be clear and brief. Lengthy quotations (exceeding 40 words) should be displayed, indented, in the text. Essential notes should be indicated by superscript numbers in the text and collected on a single page at the end of the text.

Reference style

Acta Academica adheres to an adapted Harvard reference style. Please note the following:

References cited in the text should read: Arendt (1958:63-4); Brown and Smith (1984, 1989). Use '*et al.*' when citing a work by more than two authors.

The letters a, b, c, etc. should be used to distinguish citations of different works by the same author in the same year.

All references cited in the text should be listed alphabetically and presented in full after the notes, using the following style. Books: Laclau E and Mouffe C (1985) *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Trans. W Moore and P Cammack. Verso: London.

Articles: Coetzee JM (1991) The mind of apartheid: Geoffrey Cronje (1907-). *Social Dynamics: A Journal of African Studies* 17(1):1-35.

Articles in books: Dubow S (1987) Race, civilisation and culture: the elaboration of segregationist discourse in the inter-war years. In: Marks S and Stanley T (eds.) *The politics of race, class and nationalism in twentieth century South Africa*. London: Longman Inc., pp. 71-94