

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315739550>

On human dignity – a multi-disciplinary approach (with focus on the aspects important for Catholic Social Teaching-driven management)

Presentation · November 2016

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15157.06885

CITATIONS

0

READS

410

1 author:



Tibor Hejj

Proactive Management Consulting

7 PUBLICATIONS 4 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Theology- and philosophy-driven management science [View project](#)



On human dignity – a multi-disciplinary approach (with focus on the aspects important for Catholic Social Teaching-driven management)

Prepared by Tibor Hejj

Budapest, November 2016.

Agenda

- Why „human dignity”?

The multi-disciplinary evaluation of human dignity:

- Philosophy (From the Greek until now)
- Theology and the Catholic Social Teaching (CST)
- Anthropology (Personalism)
- Psychology
- Politics, including human rights
- Sociology and society
- In management theory (Servant leadership concept)
- Leadership/Management practice
- „HR” (instead: Human Dignity Management)
- Summary

Why do I evaluate human dignity as *the* key issue?

1. Its complexity

“Dignity is variously considered by diverse people to be an antecedent, a consequence, a value, a principle, an experience, and both a contingent and non-contingent exhibition. It is viewed from philosophical, legal, pragmatic, psychological, behavioral, and cultural perspectives.” (Mattson & Clark, 2011, p. 305)

2. Its importance

“Moral virtue, in obedience to the natural law, perfects the dignity of the human person.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 206)

Each listings on the principles of Catholic Social Teaching (CST) start with human dignity (even if just listing 2 principles) – all others can be derived out of this one

3. Its impact on management

- In management theory: personalism-based servant-leadership
- In the daily management practice: “Never take a person's dignity; it is worth everything to them, and nothing to you.” (Frank Barron)

The philosophical historic roots start with Plato

For Plato „dignity” was a scarce capability of just a very few:

- “According to Plato, dignity is generally based on people’s ability to live according to principled ideas or forms, and persons attain dignity to the extent that they live up to this theoretical as well as practical ideal of excellence (Nussbaum, 1998a). People who fail to establish this elevated and stable form of knowledge (*episteme*) are governed not by their own insight but by an ever-changing opinion (*doxa*) about the world, based all too often on the inadequate opinions of others.” (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014b)

Already at that time another term got closely linked to human dignity: virtue.

- “Virtue does not come from riches; it is from virtue that all riches, and every other good for the citizens and for the city, come forth”. (Plato, Apologia for Socrates)

We will see later how these two terms have become intertwined.

Aristotle and Cicero finetuned the idea, bit within the same paradigm: something for just a few

- “Aristotle (384-322 BCE) supported the idea that human dignity is linked to man, too, however depending on the actual use of their rational capacities, we can and should differ and between lesser and better men. He defined happiness (*eudaimonia*) as the ultimate objective for life, which can be achieved by leveraging practical wisdom based well-ordered life. “ “Doing so we can establish a relative independence from external influences (*autarchia*) and to live according to one’s inward orientation (Rosen, 2012).
- In *De Officiis* (44 BCE), Cicero compares humans with animals and argues that humans in general have a particular dignity by virtue of their capacity for rational thought. “As a function of social respect, earned through the art of honorable living according to the strictures of reason, human dignity – while theoretically available to all – is only practically attainable by those who have access to a good education, sufficient materials, and intellectual resources (Holloway, 2008).”as cited in (Dierksmeier, 2011, p. 13)

They were neither influenced by the Old Testament, nor could they be by Jesus yet

Kant (in Groundwork) questioned the previous approach

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) focused on two problems:

1. Are all men and women entitled for human dignity, or just a subgroup of mankind only?
2. Is it a capability to be praised or is it an attribute?

He addressed these problems by discerning between the *relative* value of a given human person according to their moral worthiness and the *absolute* dignity of the human person as such. Kant started by rejecting the common notion that the human being is free first – and then, later, submits (or not) to moral laws. He explains human freedom itself from the ability to realize moral commands, not *vice versa*. (Timmermann 2005).

In his own words: **“Every human being has dignity – through being able to be moral – but only those who do, in fact, lead moral lives also deserve the praise of personal ethical value.”**

He explicitly stated, that humans are “end-in-themselves”, thus we must not objectify human beings:

“that which constitutes the condition under which alone anything can be an end in itself, this has not merely a relative worth, i.e., value, but an intrinsic worth, that is, dignity. Now morality is the condition under which alone a rational being can be an end-in-himself, since by this alone is it possible that he should be a legislating member in the kingdom of ends. Thus morality, and humanity as capable of it, is that which alone has dignity. ”

„Everything has a price or dignity”

Kant makes a very interesting separation between those things which can be bought and the ones which cannot be:

- “In the kingdom of ends **everything has a price or a dignity**. What has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; what... is raised above all price and therefore admits of no equivalent has a dignity.... Morality is the condition under which alone a rational being can be an end in itself, since only through this is it possible to be a lawgiving member in the kingdom of ends. Hence morality, and humanity insofar as it is capable of morality, is that which alone has dignity.”

Thus while it seems so, as if he extended dignity to all human beings, it should be noted, that Kant limits dignity to humanity

- “insofar as it is capable of morality”. In more detail: “the dignity of man consists precisely in his capacity to make universal law, although only on condition of being himself also subject to the laws he makes.” Kant Groundwork, 42.

A quantum leap in the evolution of philosophy!

In modern times dignity got even more categorized – or even challenged

Various typologies of dignity have recently been proposed:

- Schroeder, for example, differentiates Kantian, aristocratic, comportment, and meritorious dignity. (see next page)
- More recently Leslie Meltzer Henry has offered five conceptions of dignity, like dignity as institutional status, equality, liberty, personal integrity, and collective virtue. ('The Jurisprudence of Dignity', University of Pennsylvania Law Review 160 (2011): 169–233)

Some however even question the term:

- 'In recent years, the concept of dignity has come under strong, others might call it vicious, attack, as already noted above. Harvard Professor of Psychology (Pinker, 2008) goes one step further in "The **Stupidity of Dignity**". He calls it a "squishy, subjective notion, hardly up to the heavyweight moral demands assigned to it" and concludes that "the concept of dignity remains a mess".' (Schroeder 2012, p.9.)

Never before was human dignity such an important topic, than these days

Schroeder's categorization of dignity's meaning

Table 2 Distinct meanings of dignity

Inviolable dignity	Traditional ^a Catholic dignity	Dignity is an inviolable property invested by God in all human beings, which makes each life sacred.
	Kantian dignity	Dignity is an inviolable property invested in all rational beings due to their capacity for moral self-legislation. As dignity holders, rational beings have the right to exact always respect for their sense of purpose and self-worth.
Aspirational dignity	Aristocratic dignity	Dignity is the quality of a human being who has been invested with superior rank and position and acts accordingly.
	Comportment dignity	Dignity is the outwardly displayed quality of a human being who acts in accordance with society's expectations of well-mannered demeanour and bearing.
	Meritorious dignity	Dignity is a virtue, which subsumes the four cardinal virtues and one's sense of self-worth.

^a I have added the term "traditional" to "Catholic Dignity" here to distinguish Papal pronouncements such as John Paul II's (1995) from more liberal Catholic thinkers such as the dissident Catholic theologian Hans Kueng

(Source: Schroeder (2012), p 332, Table 2)

Another new aspect is the relation to „vulnerability”

- Kateb (2011) argues clearly, that the concept of dignity arises from the **universal vulnerabilities** human beings experience throughout life.
- Fineman reminds us that vulnerability is “universal and constant, inherent in the human condition”
- Dignity, on the other hand, treats **vulnerability as a source of value**. This, I am claiming, is the “organizing idea” of human dignity: that all valid uses of “dignity” reflect a valuing of the sense in which human existence (perhaps uniquely) embodies a union between the fragile/material/finite and the transcendent/sublime/immortal.” (Neal, M. 2012)
- Also Beyleveld and Brownsword – coming from a different discipline - insist that **only vulnerable beings can have dignity** (Beyleveld, D., and R. Brownsword., 2001)
- “The most obscene symbol in human history is the Cross; yet in its ugliness it remains the most eloquent testimony to human dignity.” (R. C. Sproul, (president of Ligonier Academy of Biblical and Theological Studies and the founder and chairman of the ministry).

Linking human dignity to vulnerability is finally not just a Christian approach

The theological roots go back to the origin of the Old Testament and were consistent across all times

- According to the Bible and its revelation already in the Old Testament (Gen 1, 26; Div. 83, 54.4 & 74), we are “**imago Dei**” – which automatically leads the **human dignity, unconditionally, for all human creatures**
- Anselm of Canterbury – almost 1000 years ago (1033-1109) – explained, while **humans are creatures, similarly to animals, but with much more attributes shared with God, and therefore on a higher rank, than animals, thus irrespectively from worldly achievements all humans are bestowed with a form of dignity.** Ultimately canonized in the works of Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), this conception became the bedrock for a conception of human dignity that encompassed every person.
- Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494) neither compared man with animals, nor with God. Instead he conceived a more independent foundation for human dignity. In his famous speech on the dignity of man (*Oratio de hominis dignitate*), he defends the dignity of every person as the attribute that is relevant to human life itself (Trinkaus, 1999). According to Pico della Mirandola, the very feature that defines the nature of man lies in the fundamental self-definition of human existence. **Each human being is, willingly or not, its own former and maker (*plastes et factor*).**

Catholic Social Teaching („CST”) as a term, seems to be understood by different parties, similarly

- „the Church “fulfils her mission of proclaiming the Gospel, she bears witness to man, in the name of Christ, to his dignity and his vocation to the communion of persons. She teaches him the demands of justice and peace in conformity with divine wisdom” *Catechism of the Catholic Church*
- „Catholic social teaching is a body of doctrine developed by the Catholic Church on matters of poverty and wealth, economics, social organization and the role of the state.
Catholic social teaching is distinctive in its consistent critiques of modern social and political ideologies both of the left and of the right: liberalism, communism, feminism, atheism, socialism, libertarianism, capitalism, fascism, and Nazism have all been condemned, at least in their pure forms, by several popes since the late nineteenth century.”
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_social_teaching
- Until up the 1960s the term „Catholic social doctrine” was used. Since the end of Vatican II – as a recognition of the shifts in the Church teaching emphasis – CST has become the term for it, while the Compendium uses again the term „*Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*”

The definition by the Church overlaps with the secular wikipedia definition

CST has been developed almost continuously by the popes in the past 120 years - with some significant milestones

Year	Title of encyclical letter	Pope
▪ 1891	• Rerum Novarum	▪ Leo XIII
▪ 1931	• Quadragesimo Anno	▪ Pius XI
▪ 1937	• Divini Redemptoris	▪ Pius XI
▪ 1961	• Mater et magistra	▪ John XXIII
▪ 1966	• Gaudium et spes	▪ Vatican II
▪ 1967	• Populorum progressio	▪ Paul VI
▪ 1987	• Sollicitudo rei socialis	▪ John-Paul II
▪ 1991	• Centesimus annus	▪ John-Paul II
▪ 2009	• Caritas in veritate	▪ Benedict XVI

There are different listings on the principles of Catholic Social Teaching (CST) – each starts with human dignity

- One of the latest related Vatican documents, by „Iustitia et Pax” speaks about only 2 fundamental CST principles (at least for business), which are:
 - **human dignity** and
 - the common good(Vocation of the Business Leader, PCJP, p. 8.)

- Kammer speaks about 4 core principles of today’s CST:
 - The Principle of **Human Dignity**: A just society can become a reality only when it is based on respect of the transcendent dignity of the human person
 - The Principle of the Common Good: “the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and more easily.” (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2004, sec. 164)
 - The Principle of Subsidiarity: The principle of subsidiarity protects people from abuses by higher-level social authority and calls on these same authorities to help individuals and intermediate groups
 - The Principle of Solidarity: aiming equality of all in dignity and rightsSource: *An Introduction to Catholic Social Thought* by Fred Kammer, SJ,
<http://www.loyno.edu/jsri/catholic-social-thought>

Even the longest list – with 11 pillars – starts with human dignity

For the longest list of the CST principles we have to go as far as New Zealand:

- **Human Dignity**
- Human Equality
- Respect for Human Life
- The Principle of Association
- The Principle of Participation
- The Principle of the Common Good
- The Principle of Solidarity
- Preferential Protection for the Poor and Vulnerable
- The Principle of Stewardship
- The Universal Destination of Goods
- The Principle of Subsidiarity

<http://www.catholic.org.nz/social-action/dsp-default.cfm?loadref=62>

Pope Francis made it clear, too: “If the human person is not at the centre, then something else gets put there, which the human being then has to serve.”

http://catholic-thoughts.info/catholic_life/talksForTheHolySee.htm July 2014

In my view all the others can be derived (or conversely tracked back) from/to *human dignity*

- Even the other most “popular” pillar, the “common good” principle can be seen as a consequence of systematically implemented human dignity approach, since in case we value each human being as a “person” (see later), than the communion and society (including a country or a company) would act keeping in mind that human beings are to be treated as ends and not means to an economic, political or other kind of end, thus providing gain for each and every member, which in fact is aiming the common good. Thus human dignity *is* the pillar, as **Pope Francis** made it clear, too: **“If the human person is not at the centre, then something else gets put there, which the human being then has to serve.”** (<http://catholic-thoughts.info/>, 2014)
- “It involves a three-fold task imposed upon the Church: announcing the truth about human dignity and rights; denouncing unjust situations in society; and contributing to positive changes in society and real human progress.”(Kammer, 2009).

Human dignity therefore is not a term for a few theologians and phylosophers anymore!

The doctrine can be summarized by one word: „*person*”

- “There is no dignity when the human dimension is eliminated from the person” and **“the term 'person' has been coined to signify that a man cannot be wholly contained within the concept 'individual member of the species', but that there is something more to him, a particular richness and perfection in the manner of his being, which can only be brought out by the use of the word 'person'.** ”(Pope John Paul II)
- “At the very foundation of the Church’s social tradition stands the conviction that each person, regardless of age, condition, or ability, is an image of God and so endowed with an irreducible dignity, or value. **Each person is an end in him or herself, never merely an instrument valued only for its utility—a *who*, not a *what*; a *someone*, not a *something*. This dignity is possessed simply by virtue of being human.** It is never an achievement, nor a gift from any human authority; nor can it be lost, forfeited, or justly taken away. All human beings regardless of individual properties and circumstances therefore enjoy this God-given dignity.” (Vocation of the Business Leader, PCJP, 2012, p. 11).
- “Divine creation undergirds the totality of Catholic doctrine, and grounds **human dignity as the first core tenet** of this framework. While Kantianism bases human dignity on human rationality and contractarian ethics, Catholic doctrine stresses that despite our division into races, nations and roles (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops 1986, Economic Justice for All, No. 32), **all persons are made in the image and likeness of God.**” (Carrascoso, 2014, p. 312)

Human dignity-based humanistic view derived personalism

Personalism is a heterogeneous school of thought which holds the centrality of the human person in social, political, economic, and environmental contexts.

- Globally Amitai Etzioni, Mark Lutz, Ernst Schumacher, and Amartya Sen are some well-known thinkers who have made contributions to personalistic economics (Bouckaert 1999).
- „Personalism's insistence that only personality—finite and infinite—is ultimately real strengthened me in two convictions: it gave me metaphysical and philosophical grounding for the idea of a personal God, and it gave me a metaphysical basis for the dignity and worth of all human personality.” (Williams & Bengtsson, 2016)
- „we have to emphasize that personalism can be qualified as humanism, generally theistic. However, being a philosophy, **personalism does not require any particular faith** to be accepted.” (Melé 2009).
- Hodson (2001) defines dignity “as the ability to establish a sense of self-worth and self-respect and to appreciate the respect of others.”
- „**Personalism overlooks neither individuality nor subjectivity but does not reduce human beings to either**; it considers human beings as human persons.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 202)

Maritainian personalism = philosophical anthropology

- Maritain's philosophical anthropology roots the „human person's dignity and position in the real order of things” (1948/1966). „This **natural order** is neither deterministic, nor contingent on human perception or thought. (...) Personality, of its essence, requires a **dialog in which souls really communicate**” (Maritain & Galantière, 1966, pp. 41–42)
- Maritain philosophy and anthropology: “Human dignity, freedom, and autonomy are grounded on the human being's true nature, origin, and calling or end; i.e., they stem from the reality that human beings are creatures contingent on the loving act of God who immediately creates each person's soul, sustains them, and calls them to love (1947/1972, p. 42; 1952b, Chap. XIV, Sec. 4).
- “Maritainian personalism, based on metaphysical realism, grounds a philosophical anthropology and a moral philosophy. Rather than as “one school”, Maritain refers to personalism as primarily a “current”, a “concept”, “an aspiration”, or “**a reaction against both totalitarian and individualistic errors**” (1947/1972, p. 12).
- “Specially emphasized is his **distinction between human person and individual** based on a realistic metaphysics that, in turn, grounds human dignity and the natural law as the philosophical basis for human rights, personal virtues, and a common good defined in terms of properly human ends.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 216)

With the help of Maritain we start from philosophy and through anthropology we will arrive to management theory

“Maritain and its philosophy, called “personalistic humanism”, it addresses both what is equal among human beings (human dignity and, hence, basic human rights) and what is unique among them (reflective and self-disciplined individuality). Anchored on a realistic metaphysics, human dignity and the natural law are the philosophical basis for human rights, personal virtue, and a common good defined in terms of properly human ends. Accordingly, this personalistic moral philosophy incorporates ends and means, human freedom (self-mastery through the “perfection of love”) and human autonomy (through the “interiorization of the law”), universality of the natural law and prudence facing concrete situations, right judgment and right will, intellectual and moral virtue, delectation (“interior contentment” or “expansiveness”, 1960/1964, p. 34) and utility, the human and the economic, love and justice, contemplation and action.

In brief, Maritainian personalistic humanism is claimed to be ‘true’ because **it is consistent with reality, integral** (possesses that which is essential to render what is properly human), **and cogently addresses first (fundamental) principles, distinctive human ends, and virtue** (intellectual and moral). Maritainian personalism insights are, thus, a significant contribution toward a solid philosophical (ontological, anthropological, and ethical) framework for business ethics and humanistic management.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 209)

Human dignity and psychology are naturally closely linked

Most experts agree on the deep need in psychology for dignity:

- “Humanism is not humanity in general, but men and women in flesh and blood” (Puel 1999, p. 85), as cited in (Acevedo, 2012, pp. 198–199)
- “Depriving a person of their dignity is a very serious assault and it can unleash powerful passions of anger, vengeance, and vindictiveness in the victim. Humiliation and shame fuel violence. Insults are very dangerous.” (emotionalcompetency, n.d.-b)
- **“Confounding the dignity of man with mere usefulness arises from conceptual confusion that in turn may be traced back to the contemporary nihilism transmitted on many an academic campus and many an analytical couch.” (Frankl, 1985)**
- Every person deserves recognition and respect, as a being endowed of dignity.” (Melé, D. 2014)

On the other hand some still fight against it:

- Ruth Macklin (2003) - ‘Dignity is a Useless Concept’

Dignity is not just a „nice to have”, but a basic right, and even more!

- As Balzer *et al.* (2000 p.12) formulate, the term human dignity is a **“moral right not to be degraded”**.
- „Human dignity can and should be regarded as ‘something **more fundamental than what is expressed in “human rights”**’ (Spaemann 2010, p. 51).
- “Human dignity commands respect, which means that each person has the right—indeed the obligation—to pursue his vocation and his personal fulfillment as an image of God.” (Kennedy, R., Naughton, M., Habisch A 2011).
- “Among its important insights in this regard are its approach to the human person, happiness, the morally virtuous act as perfective of the dignity of the human person (and, conversely, the morally evil act as favoring individuality over personality), and the natural law as basis of human rights and guide to personal virtues.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 211)
- Even non-believers, like Schroeder comes to the conclusion:
“If we want to use dignity as the foundation for human rights and accord all human beings human rights, then only the Traditional Catholic understanding of dignity is appropriate.” (Schroeder, 2012, p. 332)

How is the link between dignity and right evaluated?

Three different approaches:

1. The link for many is a straight forward **cause and effect**: “Human dignity, we suggest, grounds human rights.” (Kleinig & Evans, 2013, p. 559)
2. “Following Donnelly (1989, 2007), **rights are perhaps most usefully understood as a means to the end of a commonwealth of human dignity**, focused expressly on protecting those who are vulnerable from abuses by those holding disproportional power and wealth.” (Mattson & Clark, 2011, p. 317)
3. For others the link and relation is not so simple: “I shall argue that **human rights and human dignity are uncomfortable bedfellows** for three reasons. First, the justification paradox: the concept of human dignity does not solve the justification problem for human rights but rather aggravates it in secular societies. Second, the Kantian cul-de-sac: if human rights were based on Kant’s concept of dignity rather than theist grounds, such rights would lose their universal validity. Third, hazard by association: human dignity is nowadays more controversial than the concept of human rights, especially given unresolved tensions between aspirational dignity and inviolable dignity. Much of my argument rests on the meanings I give to “human being” and “rights holder”. (Schroeder, 2012, p. 324)

Human dignity – not just human rights – show up in the politics as well

The entire first chapter of the EU Charter refers to the concept of dignity. This demonstrates its importance. The chapter outlines when human dignity is to be protected and safeguarded when the Union institutions and the member states act within the remit of EU law:

- **“Article 1: Human dignity is inviolable.** It must be respected and protected. It is clear from the Guidance just how important human dignity is. The Guidance recognises human dignity as a universal right when it states that human dignity is not only a fundamental right but moreover ‘constitutes the real basis of fundamental rights’. It is inspired by the Preamble to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights: ‘Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.’ Because of its inviolability, ‘none of the rights laid down in this Charter may be used to harm the dignity of another person, and that the dignity of the human person is part of the substance of the rights laid down in this Charter. It must therefore be respected, even where a right is restricted.’”
(Jones, 2012, p. 286)

By now there are 50 countries which celebrate Global Dignity Day in October of each year!

Politics however struggles with the term

- “Seen in this dynamic understanding of the constitutional present, **the impossibility of crafting a complete definition of dignity once and for all is not an intrinsic weakness of this concept.** Rather it is arguably one of its essential strengths, making it possible to extend the meaning(s) of dignity beyond the foundational core, in order to protect all those who had been left out from constitutional or statutory protection (as discussed above) and to extend the historical core prohibitions (under articles 2, 3 and 4 ECHR) to protect new types of negation of dignity (as under Title I EU Charter p. 60)”

- **“After constitution drafters, judges are the second more active dignity-makers.** Their engagement with this concept is particularly difficult as by definition, they deal with disputes and disagreements about the scope and meaning of dignity and human rights.” (Dupré, 2012, p. 268)

- „The concept of global dignity includes the following five principles:
 - Every human being has a right to lead a dignified life.
 - A dignified life means an opportunity to fulfill one’s potential, which is based on having a human level of health care, education, income and security.
 - Dignity means **having the freedom to make decisions** on one’s life and to be met with respect for this right.
 - Dignity should be the basic guiding principle for all actions.
 - Ultimately, **our own dignity is interdependent with the dignity of others.**” (Crown Prince Haakon of Norway, 2013)

Dignity should be also seen on the level of society

- “For the viability of society, and in order **to protect the dignity of all**, some individual claims are superseded by the claims of the community” (O’Brien, 2009, p. 28)
- Claus Dierksmeier suggested at the 2014: „The Power of Words We RARELY Use in Management: Dignity, Rights and Responsibility” conference: “dignity can serve as a conceptual anchor that reconnects management science and the social sciences.”
- “Private ownership is acceptable, but there is also a **responsibility to ensure all have enough to live in dignity**. If we have more than we need, there is a **social mortgage to pay** to ensure others do not go without.” (“Principles of Catholic...,” n.d.)
- “Human dignity requires that such communication is based on trust and relevant information and on trustworthiness. A moral and trustworthy communication builds a community” (Etzioni 2001).
- “In a community of persons, contractual agreements and the ethical requirement of honoring them are not eliminated, but relationships are not only contractual, and ethical requirements go beyond contractual duties. ” (Melé, 2012, p. 98)

Another interdependence is between dignity and welfare

- „**Unemployment or poverty, for example, is not merely a deficiency of income, but also a direct impediment to dignity** because it prevents further formation of skills, self-fulfilment and individual freedom (Sen 1999).” as cited in (Hahn, 2012, p. 49)
- “A **truly communitarian economy**, one might say an economy of Christian inspiration, must ensure peoples’ dignity and their “general, temporal welfare and prosperity”. This includes the three “L’s” (*land, labor* and *lodging*), but also access to education, health care, new technologies, artistic and cultural manifestations, communications, sports and recreation. A just economy must create the conditions for everyone to be able to enjoy a childhood without want, to develop their talents when young, to work with full rights during their active years and to enjoy a dignified retirement as they grow older. It is an economy where human beings, in harmony with nature, structure the entire system of production and distribution in such a way that the abilities and needs of each individual find suitable expression in social life. You, and other peoples as well, sum up this desire in a simple and beautiful expression: “**to live well**”. (Pope Francis, 2015)
- “**The denial of dignity will impact on welfare, and the denial of welfare will impact on dignity.**” (Kleinig & Evans, 2013, p. 564)

Without work there is no dignity!

- “How I wish **everyone had decent work!** It is essential for human dignity.” (Pope Francis, 2014)
- “Respect for human dignity and the common good are foundational principles which should inform **the way we organise the labour and capital employed,** and the processes of innovation, in a market system.” (PCJP, 2012, p. 13)
- “The workplace involves both rights-based forms of solidarity (which emphasizes formal equality and universal human dignity) and esteem-based recognition (which emphasizes particularistic dignity and esteem through **achieving good works that are intersubjectively recognized as such**). In Honneth study (as in Hegel previously), these forms of identity formation are dialectically related and mutually reinforcing” (Islam, 2012)
- “In adhering to this notion of human dignity, firms are encouraged to display greater sensitivity and care in their interactions with all stakeholders, including (and especially) those **stakeholder groups that include disadvantaged** members (Goodpaster, personal communication, 2012). Without this doctrinal grounding, firm actions can easily become “prey to forms of exploitation; more specifically [they risk] becoming subservient to existing economic and financial systems rather than correcting their dysfunctional aspects” (CiV, No. 45).” as cited in (Carrascoso, 2014, p. 312)

Not any kind of work enables real dignity

- „the dignity of labor is central for the good life. **Only work allowing reflection and the use and development of skill and professionalism is able to benefit dignity and moral well-being of the workers.** A comparison between the “workers’ advocate”, Karl Marx from the middle of the 19th century and Simone Weil at the end of the 20th century is made very well by Sparling: “Both on the level of the philosophy of history and the philosophy of labor, Weil offers a celebration of contemplation over creation. Whereas Marx sought to turn contemplation into creative activity, transforming philosophy into praxis, a form of self-creation of a type similar to that at the heart of unalienated labor, Weil sought to transform labor into a contemplative activity. Labor’s dignity for Weil resides in its capacity to afford us this contemplative plenitude. That is to say, in Marx’s view philosophy becomes a form of creative action, while in Weil’s view labor—creative activity—becomes a form of contemplation. For Weil, labor is noble because it is a form of contemplation. For Marx, contemplation is noble because it alters reality—it is a kind of labor.” (Sparling, 2012, p. 106)
- “organising **productive and meaningful work** recognising the human dignity of employees and their right and duty to flourish in their work, (“**work is for man**” rather than “**man for work**”) and structuring workplaces with subsidiarity that designs, equips and trusts employees to do their best work;” (Vocation of the Business Leader, PCJP, 2012, p. 3)

Many aspects can support dignity while working

“Associating quality of work with human flourishing and dignity offers a fruitful path for assessing contemporary work, workers and workplaces that fits a vision of a fair, just and mutually constitutive society while at the same time meeting the demands of a highly competitive global environment.” (Bolton, 2010, p. 160)

Dignity in Work	Dignity at Work
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Autonomy• Job satisfaction• Meaningful work• Respect• Learning & development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wellbeing• Just reward• Voice• Security• Equal opportunity

Dimensions of dignity model (Bolton (2010), Figure 5, p166)

Dignity should be integrated into our overall culture

- “Perhaps more than never, in a highly globalized world, we must recognize that multiculturalism is not simply understanding ethnic/racial histories or the mere appreciation of cultural “difference,” but accepting that multiculturalism spreads across the very inner core of America’s institutions, and ingrained in the very essence of life, for multicultural perspectives, ideas, and ideologies empower us to elevate the multicultural discourse to a higher level of social transformation—ultimately, **universal equality, justice, respect, and human dignity for all**, in all facets of human existence.” (Guevara Urbina, n.d.)
- “**Without guiding principles and virtuous leadership**, businesses can be places in which expediency overcomes justice, power corrupts wisdom, **technical instruments are detached from human dignity**, and self-interest marginalises the common good” (Vocation..., PCJP, 2012, p. 4)
- According to Adjibolosoo (1994, p. 26), the **human factor** term “refers to a spectrum of personality characteristics and other dimensions of human performance that enable social, economic, and political institutions to function, and remain functional overtime. Such dimensions sustain the workings and application of the rule of law, political harmony, disciplined labor force, just legal systems, respect for human dignity and the sanctity of life, social welfare, and so on.” (Page & Wong, 2000, p. 1)

The humanistic, personalism-based dignity approach influenced management theory

- “a humanistic approach to management **is a feasible ideal**” (von Kimakowitz et al., 2010)
- “Personalism ... **can give a theoretical foundation** for ethical business practice, starting from the duality of the human person, thus allowing us to recognise both competition and cooperation in human action and relationships.” (M. Naughton et al., 2010, pp. 697–705)
- “**Humanism addresses everybody and is universal in its outreach.** A humanistic perspective is rooted in philosophical works from Aristotle via Kant to the present as e.g. evidenced in the writings of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum and reflected in the work of pioneers of management scholarship such as Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Frederick Herzberg, Abraham Maslow or Peter Drucker. The **humanistic management traditions** can currently be found in such approaches as positive psychology, positive organizational behavior, positive scholarship or simply business ethics. They share the implicit endorsement of human dignity and **the focus on human development (flourishing) as objective.**” (Pirson, 2013, p. 4)

Some even state, that it was the dignity approach, which was the driving force behind Europe's success

- McCloskey argues that the bourgeoisie of England, Continental Europe, and the U.S. only started **innovating, learning, and accumulating massive wealth** once such human dignity was accorded *and* protected.” (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 9)
- The quest for dignity been has been so relevant that economic historians argue that the **accordance of dignity has been the central success factor of economic progress in the West** (McCloskey, 2010).
- “The crucial remaining antecedent, I claim, was a rhetorical change around 1700 concerning markets and innovations and the bourgeoisie, a rhetoric spread after 1800. It was merely **a change in talking and thinking about dignity and liberty**. But it was historically unique and economically powerful.” (McCloskey, 2010 :33) as cited in (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 9)
- “management theorists should reflect on the conceptual lack of utilitarianism, that is, the indifference to human dignity. We argued that the notion of dignity represents a missing link to the quest for social welfare and outlined the conceptual notions of dignity as partly unconditional, and partly conditional and earned.” (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 37)

Key guidelines of Pirson's mgmt. theory conceptualization

- **“Social welfare can be understood in terms of wealth creation or well-being creation.** Based on the concepts of dignity and welfare, we then proposed **alternative conceptualizations of management theory.** This resulted in archetypes that highlight alternative ways to escape the economic paradigm, whose contribution to social welfare creation is limited. We also outlined areas for future research and the epistemological challenges that each archetype faces.” (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, pp. 37–38)
- *“Guideline 1: **Placing dignity at the core of management theory will connect it more directly with social welfare creation.**”* (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 18)
- *“Guideline 2: To reflect the original, inclusive meaning of utility, **social welfare should be understood as well-being creation rather than wealth creation.**”* (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 20)
- *“Guideline 3: **Protecting dignity is a necessary condition for social welfare creation.**”*
- *“Guideline 4: **Promoting dignity is a sufficient condition for social welfare creation**”* (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 22)

Pirson's structured model of dignity boosting welfare

Guideline 7: Management researchers who wish to connect management theory directly to social welfare creation should theorize in Archetypes 5 (bounded humanism) or 6 (humanism).” (Pirson & Dierksmeier, 2014a, p. 34)

Archetypes of management theorizing	Role of dignity		
	<i>Indifference</i>	<i>Protection</i>	<i>Promotion</i>
Welfare understood as			
Wealth Creation	Economism (A1)	Bounded economism (A2)	Enlightened Economism (A3)
Well-being creation	Paternalism (A4)	Bounded humanism (A5)	Humanism (A6)

(Pirson, Dierksmeier (2014), Table 2, p43)

The company is to be seen as a community within society

- “humanistic management holds a **new vision for business: serving the societies in which business operates, increasing their citizens’ quality of life** (Melé, 2003a; Spitzeck et al., 2009)
- “The word “participation” is used by Wojtyla (1979, 1993) in a different way than that common in management. In his approach, “participation” indicates the way in which, in common actions, the person protects the personalistic value of his or her own action and participates together with another in the realization of the common activity and its outcomes respecting “you” as another “I”. Here, the idea of **“participation” is not a form of management, as usually appears in managerial literature, but a philosophical concept with a normative significance**. Participating in the humanity of others, and consequently recognizing their dignity, respecting their rights and taking care of their real needs requires a sort of organization or living together in which the person is respected and is able to experience every act of the collectivity as his or her own. This happens when the choices of those who lead are directed towards the common good and are made with the responsible involvement of all members of the organization. Individual interests should be subordinated to the common good. Such subordination, however, must not diminish or destroy the person” (Melé, 2012, pp. 96–97)

If the company is a „community”, then a Wojtyla-type participation is to be realized

Integration of solidarity, subsidiarity and serving, not ruling

- “Solidarity calls us to embrace the common good and human dignity collectively, as the good of all; while subsidiarity calls us to embrace the common good and human dignity “distributively,” as the good of each. Mutually informed, each by the other, **subsidiarity and solidarity create a synergy capable of supporting authentic, integral human development.** Mind, body, and spirit are continually strengthened through social interaction and meaningful work.” (M. J. Naughton et al., 2015, p. 29)
- "leaders will bend their efforts to serve with skill, understanding, and spirit, and that followers will be responsive only to able servants who would lead them"(Greenleaf, 1997, p. 4). The new servant-leader had to be, a **servant first and a leader second.** The servant's motivation was ". . . **to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served**" (Greenleaf, 1997, p. 13).
- The skills needed for the development of servant-leadership include: "communication skills and **empathetic listening**, conflict resolution, problem solving, **consensus decision making, and community building**" (Bottum and Lenz, 1998, p. 164).

Servant-leadership is the theory for implementing human dignity-based management

These theories should be taught to the students!

- “It is high time, therefore, to reorient business theory towards the real human being. Instead of describing human behavior, against all empirical evidence, along the *homo economicus* model, determined by a narrow and fixed array of preferences, **the wide scope of human interests and their dynamic change, the moral nature of human freedom, and the profundity of human dignity should be moved (back) into the center of management education.**” (Dierksmeier, 2011, p. 9)
- **We invite educators and catechists** at parochial and diocesan levels, **and specifically business educators**, to make use of the document here presented with their students, inspiring them to respect and encourage human dignity and to pursue the common good in their management undertakings. We hope that this message will stimulate discussions in businesses and universities, helping business leaders, faculty, and **students to: see the challenges and opportunities in the world of work; judge them according to the social principles of the Church; and act as leaders who serve God.**” (Vocation of the Business Leader, par. 87.)
- **“Without personalistic foundations, humanistic learning and humanistic management may lack an integrated concept of the human person and human dignity.** If lacking proper ethical grounds, business students may learn that expediency and self-interest are as morally legitimate human ends as the common good and human dignity, feelings or emotions as normative as the natural law, frankness as valuable as truth, sheer opinion as reliable as reasonable judgment, flattery or fear as morally right means as justice and love. Machiavellian thought is, after all, humanistic, albeit clearly not personalistic.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 215)

From the theory of management to the realization of it

- Ethics in business and commerce is rooted in respect for human dignity and the common good. It becomes concrete in just service of the well-being of employees, customers, investors, communities, and all of the parties with whom a business interacts.” (Kennedy et al, 2011)
- Human dignity is affected not only by considerations of work life *quality* but also by encroachment upon the amount of time available outside of work for a balanced life.” (M. J. Naughton et al., 2015, p. 19)
- „CSR as a form of management for successful enterprises – to be considered by UNIAPAC as a starting point for numerous initiatives to promote worldwide a CSR that fully respects the dignity of persons and their development.” (Uniapac, 2008)
- “humanistic management gives responsible management a clear direction: to foster unconditional human dignity. This requires a continuous ethical reflection on management practices aiming for virtuous corporate decision-making.” (Spitzeck, 2011, p. 51)

Management theory is nice, but the proof is the (best) practice, implemented!

Leadership implementation of human dignity

- “Love-driven leadership is
 - the *vision* to see each person’s talent, potential and dignity
 - the *courage, passion and commitment* to unlock that potential
 - the resulting *loyalty and mutual support* that energize and unite teams” (Lowney, 2010, p. 176)
- „Leadership has to be performed differently than before. Leadership has to promote the integral development of the human person, and the role of business leaders should include economic aspects and contribute to social development, through which human dignity can be enhanced.” Jose-Maria Simone, President of UNIAPAC, at their 2015 World Congress)
- “Where trust is high, efficiency, too, can thrive, along with personal dignity and satisfaction.” (M. J. Naughton et al., 2015, p. 4)
- “humans have gifts—talents, skills, and special abilities—that may be shared for the good of all. One of the deepest implications of the logic of gift is that we can only fully discover ourselves through sharing our gifts with others. We make ourselves a self-gift.” (M. J. Naughton et al., 2015, p. 24)

We can even go down to the daily practice

- “Some practical applications in respecting man's dignity in the workplace are as follows:
 - a) one should be given time off of work to worship God, thus upholding man's dignity and keeping him connected with his Creator; b)
 - b) one should have periods of rest and not be expected to work long hours that prevent one from getting adequate sleep; c)
 - c) one should not be required to work in unsafe conditions where he is in danger of bodily harm; d)
 - d) one should not be forced to work in immoral conditions that endanger his soul; e)
 - e) an employer should pay a fair wage and an employee should give a full day's work for a full day's pay; f)
 - f) states should not overtax earnings; g) a worker should be allowed time to fulfill family obligations.

These guidelines maintain the respect and dignity of the person.” (Lanari, 2011)

- “Do I place the dignity of all workers above profit margins?” (PCJP, 2012, p. 27)

Even the term „HR” should be reconsidered

- “from a personalistic standpoint **the ‘employees as assets’ or ‘human resources’ metaphor overlooks the intrinsic worth and dignity of employees as human persons.** That their work is valuable does not imply that employees are assets. Assets are purchased, used, loaned, sold, recycled, exchanged, or depreciated, written down, or written off to signify their changing instrumental value. Were ‘employees’ to substitute ‘assets’ in that sentence, the result would spell slavery. Employees seen as ‘assets’ are actually conceived as mere means toward an end. An employee is a human person; an asset has, at most, instrumental value.” (Acevedo, 2012, p. 214)
- “Entering into a contract with an employee already presupposes the autonomy and basic dignity of both parties. By subsequently reifying employees, HRM “forgets” the implicit terms under which the employment contract is valid in the first place. The **organization treats the employee as if they were mere instruments.**” (Gazi Islam, 2013, p. 6)
- I agree with Matthijs Bal and Simon B. de Jong to “propose organizational democracy for the development of human dignity and argue for the redefinition of Human Resource Management into **Human *Dignity* ‘Management’**”

Much more than just a new buzzword!

„What gets measured, gets done!” (Percy Barnevik) How is it in the case of human dignity?

“Human dignity is a dangerous thing to measure. The worth of humans has been scaled by the color of their skin; elevated according to education, beauty, and notoriety, aggrandized in excessive compensation packages for CEO's, inflated by populist appeal of athletic and acting ability, discounted in the twilight years of adulthood, insulted in slavery, ignored in the Holocaust, and declared irrelevant in abortion. Less worth or desirability is attributed to those who are average or below average, those who occupy positions of unassuming service, those who are infirm or weak, those who have suffered loss of their abilities from a tragic accident, those who are terminally ill, those who are not self-sufficient, and even those who are none of the above, but who are merely unwanted or unappreciated by someone arrogant or powerful.

If we look closely, we find something else very unsatisfactory about human measures of worth: they mark each and every one of us as having less worth at some point in life.

Another problem is that human measures of dignity depend on viewpoint. The woman with an unwanted pregnancy might deny any worth of the developing human in her womb, while a couple who has tried for a decade to have a child might give everything for the privilege of raising that same fetus. Human measures of worth depend on who is doing the measuring.” (Picard, 1998)

The dignity index uses human rights as a proxy (R-Scale)

Human Dignity Index = Human Expression Index - Human Oppression Index.

- Or in shorthand: $D\text{-Scale} = E\text{-Scale} - O\text{-Scale} = E\text{-Scale} + R\text{-Scale} - 1000$ The range is from +1000 to -1000.
- **Human Oppression Index** = The complement of the Human Rights Index, calculated as $1000 - \text{Human Rights Index}$. In shorthand: this $O\text{-Scale} = 1000 - R\text{-Scale}$.
- **Human Rights Index** – Compliance with the UN Declaration of Human Rights measured on a scale from 0-1000 where 1000 represents full and effective compliance with the declaration. This is the R-Scale.
- **Human Expression Index** – Inspiration of the Human Spirit: creativity, courage, curiosity, invention, transcendence, amazement, and awe. Measure the number of artists, inventors, comedians, adventurers, and explorers. Normalize to a scale of 1000. This is the E-Scale. (“Dignity Index,” n.d.)

It might be a good start on a political level, but we have to develop a more complex, more dignified measuring system for management

As a kind of summary: mgmt. can be derived out of CST

- **“Catholic Social Teaching capably articulates responsibilities that reflect love, justice, and human rights.** Beyond regarding workers as mere cogs in a mindless, faceless machine, managers need to respect the inherent human dignity of their firms’ workers. This respect is demonstrated by providing workers with, not only just, but also market-based pay that meets, at the very least, their basic necessities while enabling them to actively participate in the civic sphere (LEx, No. 19). Managers must also provide workers with fair and decent working conditions that are free from occupational hazards and do not contribute to the long-term decline of their workers (LEx, No. 19). These conditions and standards are of course, determined by context, but may include time and workspace devoted to the spiritual needs of employees (Geh and Tan 2009, Vandenberghe 2011). Finally, managers should provide workers and their union representatives with opportunities to constructively discuss **just compensation and meaningful working conditions that are consistent with subsidiarity and distributive justice** (LEx, No. 20). It is the management’s responsibility to provide employees with the necessary information for such discussions, assuming that the information would not fundamentally undermine the firm’s competitive standing (Vaccaro and Sison 2011, pp. 22, 24).” (Carrascoso, 2014, pp. 317–318)

***Be one of those, who are ready for
“practicing” human dignity by “mastering
one’s existence and then displaying that
mastery” (Spaemann 2010 p. 55).***

Email: hejj.tibor@p-m-c.hu

Mobile: +36 30 350 0296

References 1.

- **Acevedo, A.** (2012). Personalist Business Ethics and Humanistic Management: Insights from Jacques Maritain. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0959-x>
- **Barnevik, P.** (2007). Interview - Percy Barnevik. Retrieved from <http://www.alliancemagazine.org/interview/interview-percy-barnevik/>
- **Beyleveld, D., and R. Brownsword.,** (2001). Human dignity in bioethics and biolaw. *Oxford: OUP*
- **Bolton, S. C.** (2010). Being human: dignity of labor as the foundation for the spirit–work connection. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 7(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766081003746422>
- **Carrascoso, A. C.** (2014). A framework for a Catholic Stakeholder core. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 11(4), 307–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766086.2014.913496>
- Constitution, A. (1992). **Catechism of the Catholic Church.** *Homebush: Saint Pauls.* Retrieved from <http://www.mariaesperanza.org/html/English/Catechism%20of%20the%20Catholic%20Church.pdf>
- **Crown Prince Haakon of Norway.** (2013). OECD Forum - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Retrieved October 27, 2016, from <https://www.oecd.org/forum/its-all-about-people-jobs-equality-and-trust-and-dignity.htm>
- **Dierksmeier, C.** (2011). Reorienting Management Education: From the Homo Economicus to Human Dignity. *Humanistic Management Network, Research Paper Series*, (13–5). Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1766183
- **Dierksmeier, C.** (2015). Human dignity and the business of business. *Human Systems Management*, 34(1), 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-150830>
- **Dignity Index.** (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.emotionalcompetency.com/hdi/>

References 2.

- **Dupré, C.** (2012). Dignity, Democracy, Civilisation. *Liverpool Law Review*, 33(3), 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10991-012-9123-7>
- **emotionalcompetency.** (n.d.-a). Dignity Index - Protecting Human Rights Report Guidelines. Retrieved <http://www.emotionalcompetency.com/hdi/hrq.htm>
- **emotionalcompetency.** (n.d.-b). Emotional Competency - Dignity. Retrieved from <http://www.emotionalcompetency.com/dignity.htm>
- **EUR-Lex.** (2016). EUR-Lex - 12016P000 - EN - EUR-Lex. Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A12016P000>
- **Frankl, V. E.** (1985). *Man's search for meaning*. Simon and Schuster. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/books?hl=hu&lr=&id=W3q8R4dRZTwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA9&dq=+Viktor+E.+Frankl,+Man%27s+Search+for+Meaning&ots=gnQRHD4jEG&sig=4p4UGpYQ0Kv3MWQUFILVASEUsrl>
- **Gazi Islam.** (2013). Recognizing employees: reification, dignity and promoting care in management. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 20(2), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527601311313490>
- **Greenleaf, R. K.** (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journal in the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press, New York, NY.
- **greenleaf.org.** (n.d.). What is Servant Leadership? Retrieved from <https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/>
- **Guevara Urbina, M.** (n.d.). quote. Retrieved from <http://www.goodreads.com/work/quotes/42574741-twenty-first-century-dynamics-of-multiculturalism-beyond-post-racial-am>

References 3.

- **Hahn, R.** (2012). Inclusive business, human rights and the dignity of the poor: a glance beyond economic impacts of adapted business models. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 21(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8608.2011.01640.x>
- **<http://catholic-thoughts.info/>** (2014). Talks for the Holy See. Retrieved from http://catholic-thoughts.info/catholic_life/talksForTheHolySee.htm
- **Islam, G.** (2012). Recognition, Reification, and Practices of Forgetting: Ethical Implications of Human Resource Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1433-0>
- **Jones, J.** (2012). Human Dignity in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and its Interpretation Before the European Court of Justice. *Liverpool Law Review*, 33(3), 281–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10991-012-9121-9>
- **Kammer, F.** (n.d.). An Introduction to Catholic Social Thought. Retrieved from <http://www.loyno.edu/jsri/catholic-social-thought>
- **Kammer, F.** (2009). What is Catholic Social Teaching (CST)? JSRI Newsletter. Retrieved from http://www.loyno.edu/jsri/sites/loyno.edu.jsri/files/WhatisCST-Spring2009jsq_0.pdf
- **Kant, I.** (1785) Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals, *Koenigsberg*, Sect. II, Akad. 440.
- **Kennedy, R., Naughton, M., Habisch A** (2011). Rationale for a Proposal to the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace to develop a document on “Catholic Social Principles for Business Professionals and Business Educators”. Retrieved from <https://www.stthomas.edu/media/catholicstudies/center/ryan/conferences/2011-vatican/KennedyNaughtonHabis1.pdf>
- **Kleinig, J., & Evans, N. G.** (2013). Human Flourishing, Human Dignity, and Human Rights. *Law and Philosophy*, 32(5), 539–564. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10982-012-9153-2>

References 4.

- **Lanari, B.** (2011). “Rerum Novarum” and Seven Principles of Catholic Social Doctrine. Retrieved from http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2011/blanari_rerumnovarum_may2011.asp
- **Lowney, C.** (2010). *Heroic leadership: Best practices from a 450-year-old company that changed the world*. Loyola Press. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/books?hl=hu&lr=&id=LjZSFhj8M_EC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=heroic+leadership&ots=l2Ci5YT70p&sig=O9vi5nYT01qclsd6uHpH2w0bO4g
- **Macklin, R.** (2003). Dignity is a useless concept. *Bmj*, 327, 1419–20.
- **Maritain, J., & Galantière, L.** (1966). *Existence and the Existent* (Vol. 324). Vintage Books.
- **Mattson, D. J., & Clark, S. G.** (2011). Human dignity in concept and practice. *Policy Sciences*, 44(4), 303–319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-010-9124-0>
- **Melé, D. (2009a).** Integrating Personalism into Virtue-Based Business Ethics: The Personalist and the Common Good Principles. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0108-y>
- **Melé, D. (2009b).** Integrating Personalism into Virtue-Based Business Ethics: The Personalist and the Common Good Principles. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(1), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0108-y>
- **Melé, D.** (2012). The Firm as a “Community of Persons”: A Pillar of Humanistic Business Ethos. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 106(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1051-2>
- **Melé, D.** (2014). “Human Quality Treatment”: Five Organizational Levels. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(4), 457–471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1999-1>
- **Naughton, M., Habisch, A., Lenssen, G., & Alford, H.** (2010). The practical wisdom of personalism. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(7/8), 697–705.

References 5.

- **Naughton, M. J., Buckeye, J. G., Goodpaster, K. E., & Maines, T. D.** (2015). *Respect in action. Applying subsidiarity in business.* St. Paul, MN: University of St. Thomas and UNIAPAC.
- **Neal, M.** (2012). “Not Gods But Animals”: Human Dignity and Vulnerable Subjecthood. *Liverpool Law Review*, 33(3), 177–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10991-012-9124-6>
- **O’Brien, T.** (2009). Reconsidering the Common Good in a Business Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(S1), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9942-6>
- **Page, D., & Wong, T. P.** (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. *The Human Factor in Shaping the Course of History and Development*, 69–110.
- **Paul II, P. J.,**(1991). Centesimus annus. Retrieved from <http://www.centesimusannus.org/media/2hnjg1352218016.pdf>
- **Paul VI.** (1965, December 7). Gaudium et Spes. Retrieved October 29, 2016, from http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html
- **Paul VI.** (1967, March 27). Populorum Progressio. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html
- **Picard, R. W.** (1998, May 1). The Measure of Dignity. Retrieved from <http://web.media.mit.edu/~picard/personal/dignity/node4.html>
- **Pinker, S.** (2008). The stupidity of dignity. *The New Republic*, 28(05.2008), 28–31.
- **Pirson, M.** (2013). Towards a Humanistic Management Paradigm: a step back to embrace the future? *Fordham University Schools of Business Research Paper*, 13–2.

References 6.

- **Pirson, M., & Dierksmeier, C.** (2014a). Reconnecting Management Theory and Social Welfare: A Humanistic Perspective - Dignity as the Missing Link. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2410374>
- **Pirson, M., & Dierksmeier, C.** (2014b). Reconnecting management theory and social welfare: A humanistic perspective-dignity as the missing link. *Fordham University Schools of Business Research Paper*, (2410374), 14–13.
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. (2004). **Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church**. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/documents/rc_pc_justpeace_doc_20060526_compendio-dott-soc_en.html
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (PCJP) (2012). **Vocation of the Business Leader: a Reflection**. Retrieved from http://www.justpax.it/pls/pcgp/rn_pcgp_new.r_select_abstract?id=3221&lingua=2
- **Pope Benedict XVI.** (2009). *Caritas in Veritate: Encyclical Letter*. St Pauls Publications.
- **Pope Francis** (2014, June 24). Twitter post. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/Pontifex/status/481367133494865922>
- **Pope Francis** (2015). Pope Francis: Speech at World Meeting of Popular Movements. Retrieved from http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2015/07/10/pope_francis_speech_at_world_meeting_of_popular_movements/1157291
- **Pope John XXIII.** (1961). *Mater Et Magistra: Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pope John XXIII [on] Christianity and Social Progress*. Paulist Press. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater.html
- **Pope John Paul II.** (1987). *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis.html

References 7.

- **“Principles of Catholic...”** (n.d.). The Catholic Church in Aotearoa New Zealand | Principles of Catholic Social Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.catholic.org.nz/social-action/dsp-default.cfm?loadref=62>
- **Schroeder, D.** (2012). Human Rights and Human Dignity: An Appeal to Separate the Conjoined Twins. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 15(3), 323–335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-011-9326-3>
- **Sparling, R.** (2012). Theory and Praxis: Simone Weil and Marx on the Dignity of Labor. *The Review of Politics*, 74(1), 87–107. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670512000058>
- **Spaemann, R.** (2010). *Essays in Anthropology – Variations on a Theme. Translated by G. de Graaff & J. Mumford. Eugene, OR: Cascade*
- **Spitzeck, H.** (2011). An Integrated Model of Humanistic Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0748-6>
- **Uniapac.** (2008). The Profit of Values. Retrieved from <http://www.uniapac.org/filesPDF/The%20Profit%20of%20Values.pdf>
- **UNIAPAC.** (2015, March 24). UNIAPAC. Retrieved from <http://uniapacfrica.org/quem-somos/uniapac-internacional/>
- **Williams, T. D., & Bengtsson, J. O.** (2016). Personalism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2016). Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2016/entries/personalism/>