

“Neither a beast nor a god”: A Philosophical Anthropology of Humanistic Management

William G. Foote

2024-06-05

Abstract

Is freedom and capability enough to sustain our well-being? For human flourishing to progress, defer, and avoid decline, managers as persons must grow in virtue to transcend to the ultimate source of the good. In our definition of a person we develop an anthropology of gift through the communication of one self to another and whose form is love, the willing the good of the other. We ask four questions about the humanistic manager as a person: what is the goal, end, good; what form, structure guides the manager; what materials, resources, technology, and context does the manager use within the structure to meet the end and exceed the goals, what is the means of effecting the change needed to meet the manager’s goals. Each of these questions form the basis to construct a philosophical anthropology of humanistic management. To these four questions we add three types of finality: the usual absolute terminal and horizontally immanent finalities plus the vertical finality of every growing and developing person among other persons in community. The need for a philosophical anthropology derives from a concomitant ethical requirement of what does and ought the manager, as person, undertake. What and how the person knows, wills, acts on provides the reality within which the manager, as person, operates. Along the way we will visit topics of transcendence, secularism, vulnerability, authentic personhood, and virtue. We conclude with a description, which is a dynamically evolving scheme of the meaning of a manager in the world, the social, and perhaps, the terminal goods of order. We move far from the *homo faber* of a technology-led world whose thought conforms being. We have begun to extend our manager into the species *homo transcendens* where being conforms thought and responsible action. We conclude with a sketch on the emerging role of spirituality in the workplace with connections to compassionate leadership, organizations as sites for healing and growth, and examples from the experience of humanistic organization who seem to have survived and thrived centuries of global operations. From an anthropology of gift we can identify several implications for managers. Humanistic management education would subsume the rational choice hegemony of economic modeling to a technological subset of tools, subject to the goals and nature of human persons. The scientism of thinking that psychology, sociology, political science, and economics would suitably describe, explain, and model human decisions would be replaced by an overarching framework leading to higher levels of knowledge, especially wisdom based educational experiences and content based on the natural integrity of human beings as learners. Since all technology follows, rather than leads, persons in an anthropology of gift, workplace practices would be founded in the structures immanent in persons and communities of persons. This would imply practices which transcend appraisal and assessment of performance to heights of contemplation and implementation of meaning in every task. Instead of beginning with a deficit of “what’s in it for me?” practices can begin with the surplus “how can I help you?” Proposed are practices which impound wisdom-based attributes of compassion, active listening, alterity, mercy, companionate and agapic love in decision analyses, interpretations of results, and incentives. The objective of the humanistically managed organization under the aegis of an anthropology of gift would be to minimize the maximum grief for the the most vulnerable. The objective would be applied as a policy across all authorities delegated by jurisdictions over organizations, and by boards, oversight groups, over decisions within organizations. This view from an anthropology of gift is consonant with emerging definitions of organizations as healing spaces where a balance of solidarity and subsidiarity guides decisions as opposed to simplistically applying supply and demand trade-offs.

We are living in an era dominated by the profit motive and anxiety over national economic objectives... It is people who matter ultimately, profits are only instrumental means to human

lives. The purpose of development . . . is to enable people to live full and creative lives developing their potential and fashioning a meaningful existence commensurate with their equal human dignity. Martha C. Nussbaum, *Creating Capabilities: A Human Development Approach* (p. 185).

In pursuing the view that development as freedom, we have to examine – in addition to the freedoms involved in political, social, and economic processes – the extent to which people achieve outcomes they value and have reason to value. (p. 291). . . Viewing development in terms of expanding substantive freedoms directs attention to the ends that make development important, rather than merely to some of the means that, *inter alia*, play a prominent role in the process. (p. 3). Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*.

He who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1253a 27–9.

Every day human interdependence grows more tightly drawn and spreads by degrees over the whole world. As a result the common good, that is, the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment, today takes on an increasingly universal complexion and consequently involves rights and duties with respect to the whole human race. . . [T]here is a growing awareness of the exalted dignity proper to the human person, since he stands above all things, and his rights and duties are universal and inviolable. . . Hence, the social order and its development must invariably work to the benefit of the human person. . . It must be founded on truth, built on justice and animated by love; in freedom it should grow every day toward a more humane balance. An improvement in attitudes and abundant changes in society will have to take place if these objectives are to be gained." Paul VI, *Gaudium et Spes*, 26.

Introduction

To achieve any notion of the human good, and with organizations especially the *good of order*, we must directly insert authentic human behavior into the consideration and reflection on our managerial decisions. Authentic human behavior derives from the moral agent who makes and executes decisions in the complex of relationships we call family, affinity groups, organizations, politics, cultures. Yet the rise in transnational crime correlated with corruption in transnational organizations witnesses an ongoing and repeated failure in human decision making degrading any movement of progress, especially for the most vulnerable in our communities. Nearly every organization has a code of conduct, supported by work practices, ratified by stakeholders, multiple overlapping compliance requirements, and subject to severe market, civil and criminal penalties, including loss of franchises and concessions as well as irreparable harm to long held positive reputations.¹ In spite of repeated efforts at legislating and building compliance frameworks to govern markets, capital flows, and the personal activities of leaders and managers, the failure of achieving well-being and the implementation of basic human rights continues to plague our organizations, markets, and families globally.

This essay continues to challenge current purely rationalistic approaches to decision making and *moral inquiry* and proposes a multi-pronged inclusion and extension of horizons of inquiry and the strength of feelings about objective value by *moral agents* into the *moral universe* within which we all operate with a *moral life*. Any human being constructs a worldview along four successive movements: an objective *moral universe*, within which *moral agents* deploy *moral inquiry* for the purpose of leading the *moral life*. For even if we do not include the four dimensions of any human being's worldview explicitly, we, as human makers and decisioners

¹For example, the *Corruption Perception Index* has recorded since 1993 a progressive decline in perceptions of integrity, transparency and accountability, especially in transnational relations, investments, controls, and managerial behaviors. <https://www.transparency.org/en/news/cpi-2022-trouble-at-the-top> The *Foreign Policy* website, hosted by the *Foreign Policy* journal, comments on the Transparency International 2022 report and notes the ongoing rise of corrupt practices by transnational organization in realizing corporate objectives. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2023/11/13/capitalism-financial-secrecy-corruption-democracy/>

and actors, imply whatever we happen to believe (justified or not) in all of our conscious, intuitive, affective and rationally contrived supports for the decisions we make. Throughout this essay we will echo the call for capabilities and a notion of actionable freedom, but be guided by actions, attitudes and structures to achieve the greater common good in *Gaudium et Spes*. Emphasized here is the humanistic manager as a person in a community of persons who receives and gives of self at once both transcending altruism with ever greater generosity for the common good (Melé (2012), Biggar (2013)) all leading to workplace practices and culture of caring, agape, and healing (Sferrazzo (2021), Simola (2023), and Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021)).

The title of this essay is from Aristotle (1941) and acknowledges that humans think and feel, but in the end are fallible decision makers who need the collaboration of other humans to progress. We require much development and practice to get it right. Byrne (2018) builds on Lonergan (1972) and Lonergan (1957) to develop a *moral inquiry* based on the jointly discerning heart and mind. Within this development are relations among feelings, values, and beliefs in the *moral agent* as constitutive of ethical judgment. Building on this ethical foundation we pose three specifically anthropological questions in this essay to focus on the decision maker as *moral agent*.²

1. What is the nature of the *moral agent*, the human manager who decides and acts to promote the good of order?
2. Why does this characterization of human nature matter to the good of order?
3. How does the authentic human nature transmit, develop, transform the decline of the good of order into progress?

In what follows we begin to sketch the structure to frame answers to these questions. The sketches will help support our thesis that all human decision makers are vulnerable beings who can only progress to the attainment of a common good through growth in the virtues, at the least, prudence, self-care, justice, and gratitude, all in support of charity whose fruit is love.³ We will define *love* as the willing of the good for the other as the other.⁴ We will directly engage with Domingo and Melé (2022) to “to consider the human being in his or her integrity, . . . contribute to the recovery of a more complete view of the human being in management, . . . being open to beauty and transcendence.” (Domingo and Melé (2022), 1).

With this definition we insert relations among those who can will a good always for oneself and for others. For the manager this is minimally the good of order, often cast in terms of a market with participants, goods, and arrangements to exchange goods. The terms might be an ensemble of compliances and practices, for example, contracts which define and mediate exchange of goods among persons. The humanistic manager wills the good for the other, a colleague, vendor, employee, oneself. These sketches expand on the humanistic management program outlined by Pirson (2016), Dierksmeier (2016), and Melé (2016). The program relies on a normative history of thought and activities of human nature and the environment within which humanistic managers operate ranging from post-Descartes and predominantly Kantian accounts to Aristotelean-Thomistic anthropology and Catholic Social Teaching. Alongside the development of humanistic management are the “markets and morality” movement of economic personalism heralded by Gronbacher (1998) and cultural evolution helmed by Henrich et al. (2023). All agree that a sea change from the relatively exclusive use of the economic rational choice model in management education, for example, Mankiw and Taylor (2020),⁵ and Krugman and Wells (2021), must be expanded along affective and discerning horizons beyond individuals to include the key institutions of human polity, and through evolutionary and other social processes, the ongoing development of the good of culture.

²Byrne (2018) proposes three questions in the style of Lonergan (1957) *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* for *moral inquiry*: 1) What are we doing when we decide ethically? 2) Why is doing this ethical? 3) What actions result from the ethical decision? We follow his lead to extend explicitly this thought into the human being as *moral agent*.

³Keenan (2022), McCloskey (2003).

⁴Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologiae* I-II q.26, a.4. There are available several other post-Thomas definitions, from Descartes through about 1914, for example Descartes (1985) (*Passions of the Soul*, Article 79)) and from 1914 to the present day, as with Singer (2009b), both of whom we will soon engage.

⁵But see his popular and very diverse Harvard Freshman discussion course at https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/mankiw/files/getting_along.pdf.

In what develops in this essay draws from several resources. First, Melé, Cantón, and Cantón (2014) develops the history and process of philosophical anthropology rife with managerial examples in a context and commentary which matches the many volumes of Frederick Copleston's monumental history of philosophy, especially Copleston (2003)'s history of contemporary, post-modern, philosophy, and with Chapter VIII concerning the human person. Second, Adler (1993) applies a Thomistic-Aristotelian approach to philosophical anthropology to argue that human beings (thus humanistic managers) are different in kind from the *beast* (i.e., the Turing Machine⁶ robot) in the title of this essay, not simply different in degree. Third, Hacker (2011) and Onians (1988) provide sweeping etymological archaeologies of linguistic sources for discussing human nature across several cultures. These excavations allow managers to clarify terms, extend their logic from material science into the contemplation of the meaning of their decisions in super-material, spiritual terms. Fourth, Donceel (1967) and Meissner (1986) plumb the depths of the psychology of the person in terms of metaphysical and religious experience. These depths often motivate decisions through emotional and impulsive states on the one hand, and contemplative transcendence on the other. Fifth, I agree with Acevedo (2012) that humanistic management is, in its nature, personalistic, and aligns with Maritain (1947) and his contribution to the formulation of human rights in the 1947 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights based on a traditional notion of human dignity. Alongside this personalistic agreement is Lewis (2009b) *The Abolition of Man*, and the appendix compendium of instances of the existence of an objective transcultural natural law written on human hearts. Humanistic management operates in the middle of transcultural organizations, markets, ventures, and projects and thus is subject to the overriding law of human nature. This law is consonant with and promotes human dignity and at least begins with human decency.⁷ Without a threshold based on human dignity, the goal of humanistic management is not possible.⁸ Sixth, what is new in the literature in this essay is the linkage among personalism, humanistic management, and a philosophical anthropology of gift as elucidated by Schindler (2011). David L. Schindler interprets and supports the metaphysics of person presented in Clarke (1993) and Wojtyła, Ignatik, and Anderson (2021) along with cultural implications from Benedict XVI (2011).

With a basis in an anthropology of gift, this essay will develop foundations for the following interconnecting set of management implications along the practical categories of pedagogy, practices, and policies employed by Pirson (2017).

Pedagogy. An anthropology of gift places persons ahead of and informing the need for an configuration of any technology, including educational content and process including the design of educational experiences for students. Already a culture of internship and community research is beginning to pervade management education as curricula are just beginning to emphasize hands-on learning opportunities over the dominance of lecture approaches. Curricular learning goals instead would guide students to expand horizons and interests to serve customers, clients, patients rather than economically trading off their preferences. The “flipped classroom” and learning labs would be at the center, rather than the periphery, of the humanistic management educational enterprise. Humanistic management education would subsume the rational choice hegemony of economic modeling to a technological subset of tools, subject to the goals and nature of human persons. The scientism of thinking that psychology, sociology, political science, and economics would suitably describe, explain, and model human decisions would be replaced by an overarching framework leading to higher levels of knowledge, especially wisdom based educational experiences and content based on the immaterial needs of managerial learners.⁹

Practices. Since all technology follows, rather than leads, persons in an anthropology of gift, the technology represented by workplace practices would be founded in the structures immanent in persons and communities of persons, for example organizations. Central to practices would be the infusion of mindfulness implicit in contemplative offers of gift and consonantly contemplative receptions of gift to promote the well-being and dignity of the community of persons and every organization. This would imply practices which transcend

⁶Turing (1950) asks if a machine can think. The dual to Turing's primal question is Harari (2017)'s question whether human beings are algorithms. Both of these sides of the coin are ripe for philosophical anthropological reflection.

⁷The first three chapters of Lewis (2009a) works through human decency as basis for respect and dignity.

⁸This is a conclusion presented by Pirson (2017), Chapter 2, “Human Nature.”

⁹A personalist anthropology of gift is as radical as the proposals of Illich (1971) to “de-school” the existing educational institutionalization of “services rendered replacing values” (Illich (1971), 2), and Lewis (2009b) to return to the *Tao*, that is, the transcultural natural law, which is an “obedience which is not slavery” (Lewis (2009b), 73) to overturn our educational and managerial culture “[w]here virtue has become *integration* and diligence *dynamism*” (Ibid., 74).

appraisal and assessment of performance to heights of contemplation and implementation of meaning in every task. Instead of beginning with a deficit of “what’s in it for me?” practices can begin with the surplus “how can I help you?” practices. When every person in an organization is out to help every other person, well-being and dignity will progress. Proposed are practices which impound attributes of compassion, active listening, alterity, mercy, companionate and agapic love in decision analyses and implementations, interpretations of results, and incentives to supersede merely economistic goals.¹⁰

Policies. We might contemplate a proposal through which every organization, whether or not public, private, small, medium or large, is chartered and certified as a Public Benefits organization (PBC; B Corp). One aspect of a B Corp is the objective of managerial decisions. Diametrically opposed to an economistic view of the products and services and with net benefits accruing to the organization is the reigning view of “the greatest good for the greatest number.” This is the objective of the rational choice model of economics however constrained. The humanistic management paradigm regards rational choice models as insufficient and not fit for the purpose of promoting well-being and human dignity.¹¹ The objective of the humanistically managed organization under the aegis of an anthropology of gift would be to minimize the maximum grief for the the most vulnerable. The objective would be applied as a policy across all authorities delegated by jurisdictions over organizations, and by boards, oversight groups, over decisions within organizations. This view from an anthropology of gift is consonant with emerging definitions of organizations as healing spaces.¹² Governance of the humanistic organization would implement principles of solidarity and subsidiarity into organizational policies to guide decision makers.¹³

Altogether. Organizational policies, practices, and education will enhance and protect the ability of persons to communicate, freely given of themselves without recourse, and participate in organizational decisions. Leaders will serve as decision affirmers, coaxing participation, visioning new horizons, and healing conflict. The Gifts rendered will transform the organization for the good of others as others.

This essay proceeds as on a pyramid. At the top is a consideration of what is a person, for human beings, and humanistic managers, especially as the self-communication of gift to another person; the only return to such generosity is the active reception of the gift by the other. The next layer elucidates further definitions and relationships for humanistic anthropology, ends, forms, materials and agency, especially the dialectical framework of humanistic management. Armed with these basics, we explore implications of self-transcendence and move then into a technical discussion of absolute, horizontal and vertical finality all to arrive at an *anthropology of gift* at the heart of capability development for freedom as well-being, a font of human dignity, from basal needs to human flourishing in ever expanding yearning for and consciousness of completing the ends of the common good. Thresholds of capability can only provide *freedom from* lack of development as persons. The *anthropology of gift* as foundation for humanistic management promotes *freedom for excellence* to grow sustainable human flourishing. While cognizant of constraints, talents, commitments, and compliances, the Giver freely gives without recourse. I conclude this essay with an expanded agenda for the humanistic management of communities of persons focused on the application of the humanistic anthropology of gift 1) to workplaces as spaces to generate caring and healing and 2) to the practice of spirituality in workplaces as the

¹⁰Sferrazzo (2021) proposes that “beyond focusing on reward systems, companies should recognize agapic behaviors to increase workers’ intrinsic motivation.” The “love” here includes psychological constructs for potentially higher forms of human activity as indicated in an anthropology of gift. Hegi and Bergner (2010) offer an essentialist analysis to guide psychological investigations into the nature of love.

¹¹Hirschfeld (2018) contends that a well-being based economics of markets and decisions cannot be founded on simply rational choice frameworks, and Hirschfeld (2019) goes further to voice the inability of rational choice models to analyze and manage inequality. Regarding *B Corp* certification here is an example of a B Corp, an organization which provides the open-source software *RStudio* used to produce this essay: <https://www.bcorporation.net/en-us/find-a-b-corp/company/rstudio/>.

¹²Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021) construct a framework and typology for “exploring a range of opportunities for how organizations can better respond to suffering and substantively contribute to remedying harm from systematic bias against marginalized groups via healing.” The use of a “systemic” approach aligns with a “minimize the maximum” frame for objectives, the identification of “healing” relates to the therapy of the “grief” of the “most vulnerable,” the “marginalized.”

¹³Kleymann and Malloch (2010) detail the directives of solidarity as community and subsidiarity as responsibility at the appropriate level in a community with the example of the Benedict and Fry (2016). The community comprises lay and monk participants jointly running a commercial enterprise. Baumann (2017) details the cooperative nature of governance exemplified in communities based on gratitude for service to one another as described by Au (2008) regarding the Jesuit *Constitutions* (Ignatius Loyola (1996)). Orsy (2020) develops the healing nature of communal discernment as a paradigm of organizational decision making for the whole person as part of the organization.

organizing principle of governing ever growing capabilities to will the good of others for their sakes, freely given, expecting no return.

Humanistic Manager as Person

Following a history of thought and practice for over two millenia here is the basic idea. 1) Persons want to grow and be complete as persons. 2) Managers are persons and persons love, that is, will the good of the other for the sake of the other. 3) Managers will contribute to their desire to be complete persons by being lovers. 4) To be a lover and to be be-loved is freely to communicate the gift of self and freely and actively receive the gift. 5) The contribution of humanistic management is organize and govern capabilities to give and receive the free self-communication of persons one to another.

We could well start with the first term in the question: “who is loving and who is loved?” We will call this “who” a person, that is, the human being that is a humanistic manager. The psychologists, sociologists, economists, neuro-scientists will effectively ask what are the attributes of what we call a person, as a humanistic manager. These attributes will imply a deeper excavation of the two questions we all ask from an early age: “what am I?” (the human nature question) and “who am I?” (the person question). We will use the philosophical distinction, without disjunction, of the subject and the object. We will call the humanistic manager a *person*, that is, a subject who knows oneself as oneself, distinct from other subject-objects, but also as an object both capable of and responsible for action beyond oneself.

Clarke (1993) is more complete: “[T]here is wide consensus among most contemporary philosophers who take the person seriously, that to be a person signifies a being that is the self-conscious, responsible source of its own actions.” (Clarke (1993), 30-31). He goes on to report the definition proposed by analytical philosopher Amelie Rorty: “the idea of a person is the idea of a unified center of choice and action, the unit of legal, moral, and theological responsibility.” (Rorty (1976), 323).¹⁴ So we will take, for the moment, the humanistic manager as a person endowed with a free will.

As to the question of what am I as a person, let alone a humanistic manager (that is coming up soon), we work further with Clarke (1993) who moves with Thomas Aquinas in just two historical steps. First, the individual is a being who is an “embodied spirit” who is “present to [one]self” in a “first act,” which naturally spills into a “second act” to present itself to others in self-expression . . . through action.” (Clarke (1993), 111). The core of this statement is that to send an act, another being must be able to receive the act. Any being cannot help but act in some way and thus communicate some aspect of itself to other beings.¹⁵ This relationality of all beings in the cosmos, is primordial: “[t]hus to be is to be oriented towards relations and ultimately toward community.” (Clarke (1993), 111). Communities of relationality among beings come in all sort of forms ranging from those materially related, like collections of rocks, to those that are both spiritually and materially related such as communities of persons as detailed in Melé (2012) in evolving cultures as documented in Henrich et al. (2023).

In the second of the two steps the person, as freely and self-consciously relational, can share itself with other persons. Sharing and communicating, can only happen if one or the other or both persons are both receptive to the communication and willing to generate the communication in the first place. All of this happens

¹⁴The definition of persons has undergone several manifestations, here are two. We might stand with A. J. Ayer that “it is characteristic of persons in this sense that besides having various physical properties . . . they are credited with various forms of consciousness.” (Ayer (1963), 302). Harry Frankfurt retorts that “the problem . . . Ayer is concerned with is the understanding the relationship between mind and body, rather than the quite different problem of understanding what it is like to be a creature that not only has a mind a body but is also a person.” (Frankfurt (1971), 5, n.1). Frankfurt resolves the difficulty by endowing a person-creature with a free will which can form “second-order desires,” (Ibid., 6), that is, “[t]hey are capable of wanting to be different, in their preferences and purposes, from what they are.” (Ibid., 7). We are nearly back to Aristotle and Aquinas by way of Rorty and Clarke.

¹⁵A rock even does this according to laws of physics inscribed into the very design of rocks! A rock on a sand beach impresses itself through the medium of gravity into the sand. The sand receives the impression of the rock. Similarly a manager launches a new product in a new geographical market using the media of governance structures in the organization and promotional activities on the ground with consumer segments, all technology to order activities. Market consumers receive the new product through reciprocal trading processes and decide to buy, or not.

developmentally as the person grows through phases of “self-possession, self-communication, . . . and self-transcendence.” (Clarke (1993), 112). Transcendence in turn implies a process of completing and moving dynamically to an ultimate source of all being. We can take this to mean that all persons have a desire to be fulfilled. There are two senses of fulfillment. One is the immanent fulfillment of breaching every possible limitation in the here, the now and the current set of capabilities of the person. This immanence is the least a person needs. But it is not sufficient for the person, or the community of persons, to stay at one level of development. In the sub-atomic world quantum leaps of electrons occur, that is, at least transition, from one energy level to another based on a stimulus such as a light source. *A fortiori* so with persons who seemingly “fall into” a relationship (love, friendship, partnership), transcend their current level of immanence and are pulled upward by the relationship itself into a new level which includes all former lower levels, but is now a new reality of relationship. That this happens dyadically is an historical practical fact of the need for at least two persons to communicate socially, and it is more so in the context of a community of persons.¹⁶ We will return to this analysis with more detail later.¹⁷

We define a person, and so a humanistic manager as person, in terms not of a singular entity, but always in relation with at least one other person. Each person as person is an embodied spirit and as such can communicate with oneself as well as with another and also has as spirit the freedom to do so. The communication itself is a joining of persons and is itself an act which precedes all other potential communications of selves to one another. Both selves are active senders and active recipients. Neither have to make a vow or sign a contract for self-communication to other selves to occur. Although when communication breaks down a declaration of rights which stem from the ground of this relationship will help ensure the integrity of the relationship in concrete situations as in organizations, communities of persons, individuals in a polity.

The issue of the integrity of a relationship leads to fundamental aberrations which can occur in relationship, one is oppression through domination, the other is conflict in diversity. For example, one self can force a specific relationship on another, with force itself the antithesis of free self-communication. Let’s assign a shorthand label to this one forceful self: a *monologist* as one who alone speaks, acts, solely injects meaning into every situation. This person imposes in the extreme an absolute control on the communities of persons which inevitably results in oppression. In this context there is only one person, only one who thinks, acts, and behaves. All other persons react. This is imperialistic management not only of other persons but of the resources which persons need to share freely the gift of themselves with others and for the sake of others.

Another aberration occurs when there are at least two, and possibly multiple and diverse entities, in competition, separately acting and reacting. While an economic duopoly / duopsony, two buyers or sellers, in an industry carries the possibility of at least action and reaction, it also carries with it a different kind of oppression than the overbearing imperialism of the one and only person. It carries an oppression of conflict and often with conflict cutthroat competition. The duopolist is a *duologist* as it is still “me, myself, and I” but now in reactive and competitive relationship with other “me’s, selves and egos.” In this case diversity, a good in and of itself for sustainable freely given relationships, devolves into the seemingly irreconcilable conflict of separate interests.

The two aberrations can be resolved naturally, in the inherent design of persons, through a relationship of the many into the one. This is the meaning of a gift as a freely sent communication of one person in active

¹⁶Managerial examples abound such as in a project team during a dreary project update meeting on a new product or service. Through communicating with one another team members, persons, realize they have been working in the wrong markets using the right tactics. Insight is often the catalyst for change immanently, that is, along the dimensions of the here and now of a project team meeting, and transcendently, as the project jumps from one mode of tactics and locations of project activity to a new level, one more in line with a project’s goals and the value proposition of the project.

¹⁷An operational implication of relationships for humanistic managers is the need to expand computational, data base, and decision ontologies to include the relationships among entities as a category at the same level as entities. Using a technique introduced by Chen (1976) most database packages will derive from legacy data models or allow data engineers to create new *entity-relationship-diagrams* from further experience as management context changes. We can associate entities, as substantial, and relationships with attributes such as dimensions of the time (e.g., short-, intermediate-, and long-run), space (e.g., physical and logical geographies of latitude and longitude, legal arrangements such as joint ventures, and qualitative assessments as level of riskiness and compliance) associated with both components. Most systems focus only on the entity components and relegate the relationship components to being mere connectors with attributes of the shape of many-to-many (entities that is), one-to-many, and many-to-one.

giving and the other person in active receiving.¹⁸ The relationship of gift resolves oppression by recognizing through active sending and receiving of self the other self. The same relationship of gift resolves conflict by replacing competition with cooperation in the jointly active sending and receiving of gifts of selves to the other for the sake of the other. Because the nature of gift is self-communication with others as receiving and who are also givers, nothing is ever expected in return. But what does effectively return to all givers is the magnification of each self among other selves, the community of persons.¹⁹

The move from Thomas (and Clarke) to Descartes and the entire Enlightenment project to Irving Singer is from cognitive choice willing an act to emotion, impulse, concern, and imagination causing the will to act. Thus Descartes (1985) describes love as “an emotion of the soul caused by a movement of the spirits, which impels the soul to join itself willingly to objects that appear to be agreeable to it.” (Descartes (1985), art. 79).²⁰ For Singer (2009b) “[t]he meaning of love is to be found in our propensity to create ideas that liberate us from reality while maintaining our adherence to it (viz., ‘reality’).” (Singer (2009b), 369). In the first volume of his *Nature of Love* trilogy Singer (2009a) views “the nature of love as both a psychological attitude and a moral ideal, but above all, as an artifact of the human imagination.” (Singer (2009a), 22). Using a financial metaphor Hegi and Bergner (2010) define love as the “[i]nvestment in the well-being of the other for his or her own sake.” and ascribes this “critical characteristic” to Singer (2009a). (Hegi and Bergner (2010), 6). Summing up his trilogy, Singer (2009b) declares that love “from above,” namely from God or other “transcendental realm,” is “defunct and unacceptable when taken literally.” (Singer2009IIIlove, 369). Regarding one person’s appraisal of another prior to or being with another person in love, Singer states: “As estimation of worth, appraisals are no different from what a scientist provides when he makes judgments about matters of fact.” (Singer2009IIIlove, 390). This seems to be an example of a reductionist utilitarian *eros*. Christian *agape* (as love for *any other as other*), including the synthesis in Medieval theology with Thomas, is then just bestowal, just blind, perhaps unwanted, benevolence from God above to persons who have no role in the process. This begins to sound like a version of God as *monologist*. “They do not choose their destiny. It chooses them.” (Ibid, 498). As Singer completes his analysis he urges an approach to the all-encompassing “being in love” which combines “benevolence, ... impulse, ... emotion.” (Ibid., 499). Notwithstanding the reduction of love to these states and attributes, we can use aspects of Singer’s terms, namely, operations of *appraisal - bestowal - imagination* with states of *benevolence - impulse - emotion*, to frame an anthropology of gift as following the form, the shape, design of love. But the move to an anthropology of gift promotes *appraisal to discernment, bestowal to gift, imagination to contemplation*.²¹ In our account, Singer misses the art of contemplation, the *Betrachtung* of Pieper and Wald (2014), which results not only in emotionally, psychologically, sociologically sound relationships among persons but in wise and meaningful ones across the history of these relationships. Thus in this frame we include, along with discernment, contemplation as appropriate to freely giving and receiving persons, without expectation, recourse, or return. We would also elevate states of *benevolence to compassion - impulse to conscience -*

¹⁸The use of the gerund *-ing is important here as it engenders an ongoing, perhaps not necessarily continuous, taking and receiving. The response of the receiver is an active receiving and giving of the self of the receiver to others.

¹⁹Further insight into this dynamic of aberration and healing is Scheler (1994) who defines *ressentiment* as “the repeated experiencing and reliving of a particular emotional response reaction against someone else.” (Scheler (1994), 2). He describes the dynamic design, the form, of *ressentiment* as “[taking] shape through the repeated reliving of intentionalities of hatred or other hostile emotions.” However, as a form, “[i]n itself it does not contain a specific hostile intention, but it nourishes any number of such intentions.” (Ibid.) Scheler expresses *ressentiment* as “Rancor” (German, *Groll*) with this template where “[t]he formal structure of resentment expression is always the same: A is affirmed, valued, and praised not for its own intrinsic quality, but with the unverballed intention of denying, devaluating, and denigrating B. A is ‘played off’ against B.” (Scheler (1994), 20). In an anthropology of gift, resentment’s dynamic and delusional negation is replaced by a positive (not positivistic) generosity of A toward B. B will scientifically (not scientific) know the gift and will a return of gratitude naturally (not naturalistic). Gift is not a reaction to others and their actions, literally by definition. Thus gift is not resentment masking love for guilt about another, oneself, or one’s station in life. There is a deeply held detachment, indifference, from circumstance, from the non-essential in giving without counting the cost, or setting the expectation. Without this detachment, resentment begins to work its way subtly at first, then much more obviously, finally, unopposed and part of the fabric of every decision. Especially germane for humanistic managers is Scheler’s approach to “humanitarian” efforts, that is, those for the “love of mankind.” (Ibid., 50). The “love of all” replaces love for any particular person or community of persons. We might suspect this is a strategy for the *monologist* to oppress all others by creating a dependence on the monologist’s *faux* gifts.

²⁰Regarding this definition, Williston (1997) critiques the application of Singer (2009b)’s theory of bestowal - appraisal - imagination - to Descartes. Williston notes that “Descartes eventually abandoned any concupiscent/benevolent distinction.” (Williston (1997), 444). The will is not “subordinate” to the assessment of mind.

²¹Love here is again a willingness leading to a discerned, contemplated choice of the good for the sake of the other, not sentimentality, amorous, companionate, or otherwise.

emotion to disposition consonant with a growing literature on *wisdom*.²²

- The Giver experiences a benevolent concern, a desirous impulse, and/or driving emotion and with this experience discerns (Singer’s appraisal) and contemplates the good for the potential Receiver. There is freedom for excellence which is dispositive in this contemplation. As the Giver contemplates, the Giver discerns a good for the other for the sake of the other, and makes a habit of discernment.
- Upon reaching an intention of willing the good for the Receiver as Receiver, irrespective of the good of the Giver, the Giver then offers, and in this sense, bestows the Gift on the Receiver. But more than bestowal is the accompaniment of the Giver with the Receiver in compassion, the *fellow-feeling-knowledge* of conscience, in experiencing the good with another. Compassion is, in intention, and in act, freely offered. The intention is to allow, to dispose and welcome the Receiver to participate in the good, the self-communication of the Giver.
- The Receiver may or may not be disposed initially, or ever, to receive the Gift. If so inclined (by, say, through states of compassion, conscience, disposition), the Receiver may also discern and contemplate the reception eventually intending to receive the Gift. If not so disposed, the Receiver might simply refuse the Gift, outright as in wisdom, or with ongoing discernment and contemplation. Either way the Receiver chooses and acts on the Gift. The Receiver’s choice is the first instance of a freely given reciprocal move of acknowledgement of the Gift to the Giver.

In what follows, we will begin to unfold the basic structure, the formal cause and finality, of the human being is itself as the dynamic giving and receiving of gift. Schindler (2016) unpacks the gift-form into the three transcendentals of truth, goodness, beauty. For managers in a marketplace, truth is getting the analysis done as best as a team can with actionable, verifiable, and reasonable judgments. Goodness is the sharing of resources with others so they too can flourish. But beauty is contemplative integration, the harmonization of team’s willingness to communicate, actively participate in the sharing for the good of the others for their sake, the receivers in the sharing in the marketplace or any place, in a word, love.

Michael Pirson’s essay “Working Alternatives: From Capitalism to Humanistic Management?” in Seitz et al. (2020), details practical examples of applying an anthropology of gift as examined here through techniques of social, humanistic, entrepreneurship to meet the needs of the most vulnerable in economies world-wide. This approach is diametrically opposed to a modernist anthropology of human beings as “greedy, amoral, utility maximizers.” (Seitz et al. (2020), 220). Instead organizations like Unilever, Grameen Bank, and Grameen-Danone work to build communities from the inside out, and some of those communities are composed of those who must literally beg for sustenance. Two vignettes will be introduced below which parallel the examples Michael Pirson provides to highlight the anthropology of person as gift, a relationship of freely willing the good of the other as the other.

Further Motivation

In what follows we will not be asking how, for example, should transborder enterprises promote human welfare (usually when they support their inly goals); or whether technology will save us from ourselves (it will not since we make technology); or whether assiduously, and arduously, how we should engage and

²²Leeson (2006), a public rational choice theorist, promotes the ideal that benevolence, concluding that “even when policy-makers are partially benevolent towards the public, they are still led to cater to special interests.” Unless practiced by *every* leader benevolence is insufficient to quell the catering disposition toward special interests. Town, Donovan, and Beach (2021) construct a *gestalt* ontology for the experience of emotion, and by extension, impulse, “where the whole is something more than its parts.” The framework integrates “innate, socially constructed, and discursive ontologies to explain how emotions exist as innate yet latent organizational potentialities, become salient through social interaction, and are embedded in organizations through discourse. . .” all in the service of “practical wisdom (phronesis).” Intuition, all that is “innate,” “latent . . . potentialit[y],” and “socially constructed” interactions, along with practical wisdom, help to form the conscience of managers and, by analogy, of organizations. Sferrazzo (2021) study agapic (love *for any others*), not just erotic (love *for just one other*) behaviors in organizations while Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021) focus on organizations as compassionate healing spaces.

manage humans in order to solve war, poverty, suffering. All laudable questions and goals, but what we will continue to ask here who it is, who are we who manage ourselves and others in this world?

We will restrict our deliberations here to two scenarios. First, the more we create new artifacts, processes, enterprises, in a word, technology, to support, enhance, extend human development, the more, paradoxically, we create a new layer of abstraction from nature. The abstraction comes from complexity at the least. And at the least, this *gennetic*²³ development results in an increasing retreat from a position of being previously less complex and less abstract from nature.²⁴

Second, the use of indentured labor pervades nearly all economies. To indenture means effectively to allow another, a company for example, to have a specific, often overriding claim on one's time and even space to pay off a debt, often fronted by the employer. We might explain the practice by the so-called free will consent of parties to *sign up* for whatever the task might be.²⁵ What if a coercion violates the relative peace in a mutually beneficial contract? Is there "free will," a choice which propels the parties to greater excellence? Or is the choice simply one of indifference between two equally good (or not so good) alternatives? For example, male heads of households in certain districts adjacent to, or even on, coal deposits would at the mine mouth be employed to be *lidmen*. A lidman would be directly in the line of exposure of pulverized coal and its dust going into a coke oven and the plumes of carcinogenic gases and particles emitted through the tops of these ovens. We use coke every day as it is the metallurgical fuel of most steel production world-wide. Such a scenario might envision a chain of decision makers from CEOs, division presidents, facility managers, supervisors, and then the lidmen.²⁶ Why indentured? Why a slave? Was there not consent? Were there not other choices? Certainly the lidman is effectively indentured if the lidman's salary supported a family, with an onerous mortgage on the house, or at least a credit agreement inuring to a lease on a rental property. A slave? Did the lidman have a voice, a choice? Probably not given the slate of available employment opportunities. What is the nature of manager to allow these choices? What was the nature of the person, called a lidman, which the managers held and assumed?²⁷

A picture of a humanistic manager philosophically subsumes several manifolds of connected layers of economics, psychology, sociology, even cultural anthropology. These manifolds in turn subsume biology, chemistry, physics and even their representation in algebraic geometry, material and spiritual. We will take as given, that is, self-evident and thus without proof, or even ability to prove, four assumptions, since all arguments, and we will indeed argue here, begin with a set of assumptions. We will not engage in a discussion of the doubtfulness of these assumptions. We will not fall into the skeptical trap which ensnares us into what we, or the objectors, do not believe. We will state what we do believe to be true and ask objectors to do the same. We all believe, upon reflection and discussion with other humans, in some indemonstrable things.

²³The word is from the Greek verb *gennaō* beget, as in parents begetting, generating and producing, even rearing, thus developing, children. The adjective *genetic* in turn derives from the Greek middle voice *gignomai*, have become so, take all shapes, recover oneself (the middle voice is reflexive). The excavating work of Richard Onians explores the development of *gens*, the root of these words, where *genesis* is more the "substance than the agent" of generation. The same root is in the word *genu*, knee, and the German *Kinn*, chin, both related to the generative power of the family. (Onians (1988), (p. 247).

²⁴A simple example inspired by Guardini (1994) is the replacement of a cut stone masonry retaining wall with a concrete steel rebar structure. Managing the supply chain, that is, the humans who find the stone, cut it out of the earth, transport it to a building site, prepare the site, cut the stone to fit the landscape and purpose (retaining wall), and then admire the beauty of the texture of the resulting sculpture. The craftspeople at the site would erect a pre-fabricated steel form, weave rebar in side the form, mix and pour cement into the form, wait several days for the cement to cure, then hire someone to spray paint a design of cut stone to please, aesthetics is everything, the owner of the site. As Guardini notes: "In all manual work we find the primal phenomenon of culture that is human but close to nature. Now compare the smithy with our factories and their electric machines. And compare carpentry and bricklaying with concrete or prefabricated housing. Compare the work of the cabinetmaker or wheelwright with the division of labor at a Ford factory, which breaks down the products into small parts that are produced in vast numbers daily" (Guardini (1994), 24-25).

²⁵See Galenson (1984) for an economic history of the practice in the Americas. We learn that the contract had indentations in the text. The two parties to the contract each possessed a copy of the contract. The indentations in the two copies must line up for the contracts to be enforceable.

²⁶See the report by Abel (2023) relative to the now abandoned Bethlehem Steel works in Maryland and Delaware, US.

²⁷In some countries the lidmen live to about 45 years old and die a short but agonizing death. Sometimes the surviving family is take care of by the company, warlord, provincial governor. In 1996 the People's Republic of China banned beehive coke ovens. In 1996 I was part of team which match-marked and shipped vintage coke processing plants from a Bethlehem Steel site in Delaware to Shanxi Province. It takes years to disseminate technology like this. See Gitig (2018) for the legal, contractual and economic details.

Here are four we will enjoin on any reading of this paper.²⁸

Provisionally we can consider *Spiritual* as understanding (*Verstandnis*) while what is *Material* is what is determined and thus understood (*Verstanden*). If this is so then spiritual is open to *be-ing* while material is a closed system of what, historically or developmentally, is currently and already known to be. If the form of a person is simply and purely material (otherwise understood collections of other material beings), then there is nothing more for the person to be, to understand, to develop, or to grow to some as yet unspecified end. If the design or form of the person is purely spiritual then there is nothing yet understood and everything to understand. Somehow a human being is a unity of the spiritual openness to understanding all being and the material givenness, of limitation, of what is already understood. All of this is known through operations, actions, the result of experiencing the materially and commonsensically understood, contemplating further systematization and theory, interiorly self-reflecting (and possessing for the self) judgments, and alteriorly transcending by freely exercised action. This last step contains state of being called *alterity* as described by Dadosky (2020) and interior to the notion of a person as gift, with the form of person as love, that is, willing the good for the other (*alter*) as the other each in relation to one another.²⁹

The many possibilities of what might “be” as the very limitations of what were once the possibilities, the potency,, is determined by a person’s action. Every person and thus certainly every manager experiences this limitation. After setting up several market and product scenarios, sending thousands of surveys to market participants, interviewing every engineer and banker, in the end, the manager takes all of that simulated possibility and boils its ocean down to the one drop of water called a decision with an action plan which the manager executes (fingers crossed!).

On the flip side of action in the anthropology of gift is the reception of the gift. Thus the discursive setting up of scenarios, testing, experimenting, writing the cheque to implement a decision, all occur with a simultaneous contemplation. This is the conception, the vision, of what the manager means to do.

Given all of the above, we can express our worldview about persons, the world, relationships, and so, in these four statements.

1. We believe that the world, as well as the humans in this world, are real, not a delusion. I personally cannot prove I am in a dream or even as one movie put it in a dream being dreamt in a dream.
2. As we are not deluded, we also will hold that what happens to us also really matters, that is, matters in reality. It matters that if I hear a women scream in agony on the street in front of the local deli that I will awaken some gumption in myself at least to investigate and see if and to the extent of which anyone is hurt or being assaulted. I also hold this as an obligation of the sort that in my decision I will act accordingly and consistently with what I know to be plausibly true. If I see someone is hurt, I will attempt to do something about it to help. Why? We recall this is an assumption not requiring proof, but at least commonsensical.
3. As we hold to things outside of our selves as real and not merely delusional, we will also hold to a developing continuity of something we will call a self, or ego perhaps, across time and space. There is a definite I who somehow relates to another I, you, really, and with consequence.³⁰

²⁸We thus enjoin and suspend with Coleridge any further disbelief, for the duration of this argument.

²⁹Pieper (2009) demonstrates that a “[r]elationship, in the true sense, joins the inside with the outside; relationship can only exist where there is an “inside,” a dynamic center from which all operation has its source and to which all that is received, all that is experienced is brought.” It is a web of interconnected relationships he then defines as a “world:”A world means the same thing, but considered as a whole field of relationships. Only a being that has an ability to enter into relationships, only a being with an “inside,” has a “world”; only such a being can exist in the midst of a field of relations.” (Pieper (2009), 115). The interconnectedness of relationships is the gift of sharing, communicating, oneself to another self, and reciprocally.

³⁰This assumption might lead to a foundation for human dignity. Keenan (2022) notes that Francesco de Vitoria (1483-1546) seems to have developed, from Thomas Aquinas, the notion of “subjective rights” based on “justice [which] determines the right that is due to another.” (Keenan (2022), 219). Vitoria locates this right directly in human nature so that not only the person, but the community of persons, has rights inuring to the self. “Herein Vitoria established the fundamental principle that human dignity and, therein, the equality of all persons and peoples, is founded in being created in the image and likeness of God.” (Keenan (2022), 219). As individual humans have dignity, so do the communities, including nations and organizations, have dignity. De Vitoria (1991) pursues this argument in his tract *De Indus* (*On the American Indians*) using the *quaestiones disputatae* framework we develop further in this essay. (De Vitoria (1991), 231-292).

4. With all of this reality swimming around a continuous self over a life span, we will assume we can choose (something) and that choice will mean responsibility for the choice.³¹

Thus my rendering of G.K. Chesterton's four sanities perhaps extends into the communal realm of humanistic management.³²

Clarify with Definition

Using the four sanities as a basis for our discussion we will attempt here to fathom the nature of the beings who, on the one hand humanistically manage, and, on the other hand, are humanistically managed. Both aspects are required.³³ To fathom such depths is the perennial perview of philosophical anthropology. A definition is in order. By *anthropology* we mean the study of beings, specifically humans, the plural Greek noun *anthropoi*, where study is really the Greek *logos*, as meaning, reason, even word, as in what do we say and mean about humans. By philosophy we mean the friend of wisdom, to directly and literally translate the Greek nouns *philios* and *sophia*, respectively. *Philios* connotes also acquaintance, companion, the "other who is as close to me as my shadow." And *philia* is "love in fellowship," with all the trappings of being with others. While *sophia* is a virtue which encompasses in the Graeco-Roman *politeia* the culmination of knowledge and understanding in experience lived and practiced. But it is not just knowledge garnered from experimentation, supported by the modern scientific method of objective-hypothetical deduction. As *sophia*, wisdom is the knowledge of ultimate causes, virtues, conscience, values, priorities, the order of the world around us. It seems that philosophical anthropology might aid us in our discovery of the meaning of the beings who humanistically manage and are managed. At the least it will help us discover the intelligibilities, the patterns, in ourselves to manage humanistically. Both Costanza (1951) and, much more recently, Georgantzis (2015) argue that the *politeia* offers a participative, socially based, "spherical" approach to participative decision making as an antidote to the modern organization's "pyramidal hierarchy" for humanistic management. The geometric metaphor is not lost on the vast management leadership literature which Fischer and Sitkin (2023) and Ramachandran et al. (2023) review.³⁴

We now step further into this maze of definitions.³⁵ By *humanism* we mean, taking the dictionary definition: "a doctrine, attitude, or way of life centered on human interests or values."³⁶ Thus we take as definitional that *humanistic* is that which pertains to specifically human interests, as in a focus, with other interests as they relate to humanity. Those interests might be precisely what we need to specify as we go along. The International Humanistic Management Association further explains that management involves "the intrinsic value of human beings as humans first and foremost."³⁷ This seems all in line at first blush with each of the

³¹If we take Keenan (2022)'s suggestion with Vitoria that the self we talk about here is by extension the community, not the collection, or aggregation, of selves, then the community also has responsibility for the choices that the community makes.

³²The sanities appear in his "Philosophy for the Schoolroom" at <https://www.chesterton.org/philosophy-for-the-schoolroom/>

³³We have Wittgenstein (2022) to follow in this regard: "... in order to draw a limit to thinking we should have to be able to think both sides of this limit (we should therefore have to be able to think what cannot be thought)." Wittgenstein (2022), 23). Far from a pedantic note, we will rely on such ideas when we frame the form or design of the role of a humanistic manager dialectically. The metaphor extends to gift: sender → relationship → receiver, and possibly back again or onto other receivers, where sender and receiver are two regions on either side of a relationship. The metaphor fails since relationship itself is as primal as the sender or receiver. To be sure the metaphor succeeds there can be no border without abutting regions, or regions without a border, a delimitation, an essence.

³⁴Costanza (1951) makes a further point: "How could pagan society thrive on the vitality of its citizens when the individual was caught up within a World-State or absorbed into a World Soul? Without any certainty about the meaning of personal existence, constant demands on individual and collective allegiance cannot but exhaust the positive energies of human nature, and consequently, individuals and societies inevitably surrender apathetically to sheer activism. For in the recognition that there is in each [person] a final essence, that is to say, an immortal soul-which only God can judge, a limit was set upon the dominion of [persons over persons]. The prerogatives of supremacy were radically undermined. The inviolability of the human person was declared, endowed with authentic and transcendent purposes and inalienable rights." (Costanza (1951), 155).

³⁵Having begun with wonder, we begin to satisfy the Socratic injunction to first define our terms. A linguistic turn to analysis, for example the monumental works of philosophical etymology by Onians (1988) and Hacker (2011), urges us to at least accuracy in our statements.

³⁶The Merriam-Webster Dictionary offers an almost neutral definition.

³⁷From the website itself: <http://humanisticmanagement.international/what-is-humanistic-management/>. All of this is explicitly laid out in Dierksmeier (2016), Pirson (2016) and Melé (2016). But a question presents itself: what is the role of

quotes we began with. It might seem that *Gaudium et Spes*, Sen, Nussbaum, and the philosophical tradition would support this claim.³⁸

We might conventionally define *management* generically as the art and science of administering an organization. But that definition might be too narrow if it does not include the manager as object and subject of management, and this manager is human. To administer typically means provide, dispense, take care of, possibly a very narrow view of what management by a manager does. If we view the role of any manager at the least in provision of the goods which an organization promises to markets, then we might further view the manager as the one who envisions what that good is, designs the path to fulfilling the good, catalyzing and enabling collaboration among other managers and their resources to achieve the design goals and fulfill the promise. This sort of manager lives to serve customers, co-workers, investors, the community in which the organization operates. Melé (2012) offers a comparative typology of organizational forms culminating in the organization as a “community of persons.” Whetstone (2002) folds a personalist anthropology into leadership styles and concludes that “[t]o inspire followers with the strength and sensitivity of a transforming vision, the servant leader would use proven transforming techniques such as developing a vision, enlisting others, fostering collaboration, strengthening others, planning small wins, linking rewards to performance, and celebrating accomplishments.” (Whetstone (2002) p. 391).³⁹ We would then subscribe to a much wider view of administration to that of the unfolding of leadership into administration across the ecosystem within which the manager operates internally and externally. That management is an art or science would to a Greek of 2400 years ago mean *techne*, whence our word technology, the study, reason, meaning (*logos*) of the particular art or science. Here art is the implementation of science and wisdom, that is, knowledge. Wisdom as a product of contemplating action, here the implementation, carries the meaning of an implementation. Both science, culminating in the art (the hammer), and wisdom, as meaning (the carpenter’s intentional use of the hammer), operate together in the discursive act of reasoning along with the contemplative act of conception.

We consult Aristotle for a way to define comprehensively anything we might discuss, in this case a humanistic manager. He labeled this way an analysis of causes, but really he meant not the modern sense of cause rather the Greek notion of the grounds for, reasons for, meaning of something, in the word *aitia*. (Liddell and Scott (2007), 22). It is “analysis” because we will break up our definition into four parts: *final*, the end or good that is desired; *formal*, the design or nature; *material*, the composition and contents; *efficient*, the one acting and enabling whatever it is we are talking about. In this schema the humanistic manager has as an end, human selves, as a good; the nature of which manager is to question, frame, design, structure, draw out pros, cons, resolutions, namely, a road map with a set of action plans; with materials, that is, the technology, the inputs to the action plan, the outcomes of the plan, resources to support and govern the plan; by a mind driven to meet and exceed mission critical objectives to produce the good for the human with all of the constraints, connections, governance, and a will which motivates, but is guided by mind, all driven by a desire to achieve the common good. Here are some details.

The *final cause* is the end or goal or even good of the humanistic manager. The good is that which is desired so that an end or goal seems reasonable. So what good does the manager desire? Already it seems

“centered” in the definition. Is this exclusionary of any other being? If so, we arrive at a moral inquiry, at the moment beyond the scope of this essay.

³⁸We might take “first and foremost” in one of two senses. In one sense, the “first” is the one first in sequence, as in first in a waiting line at the store. That would imply others, of some sort, preceding the first place sequentially. That would also imply that there are no others ahead of the first and foremost human in this consideration of the focus of management. But in another sense, there is a “first and foremost” evolving from a prior state or condition. It would seem that our sanities assume a rationally self-conscious self, a self that can know, in some part, the reasons for the reasons of an action by the self. Well then a rationally conscious being must have preceded and could not supersede the rationally self-conscious being. In turn the intuitively conscious being precedes and could not, since it did not have the capability, let alone the freedom which the capability would help enable, supersede the rationally conscious being. This second sense we might call subsistence, the rationally conscious being subsists in the rationally self-conscious self.

³⁹Whetstone (2002) cites Kouzes and Posner (2010) generally for the linkage of transformational techniques with servant leadership. For an excellent example of this approach recently we have decades of management experience titrated to six mindsets according to McKinsey’s Dewar, Keller, and Malhotra (2022). The personal effectiveness mindset in the McKinsey list would owe much to what it means to be a good manager as unfolded with the virtue management approach to business ethics espoused by West (2018). Yeager and Dweck (2020) describe the evolving theory of growth mindset and an interpretation of several controversies with an eye to research lessons learned from heterogenous practices and results.

that the good of humanistic management is (necessarily in the adjective) humans “first and foremost.” We might want to examine the formulation of this priority. On its face, it might appear humans against all else allowing for a plurality of values some of which are in the domain of an all-consuming and/or all-controlling humanity without regard for the fact that all-consuming, or all-controlling, might annihilate said humanity. For the human decision maker the final cause is the good which the person, any person, strives toward using a structure to frame the analysis of decisions, the content of those decisions, and the abilities, will, conscience, skills to organize and deploy decisions in a very active and challenging context of global and local markets for goods and services.⁴⁰

Anderson (1995) offers a helpful set of examples of the development of a final cause where she contrasts consequentialist rationality with her theory of expressive rationality. For her consequentialists are a thin version of the person. The aim, the *final end*, of the consequentialist is the “maximizing of intrinsic value.” (Anderson (1995), 30). More importantly, all persons, their intentions, values, history, even outlying behaviors, are reduced to a formal object called “intrinsic value,” that is, “the state of affairs,” (Ibid., 18). linked immanently to the immediate satisfaction of attaining intrinsic goods.

In another vein, Kant’s “Copernican” revolution defines truth such that “*objects must conform to our knowledge.*” (my *italics*) (Kant (2008), 21). Knowledge, that is, *Verstand*, as understood here is some aspect of the cognitional operations of thinking, further endows *Verstand* with the form of *maxim*. Lonergan (1957) indicates that the structure of intentionality of human consciousness extends Kant’s notion of thinking into realm of rational self-consciousness and judgment of what is and is not verified in the experience of the subject as virtually unconditioned. (Lonergan (1957), 348-364). For managers this means it is not enough to think concepts about what is apparent through the senses, that is, it is not enough to take a look at, say market data as empirically observed data. The manager as a self knows the reasons for the reasons of a judgment about the movements which might be indicated in market data. Reasons for the reasons are the data of consciousness. This is where managerial wisdom begins. The manager also experiences, understands, and judges the very reasons the manager even makes a judgment at all about market movements. This leads to a manager who is responsible for enacting what the manager knows to be true. In this way *knowledge instead conforms to reality* in the subject who is the manager. The responsibility born of knowledge of market reality then impels the manager to decide on an action in the market, that is, the *will* drives the next managerial act. Subsequent sequences of acts, knowledge, and will consistent with knowledge build successive manifolds of market reality. The manager is at once “explanatory genus coincident with explanatory species.” (Lonergan (1957), 267). By explanatory is meant the ability to systematize the data of facts (e.g, prices) and the data of consciousness (e.g., reasons for the facts as understood and thus intelligible). That a manager is a genus means the manager can systematize what are otherwise species as lower levels of unsystematized coincidences (e.g., independent residuals in a regression of current prices on past prices and volumes of trade). In this one move the manager is the embodiment of a “transition from the intelligible to the intelligent” (Ibid., 267).

One bottom line for the humanistic manager is that market price data samples are necessary but hardly sufficient to discern a buy or a sell or a hold decision. Rarely is it one manager who acts, more likely the manager acts in concert with a community of managers, a management team. More importantly, the management team’s action plan to implement the results and judgments from an understanding of market movements, with the manager present in those very movements, means that the group relationships of each manager in communication with other managers on the team, and perhaps in the marketplace as well, deposits the data of their collective consciousnesses, their reasons for their reasons, into the action plan. This plan now systematizes at a higher viewpoint, a *genus*, from the team’s perspective, various lower unsystematic components of viewpoints, perhaps several *species*, and thus develops a transcending and innovative *final end*.

Second, the *formal cause* is the structure a person as humanistic manager applies to the *techne* of management. Here we will mean the structure of a decision made by management, one of the originating activities

⁴⁰Keenan (2015) raises the role of conscience formation especially given societal debilitation through systemic bias. For the humanistic manager we could follow Keenan’s lead and would ask the question posed by Lonergan (1957): “How is a mind to become conscious of its own bias when that bias springs from a communal flight from understanding and is supported by the whole texture of a civilization?” (Lonergan (1957), xv) This is the work of the self-conscious being, one who forms reasons for reasons in an onward progress of reversing decline. Put simply, the humanistic manager cannot ignore the plight human beings when they fire them for, say, budgetary reasons, or other managerial failures. We can easily wander into an ethical discussion.

by managers in any organization. But we do not want to confuse the context and content of management with the operations and technology of decision making, for example, the content inherent in organizational governance, contracts among and within organizations, markets, regulators, databases, data mining, and the list is quite endless. what we do want to develop is the immaterial component of a primary activity all managers perform – they decide and implement their decisions. The formal cause is the blueprint of the humans who make the decisions to build tall spires into the sky, roam the planet in search of ore and those to mine, process and transport it, and ultimately decide to employ humans to fabricate products other humans will decide to consume. Some might conceive the formal cause as a taxonomy of capabilities.⁴¹ Others have formulated management structure as a set of opposing but linked propositions in the context of the exchange of goods and services. We might even say that the form of the manager, and the polity of a management team, is the structure by which the manager as person transitions from the merely intelligible (e.g., simply pattern recognition) to the intelligent (e.g., genus systematizing the merely coincidental components of species).

All of these, the structures, capabilities, functions, contracts, are likely candidates, but here, in a decision making frame of activity these are just the content, resources, inputs and outputs, the *matter*, that which is already understood and determined, of humanistic management. Here we will bend to an 1500 year old approach made popular in the medieval universities, the *quaestiones disputatae*.⁴² The *quaestio* approach raises a question, poses a provisional answer, allows for objections, as another, and contrary to the objections, point of view. Then the questioner launches into a response and answers the many objections. We conceive as natural in the humanistic manager questioning the relation of some A and some other B, then is the formal structure:

- What is the relation between some A and some B? (Say, A = advertising and B = buying)
- It seems that A causes B, the provisional answer.
- But A does not cause B for reason one; for reason two; and so on. These are the objections to the provisional answer.
- On the contrary, it seems that A does cause B for yet another reason, perhaps a can-opener is in play.
- I respond that, maybe there is some other action in play for why A causes B which may include some of the terms of the contrary view (to the objectors), and even slyly using some of the very terms used by the objectors, but transcends both.
- I reply to each objector with reasons why they are full of stuffing of some sort or other.

Take any managerial act of envisioning, coaching, catalyzing, organizing, engaging, and attending to one's own growth and care, and we will find the *quaestio* structure at work. But apparently in teams hierarchy matters. Gray et al. (2023) indicate that knowledge sharing in diverse teams can benefit from perceptually flatter organizational hierarchies. The flatter the hierarchy and the more diverse the team members, would seem to support the *quaestio* demand for impactful objections and actionable responses in making complex decisions.

Where is the rational choice model of modern management decision analysis in all of this? We might locate it as simply a component of one, possibly two, unlikely three, objections to a provisional causal explanation of how managerial action A might infer B. Or better how if A is good or bad news then B is the decision to be enabled into action.⁴³ Such models, as rational choice would prescribe, are properly designed to help

⁴¹See Nussbaum (2011), Sen (1999) for expositions of such taxonomies.

⁴²Actually this also mirrors the Platonic dialogue itself. This structure also is similar to governance argumentation by attorneys, the so-called IRAC method of legal analysis (Issue - Rule - Analysis - Conclusion). Managers might recognize this as a table-top exercise structure consonant with knowledge-based decision making (KBDM).

⁴³Thus we might follow the bell-weather rational choice model of Luce and Raiffa (1957) two-state (good or bad news) with at least two decision alternatives (act or stand pat) Bayesian decision model. Bell, Raiffa, and Tversky (1988) detail the interactions of descriptive, normative, and prescriptive goals of a decision modeling effort, all within the scope of the rational choice literature surveyed by Herfeld (2022). Hirschfeld (2018) notes throughout her research that individual decision makers and organizational

the decision maker understand the trade-offs evinced in the play among objectors to the provisional answer, conjecture, or hypothesis. But to think that these models are expansive enough of the kinds of knowledge needed to guide human decision makers and moral living is to give them roles they cannot possibly fulfill. One of those roles is the visioning process itself wherein given two alternatives, with equal validity in the confines of a rational choice model, which alternative will be preferred. Even Sen (1977)'s critique of rational models with its proposal of using alternative weights to drive differential preference orderings across groups of persons will, when convolved into a "solution," yield a so-called representative economic agent. This agent is still an aggregation, an average, albeit a complicated average, of the preferences, goals and constraints of all agents in the space of the decision being considered. The problem of what goods are sought through the exercise of the decision is assumed to be known to the agent. The rational choice model does not frame the vision, it is the other way around. Put differently, this is the role of conscience at work, not only for the individual manager, but relationally as a group conscience. Group discernment with gift as a good takes over the reins of a "driven by the numbers" approach to decisions in any community of persons.⁴⁴

The *material cause* is the content, resources, yes, even the capabilities inhering to humanistic management. These of course are the art and science of administration, meaning the ministry of serving oneself and one another with the resources, processes, practices, governance, techniques, technology, mines, ships, supply chains, data stewardship governance, algorithms, data storage farms, and so on and on. These multiphasic and multifarious contents are nothing without the guidance of the formal structure of management to its goal, good, or end, the final cause. We might imagine the complex of inputs and outputs as inputs into a linked web of activity whose cause and effect are yet to be determined by the operation of the efficient cause of it all, but the vertices and edges of such a network graph are the grist for the mill of the efficient cause, the humanistic manager herself. Again as much as the determining guidance of formal cause results in determined material causes, efficient causes indeed make it all happen in operations.

The classic rational choice modeling technology called linear programming is illustrated by the models in Dorfman, Samuelson, and Solow (2012). The models in this book are the stock of technologies taught in most business school quantitative decision making courses.⁴⁵ The authors state that the "[linear programming] method, although mathematical in form, really depended on an economic criterion, namely, . . . , that no activity should be used if a more profitable activity or combination of activities was available to the firm" (p. 166). Managers would specify a network of not-to-exceed and requirements resource constraints (e.g., labor, materials, processing costs, timing, and availability) in terms of a known slate of decision variables (e.g., amounts of product to produce and services to render). These are all components of the supply chain which is the "technology" of the material cause. The value of decision variables is then specified (e.g., marginal profit per unit produced or rendered). Dantzig (1949)'s simplex algorithm then solves the constrained optimization model for decision variable values. Perturbing resource constraints will yield per unit changes in the value of the decisions, a "price" of a resource constraint.

The *efficient cause* is the manager as person, including the manager's mind, mentality, experience, will, *hubris*, component of the worldview of humanistic management. In this cause we see the material antecedents and consequents formally structured by our *quaestio* rambling around in a person who is the *quaestio*ner. The questioner is both subject (and thus self-reflective) and object (reflects on the self as if an object) when in the process of making decisions. For material and formal causality we have determined and determining. For material and efficient we have deployed and deploying, transcended and transcending. For efficient and final we have in turn caused and causing. The final cause itself is the source, the ultimate reason

policy makers might not have yet realized that the rational choice model cannot answer the ultimate questions of fulfilling the promise of the good, product and or service, to other human beings. For the capability approach of Sen (1999) and Nussbaum (2011) the ultimate good is freedom. But is capability as freedom from a state of less dignity to a threshold of dignity enough for well-being and human flourishing? This comment points us in the direction also of asking whether Dewar, Keller, and Malhotra (2022)'s notion of mindset is sufficient to the task of dynamic leadership and the management of highly complex organizations. The anthropology of gift would say no and instead provide a further good of relationship among persons.

⁴⁴See Byrne (2018) generally along with Orsy (2020) and Ahern (2015) for examples of Catholic institutions and the global reach of the common good in the context of communal discernment practices and governance.

⁴⁵Ragsdale (2021) is a comprehensive resource using the incredibly convenient spreadsheet computing environment. By convenient is meant that managers can immediately see the results of their modeling experiments and simulations. By "incredibly" is meant that users implicitly and habitually act as if the spreadsheet will model all that is needed, without further scrutiny. The table of contents would easily populate a two semester (15 weeks per semester) advanced undergraduate or core MBA quantitative methods curriculum, now christened business analytics.

for the causation inside of efficiency. On its own as a priority, and given thus an arbitrarily set goal and tolerance, the the manager as efficient cause deploys materials and forces in processes which harness and release, unleash and chain, open and close, initiate and shut down or idle, and direct inputs to outputs. On the basis of a known formula, a heuristic, or an algorithm, such as a generative pre-trained transformer, the causal process as human decisioner deposits materials and energy into requisite programmed machines. Programmed machines, robots, golems accompany materials to the desired end through time and space, and of course any other efficiently causing humans along the way. Programming requires the storage and retrieval, and communication of information critical to the tolerable, as set by some arbitrary norm or physical constraint, operation of the processed amalgam of materials and energy, from whatever source.⁴⁶ A “by the numbers” manager with an anthropology of a final end of producing maximized profits, within a formal decision heuristic of criterion, constraint, decision variable, a technology which, by assumption, is purely situational, with effecting agents who are normatively amoral⁴⁷ will base decisions on resource prices and satisficing values from an algorithm.⁴⁸

By Chance an Example

Here we review an example of the formal constituent of the humanistic manager as person. For example, we, the manager, might ask, “How much luck can or should we humanly live with, in order to live the life that is most valuable for a human being?”⁴⁹

This is a most general question of great practical importance to management. It speaks to our notions of what is or is not a human being; living life; what is or is not valuable; what is human life; what is self-sufficiency versus external forces at work on our life; what can or potentially will occur; what should occur according to predictions, rules, expectations, obligations, contracts and agreements. Are managers “empty suits” who get lucky, then get paid for their prescient stroke of luck?⁵⁰ We then state an answer to the question, for example, “Luck has nothing at all to do with the value of human living.” With this answer, we then support it with three or more positions. The idea that managers experience luck is the ground for managerial freedom to choose. With luck, a manager’s decision outcome is not, can not be, determined *a priori*. After the positions we state a contrary position. Upon the statement of a position contrary to the objectors, we then state our response, followed by replies to the original objecting positions. Here is a rendition of this *quaestio disputata*.

Question: *How much luck can or should we humanly live with, in order to live the life that is most valuable for a human being?*

Provisional Answer: *Luck has nothing at all to do with the value of human living.*

Support #1: Moral value is completely distinct from every other value. No matter what happens, the moral value of the good will is thoroughly immune to the onslaught of luck. (Kant inspired)

Support #2: The aim of life is uninterrupted control and activity. You can only trust that which is stable and immutable. Risk is intolerable, should be avoided at all costs, so as to achieve a godlike simplicity, without conflict of value or action. (Plato inspired)

⁴⁶Collins and Pinch (1998) is again apropos of the connection between science and technology. An algorithm cannot, by its nature “think,” but it can act according to its programming.

⁴⁷“Amoral” in the sense of using axiomatic norms such as if A is preferred to B and B is preferred to C, then A is preferred to C. This example of a preference ranking can then be extended deterministically according to maximizing the a posteriori plausibility of ranges of decision outcomes.

⁴⁸Gelman, Hill, and Vehtari (2020) provide an example of the hypothetico-deductive approach as normative is the use of constructive choice logistic regression to norm water well choices in Bangladesh in the presence of arsenic. (Gelman, Hill, and Vehtari (2020), 279-283, and Gelman et al. (2004)).

⁴⁹This example follows Nussbaum (2001) in the question, the objectors, contrarians, and some of the analytical response and content.

⁵⁰We can otherwise characterize this question with terms from Taleb (2010) glossary of the Black Swan phenomenon and “Fooled by randomness: the general confusion between luck and determinism, which leads to a variety of superstitions with practical consequences, such as the belief that higher earnings in some professions are generated by skills when there is a significant component of luck in them.” (Taleb (2010), 308).

Support #3: A young man must choose between his patriotic commitment to the French resistance and his dying mother. Both are outside of his direct control. From this case of inconsistency systematic ethical principles are inadequate guides for action. Thus, discard principle altogether, freely improvise choice, without regret. (Sartre inspired)

On the Contrary: The world exists such that there is indeed uncontrollable external power. Human values necessarily reside in the mutable and unstable. Thus, living well in such a world entails actively taking risks balanced by receptivity to a limited control over one's life. (Aristotle inspired)

Response: Life, tragic literature, and bankrupt organizations shows good people being "ruined" all of the time because of "circumstances beyond their control," otherwise known as luck. We often lack clarity of sight about our own lives, and those of people around us. We are blinded by our own bias and faults and often revise our positions to suit our bias. At the extreme you may simply give up any hope of amending your own or anyone else's ways, everything is luck. Aristotle notes that "we are better able to contemplate [Gk. *theorein*] someone else than at ourselves." (Rackham1926nicomachean 1169b33-4, 558-559.)⁵¹ We can use models, persons, especially friends (*philo*), to help us determine what a good person would do in a situation like this. Knowledge consists in the intuitive perception of concrete particulars. Perception is both cognitive and affective: feelings matter! It consists in the singular ability to discern the ethical (what is valuable for human living; what we ought to do) features from a particular situation.

According to Lonergan (1957), human knowledge proceeds from experience of data, feelings, senses, driven by insight to an understanding that describes and explains the data, further driven by reflection to a judging that affirms or denies the existence what is true or false, finally leading through deliberation to a choice that becomes an action. Luck occurs at each step of the way if only because of the complexity of all data, understanding, judging and choosing. It also occurs because each concrete situation is unique, although an understanding of it may be recurrent and probable, but not determinant. Correct perception cannot be learned by rote or precept, but by guided experience. This is a lifelong process that risks vulnerability and reversal.

The goal is not somnolent contentment, but rather a rich, vital life of value. The job to be done is to take on the world, make it and create it as a platform for more virtuous living. Conflict of values is not to be avoided, it is to be embraced. According to Nussbaum (2001): "The person who elevates simplicity to a supreme value is like the architect who uses a straight-edge against a fluted column: his calculations won't build a sound building, and he will leave out much of the beauty and value of what is there before him." (Nussbaum (2001), 372).

Reply to #1: The primary imperative is that we will to act consistently with what we know. In a sense, through the interdependence of experience, understanding, judgment and decision, data, theory, affirmations, and choices are bound up in a hierarchy of values: the good of desire and the satisfaction of desire is the end of the level of experiencing; the good of order and the harmonization of satisfactions is the end of the level of understanding; the good of reason and the affirmation of one order over the other is the end of judgment; the good of value and the choice of one action plan over another is the end of decision. These values are all moral since they all relate to ways in which we can live as humans. Each of these values occurs in concrete situations in which luck is a given component. Each of these values and their realization in any situation I find myself, builds on the development of my life and character up to this point in my life and in anticipation of any future life I might have, with luck. Thus there are a plurality of instances of values that operate in my life in which luck is a factor. But value itself is not what is merely satisfying in the immanent here and now. Value is what is objectively true and virtually unconditioned.

Reply to #2: On the contrary, achievement of any human excellence requires both external resources and necessary conditions, as well as receptive objects to receive the excellent activity. Thus excellence requires relationships. Those relationships will exist in a developmental context and will thus be subject to bias, misapprehension, reversal. The person or persons in a relationship will need to develop together in order to meet their particular range of excellences in the concrete of the here and now of living. Although they might

⁵¹While the Greek word *theorein* can be simply "look at," "observe," as a spectator, Liddell and Scott (2007) might seem to indicate that in the context here of considering the usefulness of friends to achieve flourishing, we might offer "contemplate," for a broader consideration of sources of acting ethically. (Liddell and Scott (2007), 317).

converge in some aspects, they will always be personal principles of plural value insofar as each is uniquely different from the other. Thus it is impossible to attain any particular excellence through a solitary, simple attainment of a supreme value.

Reply to #3: Conflicting general principles in particular situations will need to be revised according to the practical terms of the unique situation. By making relevant changes to general rules in particular circumstances, we can make the rules as practical norms more precise and come to future particular situations better prepared. But if we change the rules to rationalize a new particular situation, no matter how justifiable it may seem, we can still lose something essential and human. To let his mother die without care, or refuse to enter the resistance: neither case is palatable for Sartre, or us.

There is no “solution” in the scientific sense for the young man. The problem is richer than geometry. Whatever the actual choice, there will be grief, and this is appropriate. If we could dissociate ourselves, we would be less good. Good deliberation here may involve a yielding to flexibility and the renunciation of self-centered stubbornness. So Sartre is partly right: improvise. But regret is not bad, it helps us to remember the humanness of the problems we face, the difficulty in deliberating about what we judge to be true, given our understanding of heart-felt experiences. Civic virtues are good guides; but they are built from familial love. They represent an ordering that has oppositions and tensions. We cannot wish away the tension, and instead must live it from situation to situation.

Thus our example concludes.

This lengthy example serves as an example of the formal constituent of humanistic management where we construct a dialectical heuristic in the form of a question. Dialectic may be neatly defined as a “concrete unfolding of linked or opposed principles of change.” (Lonergan (1957), 217). But the ensuing study does not end here as scenario-based decision makers continue to discover.⁵² Dolan (2018) applies dialectic as a framing heuristic in a variety of management contexts, notably in developing health care policy and forecasting resource commitments.

In our exercise of humanistic management we will consciously put ourselves into concrete situations with studies of vignettes and cases, as well as actual ethical situations. These will develop and unfold over the duration of making the initial decision through the implementation of the decision in the concrete particulars of the decision and back to re-considering, re-deliberating, and re-modeling the decision as circumstances change for the organization. There will be conflicting goals, aims, principles, and means to “solving” problems and answering questions.

But the terms of the practical principles in each situation will always be linked, and our knowledge will evolve and thus change and be a viewpoint on the move. While we may have learned in the domain of the natural sciences that the aim of empirical method is an as complete as possible explanation of the available facts, here the aim is similar: a comprehensive viewpoint of the array of seemingly opposed principles of change.⁵³ While managers would want to be decisive, they must continue to be aware of change from all directions.

Good and the Intention

In framing our discussions about *moral agent* and the *moral inquiry* performed by the humanistic manager we will necessarily be using intentional operations (experiencing, understanding, judging, deciding) performed by a specific person and persons (you, me, our business) in a process that itself is objective. We will be encountering most, if not all, the main problems of philosophy, science, common sense, consciousness, and self-consciousness. Our organizations themselves in analogy with the human beings constituting the organizations will communally develop awareness across experience, understanding, rational judgment, responsible action. Some will label the will of the organization as the drive to be attentive, be intelligent, be rational, be responsible, all directed to the common good of one another.

⁵²See the many examples in Schwartz (2012) and Schwartz (2004).

⁵³MacIntyre (1990) describes the growth and use of the *quaestiones disputatae* and notes that “the dialectical conclusion is always open to further discussion.” (MacIntyre (1990), 89).

In pursuit of this discussion we will encounter four levels of intentional consciousness:

- Empirical consciousness with operations that attend to and select data that give rise to questions for consideration.
- Intelligent consciousness with operations of representation, inquiry, expression, working out of implications, hypothesizing, theorizing, proposing, in a word understanding that give rise to questions for reflection.
- Rational consciousness with operations of reflection, marshalling and weighing evidence, and passing judgment on the certitude or probability of occurrence of facts, that give rise to questions for further deliberation and potential action.
- Responsible consciousness with operations of empirical, intellectual, and rational self-awareness, deliberation about proposed actions, evaluation, decision and execution or implementation, all of which yield results that are effectively new data to be experienced at the first level of intentional consciousness.

The trained, educated, and seasoned will of the *moral agent* penetrates each level of consciousness and even more so the move from one level to another. Without the will to experience, move from experience to understanding, to understand, then to move from understanding to reason, then reason, finally and laboriously, move to and stay at responsible consciousness requires resources outside the capability of any individual, family, community, the world.

Corresponding to these levels of awareness are four levels of the human good and four concrete instances of human community. Here we mean by good, the specific end of a set of activities, the final cause. In the case of the activities of responsible consciousness, the human good will be comprised of the specific end of some compound of experiential, intellectual, rational and responsible levels of intentional operations. Our job is to unpack these implications for the human good in specific cases, and concrete situations as they arise in humanistic management. By community is meant not simply the sum of all participants, but the overarching culture of a tradition, the handing down, the *traderens*, which allows participants and the community to overcome immanent declines in favor of transcending progress. Here are the four levels of the human good: the good of desire reaches to the good of order, in turn both supporting the good of reason, finally reaching the transcending good of value, of what is worthwhile or not.⁵⁴

The *good of desire* relates to the empirical or experiential level of consciousness. Realizing this good yields satisfaction of our various desires and appetites. It is at the base of the Mills/Bentham claim that all human action is consequential to the maximization of utility. This paradigm, along with appropriate constraints, is the dominant economic method of today. Corresponding to the spontaneous grasp of experiences and the good of desire is interpersonal community. The movement from this level to the next is prompted by questions for understanding that include questions for description and explanation. This initial movement is discerned by noticing the occurrence of insights.⁵⁵

The *good of order* relates to the intellectual level of consciousness insofar as we understand the unities of things to ourselves and among themselves, the correlations that explain the operations of things. It is at the base of our grasping (experiential consciousness) and formulating (intellectual consciousness) technological development, economic and business systems, governance, and political structures, all of which fall into the order of *techne*.⁵⁶ These are instances of the good of order since they stand as higher syntheses that harmonize, that is, bring to order, as well as maximize the satisfactions of individual desires. Harmonization

⁵⁴Bendak, Shikhli, and Abdel-Razek (2020) develop a framework to deploy organizational culture as a driver of innovation.

⁵⁵The insufficiency of the good of desire is the subject of the entire humanistic management movement (Pirson (2019)), along with economic personalism (Gronbacher (1998)) and even the application of cultural evolution and reciprocity to complex organizations (Henrich and McElreath (2003)).

⁵⁶The phrase *order of* followed by some object, such as technology, persons, intellect, will, will refer to the relative importance of the object within the manifold of other objects. In this way we have a precedence and a subsistence. Whoever is first in line precedes whoever is second. But each person grows through learning so that the immature apprentice subsists in the mature master.

proposes rules, norms and guides for otherwise hedonistic and egoistic actions that solely maximize individual satisfactions.

Here we have begun to recognize that individual satisfactions of any kind subsist in the relationality of the individual with others, but in a wider context of the community. Far from a mere aggregation of individuals, elsewhere known as a collective, the community at one and the same time centripetally directs its intentionality to each individual and centrifugally directs its intentionality to the unity and harmony of individuals living and working together. As individuals find meaning in self through one another, the community of individuals finds meaning in supporting subsistently the actions of all individuals.

Business contracts, customs, laws and structures of enforcement and encouragement are concrete instances of the good of order, of the harmonious subsisting of individual deliberations in the overarching manifold of the community. Corresponding to the good of order and intellectual insights is civil community which supports and protects the will's movement to the good of order. The movement from this level to the next is prompted by questions for reflection that include questions for judgments of fact. This movement is discerned by noticing the occurrence of reflective affirmations or denials.

The *good of reason* relates to the rational level of consciousness where theoretical formulation, based on experiential grasp of concrete situations, is cut short by judgments of fact. These judgments ask the simple question is it or is it not so? The will of the individual for the other, and thus some sense of the will of the community, enters here as well to vitally penetrate the reason to continue until all relevant questions are sufficiently asked and answered. At this point we recognize the formal aspect of the humanistic manager as a nexus of formulating the structure of dialectic, the *quaestio* framework itself. These judgments are instances of the good of reason since they stand as syntheses that create a virtual conditioned (a result with its conditions fulfilled) built on harmonization and maximization of the satisfactions of individual desires.

The *good of reason* criticizes the various goods of order by proposing those orders that are probably true and correct given the circumstance, and disposing of those orders that are probably false and incorrect in concrete situations. Again the will, especially the trained seasoned will of conscience, floods the moral agent with a persistence and a courage to judge what is and is not true. This criticism is a source of restraint and constraint in decisions. Corresponding to the good of reason and rational consciousness is a discriminating cultural community. The movement from this level to the next is prompted by questions for deliberation that include questions for the acceptance or rejection of concrete proposals. This movement is discerned by noticing the occurrence of choices and decisions. Some becoming more, some less, acceptable to individuals and communally the culture in which individuals abide, and quite dynamically. Questions of priority embed deeper questions of the reasonable worth of decision alternatives, where worth is tied to the final *aitia* of the humanistic manager, namely persons "first and foremost."

The *good of value* relates to the responsible level of intentional consciousness in judgments of value subsuming all of the previous goods. This final level asks the question: is it worthwhile? That the level is *final* reflects the end, good, and purpose to which the judgment strives, willfully. Judgments of value set the good of order above private advantage, subordinate technology to economics, economics to social welfare. The good of value appreciates the various goods of reason and provides the criterion for advancing valuable proposals to their ultimate execution in a decision and implementation, and simultaneously rejects bad proposals. This appreciation is the source of action. Corresponding to this appreciation and judgment of value is moral community. In this way the good of value is objective truth, the first of Chesterton's sanities, not mere subjective satisfaction of desires without necessary regard for others.

This good works on and through the will to act on what is known and not known plausibly to result in discernment. The virtue which then drives the good of value, with faith and hope as leading up to but not sufficiently, is charity. And charity's fruit is love as willing the good (all of the goods) of the other. Sin, error, ignorance result from, as Keenan (2022) explains through our millenia of shared traditions, "not bothering to love." The virtues supporting charity are then those imperatives of consciousness, namely, be aware, be intelligent, be rational, be responsible.

Two confusions can occur when knowledge, the good, and community are not appropriately distinguished when we talk about "who is the *moral agent*," or about "what I/we ought to do as a *moral agent*," or about "what is and how do I/we live the good life, the *moral life*?" Here the *moral agent* is the moral manager.

The moral agent who exhibits the symptoms of *naive realism* says that there is indeed knowing and the good and community, but really means only experiencing sensation, the good of desire and interpersonal community. This person bases all knowledge on the mistaken notion that knowing is still simply taking a look and retreats into a skeptical empiricism in which if the discussion does not get down to the brass tacks of the material causality, reduce to a determined result, then there is nothing more to say, let alone do.⁵⁷

On the other hand, the *idealist* asserts that the realist is only partly correct, in that it is by perceiving or formulating that we know what we are looking at. Knowing is not only taking a look, it is perceiving and formulating a look. The only good is the good of order, with a corresponding civil community of appropriate social agreements and arrangements. This person is mistaken too, since the idealist forgets that knowledge is completed in a judgment of reasonable fact and responsible value. On top of that issue, the idealist might even fail to notice the data of consciousness itself, and the motive force of a will to act on what is known. [Hong and Henrich (2021) discuss the evolution of the human processes of knowing and deciding within the “magical” technologies of divination. The authors categorizes divination technologies as “intuitive plausibility/credibility, objective efficacy,[and] perceived cost/benefit.” (Hong and Henrich (2021), 633, Fig. 3). They line up a range of practices from idealistic to realistic with a lay-over in utilitarian obliging economic exchange. The authors note, and here the dichotomies of ideal and real appear in high relief, that first, modern societies are imbued with a “metaphysical theory about causality [that] is mechanical and materialistic, and it actively denies the causal relevance between events that do not have plausible physical connections.” (Ibid., 643). Second, they point to the mass laicization of knowledge production. The “division of labor” is between knowledge-producers and knowledge-consumers. Consumers might then be classified as idealists in their beliefs without verifying physical connections as in the mathematical version of the scientific method (more Cartesian in spirit), while scientists are the naive realists who create the only knowledge they believe is possible, that which is in accord with the experimental hypothetico-deductive version scientific method (very Baconian in action).⁵⁸

The *idealistic* and *naively realistic managers* resolve into the manager as *critical realist*. This manager knows that experiencing the world spontaneously is not knowledge. This manager in Melé (2012)’s “community of persons,” realizes that intellectual formulating and hypothesizing relations among what is sensed is not yet knowledge. The manager as critical realist contends that the world of the naive realist and the idealist is a picture-book world based on taking or hypothesizing a mere look at data. The critical realist knows that knowledge is a compound of experiencing, understanding and judging. Rational operations cannot be reduced to intellectual operations. Similarly intellectual operations cannot be reduced to experiential operations. Knowledge and consequently action are polymorphic in the person. This means as managers we can experience what we think, judge, decide, and decide on what to experience, understand, judge, etc. in all the permutations of our human ability to know ourselves as ourselves (subjects as objects). More importantly this critical self-reflection is what we can communicate to other critical self-reflectors, not only the communication itself, but the development of increasing instances of and depth of receptivity in the communication. Training, education, learning as inference, acting on knowledge to produce ever more and wider possibilities is in the capability of the community of humanistic managers as persons.⁵⁹

Each set of operations is included and presupposed in the other.⁶⁰ The good which is what the manager

⁵⁷A technocratic manager in an organization might exhibit such a behavior. If the manager is a fan of Descartes and Cress (1998), especially Meditation VI, then rationalistic “mind over matter” mastery can even eliminate the “debility of fragile old age.” Technocratic fans of Francis Bacon would turn Aristotle on his head so that “Where Aristotle privileged the ‘natural’ over the ‘violent,’ Bacon considered the ‘violent’ far more useful in finding new knowledge, now understood as the ability to control nature.” (Pescic (2014), 77).

⁵⁸We might refer to Descartes and Cress (1998) “...eliminating the frailty of old age...” (Descartes and Cress (1998), 35).

⁵⁹Pirson (2019) proposes a program for management theory with “promoting dignity related theorizing ... and making a concerted effort to broadening our epistemological basis.” (Pirson (2019), 53). The program promotes a normative basis linked with Sen (1999) and Nussbaum (2011) for a radical change in the provision of capability globally and with McCloskey (2022) around the success and failure of economic development. Pirson, Piedmont, and Nagy (2023) backs the program with an inventory dedicated to understanding what might be called a growth mindset of human dignity.

⁶⁰In the polymorphic world of interpersonal relationships the number of pairs of reciprocating relationships is $n(n-1)/2$ where n is the number of persons, and double this for each reciprocation. Thus a 3 person team can have $3(2) = 6$ communications. With each person a pod or partition of an individual’s 4 levels of consciousness (experience, understanding, judgment, decision), the number of potential communicating components (e.g., person A’s understanding with person B’s experience) quadruples. For the 3 person team, there are $6 \times 4 = 24$ possible intentional connections at any given time. No wonder there are practicalities

desires, what the organization as a “community of persons” dynamically move toward is the good of rational judgment and responsible choice, and community is ultimately moral, where moral means both for the other person and consistency of knowing and doing, community. But the good of rational and responsible choice include hard fought for goods of order that in turn harmonize goods of desire. In the same way the moral community is built on intellectual and cultural communities that flesh out the common funds of meaning as understanding and rational judgments. These common funds compound themselves into traditional systems of beliefs about the description, explanation and the affirmation of experiences in the community. The common funds of knowledge and action consistent with knowledge are the root of organizational culture.⁶¹

However we express it, human knowing is not authentic human living.⁶² There can be no authentic human living and thus no answers to the question “is this worthwhile?” if knowing is not objective. We know personally and in the community of persons objectively insofar as we are not inattentive, not unintelligent about our perceiving, hypothesizing and model making, not unreasonable about what we think is true, and not irresponsible about what we finally choose to do. We thus discover a distinction between managing people and treating them as authentic persons. To manage people we need only confront them with their inattention to data, unintelligent hypotheses, and unreasonable judgments of fact, and with the practical wisdom of tactful decisiveness. To treat people as authentic persons we need to be present, initially for awareness-raising, but more importantly, to enable their achievement of the goods of desire, order, reason, and value in the context of organization, community, and culture.

To treat people as persons we must work to invite them to full knowledge of themselves as valuable for themselves and others. It is in this reflecting on our living in common that we come to know ourselves as valuable. This is management in the order of contemplation and as a habit becomes a source of wisdom. Persons make themselves and their communities ever transcending previously held positions, extending the moral universe itself. This making is never finished and there are pitfalls as well as triumphs since it is a process still and always in progress. Management remains merely with technical confrontation. Human nature itself as transcending being in relation with other transcendent beings through their self-communications as gift further draws us to reflect in common on our interdependent values as persons in process, responsible for our common making of meaning.

A Humanism Emerges

We might now ask whether a purely secular humanism, one which excludes any reality of a supernatural influence or force, is sufficient to realize humanistic management, one aspect of which is the sometimes terrifying transcendence of progress. Charles Taylor notes in his interview with Kearney (2016) a reduction to materialism when we as managers embrace only the purely immanent frame of the “already-out-there-now-real.” (Lonergan (1957), 267). The notion of anything beyond this frame, and its narrative, at least as

of information, let alone awareness, information overload occurs! Humanistic managers wisely learn how to sort such a complex operation. Werder (2019) develops such a model in the context of healthcare communications. Perhaps models such as these will assist the formation of the “rhetoric” needed to advance management theory and practice which Pirson (2019) and McCloskey (1998) rightfully point out. Along similar lines we might also consult McCloskey and Ziliak (2010) regarding the testing of our empirical findings, let alone the rhetoric of interpreting these results.

⁶¹The evolutionary anthropologists continue to develop some interesting typologies nascent in their field. Henrich et al. (2023) conclude: “Cultural evolutionists have argued that our capacities for cumulative cultural evolution, the hallmark of our species, produces many of the tools, techniques and heuristics that we think and reason with—ready examples include number systems . . . physical concepts . . . and perceptual categories. . . . Social norms and daily demands mean that people habitualize the use of these in ways that recede into the background and become part of how we automatically perceive and process the world. Specifically, humans have evolved genetically to mold our minds and brains to culturally-constructed worlds—adapting to their diverse incentives, affordances, and constraints.” (Henrich et al. (2023), unpaginated, concluding section.). It remains to be seen whether the field of Cultural Evolution will devolve into a reductionist explanation of the person in communities of persons or participate in a growing understanding of the transcendence of human beings.

⁶²The word “authentic” derives from the Latin *auger*, to grow, and is related to “authority.” Noce and Lancellotti (2014) states: “If other languages are considered, one finds a common ideal structure. Thus, the German *auch* (also) is the imperative of the Gothic *aukan* (to make grow). Therefore, the etymology of authority includes the idea that *humanitas* is fulfilled in man when a principle of non-empirical nature frees him from a state of subjection and leads him to his proper end, as a rational and moral being. Man’s freedom, as power of *attention* and not of *creation*, consists in his capacity to subordinate himself to this higher principle of liberation and be freed from the pressures from below.” (Noce and Lancellotti (2014), 189-190).

long ago by Callicles' response to Socrates in the *Gorgias* dialogue (Plato, *Gorgias* 481b - 491d),⁶³ will be a secular humanism excluding any so-called supernatural source, in effect a "meaning of meaning." (Hamilton, Cairns, and others (1961), 264-273).

For a busy manager, such questions are typically left at the threshold of the meeting room or hop as fast as possible through the transom. But the meaning of meaning, reasons for reasons, a going beyond the status quo are indeed the purview of an entrepreneurial spur in management. Dewar, Keller, and Malhotra (2022) quotes former American Express Chair and CEO Ken Chennault: "My leadership mantra . . . is that the role of a leader is to define reality and give hope. Defining reality is very challenging. It requires a level of transparency and courage to articulate what is the truth, what are the facts. But that isn't enough. What are the tactics? What are the strategies? What are the reasons why people should be hopeful? That focus on defining reality and giving hope is something that I've used to guide me as a leader." (Dewar, Keller, and Malhotra (2022), 271).

The meaning of meaning points toward, often inexorably, to something more, and is a seeking of something beyond, the object of which might not yet be identified in its particularity. Martha Nussbaum will locate this aspiration in Aristotle's *orexis*, which elucidates her reading of Aristotle's notion of a power within all living things to something more, as inclusive of the "beyond" the current shackles of current existence.⁶⁴ This power within is oriented outward into the *moral universe* by inquiring *moral agents* bent on achieving the good. The entrepreneurial manager, for example as in Teehanke (2008), launches new products to grasp at a new market for the purpose of more profit, perhaps something more interesting to do, but clearly beyond the current context, the status quo, business as usual.

What Taylor and Kearney refer to as "transcendent humanism," might be read of a transcendence drawing up the person, and the organization as a community of persons, into another level of reality, with or without the *techné* (tools) or the *logos* (meaning) to get there. There are inclusive, and exclusive versions of secular humanism. In his conversation with Kearney, Taylor uses "transcendent humanism" as a synonym for a "Christian humanism," so we might consider a religiously oriented and, if not, simply an absolute finality for the transcending person and community.

Suppose someone is drowning in a lake. There is someone, a resource, on the shore who efficiently causes the rope to land at the drowning person.⁶⁵ Certainly the designers of a production process have put thought into the cause and effect of material inputs resulting in material outputs, we might call products, here the rope, used by hands and aimed at the drowning person with eyes and coordination. But final causality needs an end that is also a good. Is the motive the good of desire? We say yes, as a life may be preserved from drowning. Is the product a good, the good of order? We again would agree, reasonably, if the product or service our organization has just launched does no intentional harm to its community of users of rope, then we can say yes again. So if the end to which the *orexis*, the desire, the longing, is good, or the terminus of a process, is good, then we have final causality, preserving the life of the drowning person.

Helpful here as we sketch some thoughts about transcendence is the discussion by Taylor (1988) about Nussbaum (2001) (updated edition) and by Nussbaum (1992) literally beginning an exploration of transcendence with what Lonergan (2005) coined *vertical finality*. We now can lay out Lonergan's scheme of finalities. There are three: absolute, horizontal, and vertical. In general a finality is simply something accomplished, and thus finished, and on to the next process, satisfaction, judgment, milestone, and so on. Managers experience,

⁶³Hamilton, Cairns, and others (1961), 264-273. The *Gorgias* dialogue sets up the orator Callicles as one who would use whatever words would be needed to produce the immanent result, the seeming good of the nano-second in our social media culture. Socrates catches Callicles in a favorite contradiction of the very words Callicles would employ to project his power over others through three nihilisms: 1) there is nothing objectively true; 2) even if there were I could not know it; and 3) even if I could know it, it would somehow not matter. For him the job of the rhetor, the visionary, the leader is not to use words to represent reality, to ask and answer whatever *the Good* might be, but rather to conform to whatever *the good* of his client might appear to be in the myopic context of the here and now. Sophists use big words and vacuous phrasing to, basically, say not much at all. But everyone is still entertained with whatever kernel of truth they proclaim however nihilistic the claim, the cause, the outcomes are.

⁶⁴Nussbaum (2001) notes that the "medio-passive" verb *oregesthamai*, the root of the movement called *orexis* preserves the notion of "grasping for," "reach for," and "stretch (oneself) for," with metaphors of "long for" and "yearn for." (Nussbaum (2001), 273).

⁶⁵Perhaps we can, for a moment, side with the positivists, or at least with efficient, unadulterated cause-to-effect instrumental causality, as well as perhaps some material causality with ropes and hands and eyes belonging to someone.

understand, judge, and decide on finalities all day long. They experience extreme market movements such as competitors exiting and leaving 20% of the market unserved. They understand that their organization might not have the resources needed to serve the now unmet demand. They judge the most likely scenarios for immediate, intermediate, and longer term responses to this innovation in the market. Managers choose a path, follow a road map, and commit physical, human, and financial resources to meet the occasion of luck in their markets. They monitor their performance and adjust their plans. They reach intermediate and ultimate terms of an ongoing managerial process.

We can divide a finality into two complementary aspects. *The first aspect is the completion of a process from input through activities ending in the output.* At that point the process terminates. Chains of processes can join up into intermediate components, but in the end, there is an end, a terminus. In this aspect an input and process orient to an output. This definitely seems the core of supply and value chain analysis any manager would be aware of. *The second aspect is finality viewed from a motive, a reason, which activates a longing for, a desire, a stretching of oneself out,* known as *appetition*, and in Aristotle's *orexis* as we noted already. The finality here is when desire meets up with, perhaps finds its goal, end, or good.⁶⁶

Perhaps it might be that when we manufacture our own goals that we go awry. But if we manufacture the goal, we nominally give the good a label effectively inventing the good we should be discovering. In this case we divert the possibility in ourselves of finding the good. We replace the good with some palimpsest, some facsimile, some replica, of the good.⁶⁷

Simply observing a drowning person's very strong desire to catch a rope being tossed by another person does not mean finality in and of itself.⁶⁸ This is just an observation, and at that, just a first step to knowledge, let alone action. We might construct an argument out of antecedent probability that the end, the good, sought by such striving is to grab quite securely the rope, for dear life! We might practically replace the argument with an intuition born of very strong desire to live and correlated with previous experiences analogous to drowning. In any case, is there even time to discern, let alone contemplate? Whatever the process, now we have plausible finality, in some statistical sense perhaps. Beyond correlations and associations, a sane motive to live grounds and causes a desire to reach for the rope and, finally, grab it at which point the desire has been fulfilled. This seems so much common sense. A pure, and avowed, positivist like Milton Friedman whose titular statement that "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits," might not see, or understand, and might even try to refute, the finality in our grabbing the rope on correlational grounds. (Friedman (1970)). In complex organizations, life-lines are often constructed to aid individuals develop talents, even market contacts and know-how. These individuals pursue development plans to aid their progress in organizations. The managers who helped these individuals plan and execute the steps of successive positive development, produce the good of well-being not only for the individual but in the organization. So-called success is not correlational, but cause and effect by persons giving and receiving.

The end, the goal itself is the final cause which draws, attracts, the formal, material, and efficient causes to itself. The formal cause is the good as a cause, a fine point with two prongs, the good as cause ("preserve life" for the motive as cause, "a safe product" for the process output as cause enough) and the way by which the cause operates ("manufacture the product" for the operation of the cause). For creatures with motives and process, God is not and cannot be another being, rather the act of being itself, the *other-other* of Nicholas of Cusa (Hopkins (1985)). The *moral universe* as creature and limited being, that is the limits essence imposes

⁶⁶On the one hand, the beloved moved by desire meets the loved. On the other hand, "law is mind without desire." (Aristotle, *Politics* 1287a20). This is my translation of Gk., *dioper aneu orexeos nous ho nomos estin*. Law as *techne* steps in to rule potentially chaotic desire and thus is a tool for governance and organizational design.

⁶⁷As an illustration of the notion of the diabolical - as opposed to the symbolical - when presenting his work on the flight from freedom of John Locke Schindler (2019) uses the example of a story told by the sardonic comic Steven Wright. I paraphrase and expand on the story. He goes to work leaving his home, his belongings, what we know as the real in his life. He returns, and finds the home seemingly exactly the way he found it. But there is a discernible difference. Not one he would discover by a statistical analysis of differences in the distribution of what he perceived to be true when he left his home relative to what he now perceives as he returns. Statistics, even Bayesian analysis, fails him. He realizes, partly to his horror, now abated by his emotionally calloused and jaundiced view of the so-called hard-boiled Genus species: *Neo-Eborensis manhattanis*. . . , yes he realizes that everything is just a replica of his home from 12 hours ago. "This is the heart of the diabolical: that the image is not the image, but it presents itself as the real thing, . . . indeed, in a certain sense . . . as *better* than the real thing precisely because of the immediacy and the lack of transcendence that the dissemblance implies." (Schindler (2019), 158). In many ways this story also illustrates Taleb (2010)'s phenomenon of the "empty suit."

⁶⁸In this metaphor we might imagine a co-worker, another manager, in distress personally and professionally.

on being, desires God (appetition, *orexis*) and intends God (oriented to the process terminus). Thus God is motive and terminus all in one and so absolute finality itself. In a way then absolute finality is the ground of all finality in the *moral universe*, remembering that finality simply means accomplishing the good and the good is that which we desire, strive to order, reason about, value, ultimately then find worthwhile. And so we can also say that God, with absolute finality, is the highest good, *summum bonum*, to which we would strive (again appetition, *orexis*) and intend (the order of process from input to output). From the point of view of anthropology of gift, then absolute finality is the absolute gift of existence itself.

But taking this one step further we have strata of beings in the *moral universe*. We retrieve the title of this essay for an example of such strata, as if rungs on a ladder. Empty space and the quantum vacuum are beings, not much to talk about, but created with a more limiting essence than particles in space, than atoms, molecules, compounds, minerals, liquids, gases, amoeba, dandelions, bees and birds, my cats, me, angels. This is the *analogia entis*, the analogy of being.⁶⁹

The principle of analogy is that between a lower level and a higher level, the lower level must be more dissimilar to the higher level, than similar. This decisively distinguishes a lower from a higher level. We might think of a expert guild cabinet maker and high school student in carpentry class as a fairly clear illustration. Both expert and student work in wood. But the differences in experience, talent, knowledge, ability are vastly dissimilar and the master is definitely and no longer a student. One can design and make a useful and beautiful sculpture of a cabinet, which fulfills a client's requirements on time and in full, while the other is just learning how to saw wood under the strict supervision and orders of an instructor. There is a hierarchy at work in the *moral universe*. The limitations of the student are not those of the master. The goods that the expert intends and is desirous of attaining are far and away different from the student. Both as creatures somehow, perhaps in yet to be known ways, are desirous and are oriented to the absolute ground of being, but again in different ways. The student can develop into an apprentice, journeyman, eventually, perhaps into a expert, a wise elder of the guild.

What we have now is a *vertical finality* from a good (getting a A for the course) at a student level to a good (designing and crafting a bespoke wooden spiral staircase with no nails) at a guild expert elder level. At the guild and student levels of the hierarchy there are, again, analogous, but horizontal versions of that level's limitations. By *horizontal finality* we would then mean the orientation to ends, and goods, the motive which causes the desire to *excel at a level*. There might be some vertical movement at the level, but one does not get promoted from grade 5 to grade 6 unless can perform the work required at grade 6 in elementary school.

Manager as Transcendent

We might even call our sketch of vertical finality *self-transcendence*, where the Latin verb *transcendere* means to “step over, across” and “surpass.” It is vertical in the sense that our person moves from a lower level (more limitation) to a higher level (less limitation). The *self* is at once the Giver and other times the Receiver in the relationship of freely communicated gift. In this sense we might define development as the opening of persons, communities, organizations, cultures, globally, to the greater good of the flourishing of the community of persons. We might even glean a notion of freedom, not so much of choice or indifference or a freedom from lack of capability, but of exceeding, openness of a freedom for excellence in transcending current capabilities, certainly beyond minimal dignity thresholds, on to great authenticity and authority as persons.

This is the humanistic manager operating in the various goods of desire, order, reason, and value. But how does development in the sense of vertical finality, the seeking of, the orientation of the good? This is what virtue as *arete* or excellence is about. The orientation of all being to the good also has absolute finality in the ground of all being; horizontal finality as a budding manager-in-training rotates among the

⁶⁹Przywara, Betz, and Hart (2014) defines the analogy of being as “. . . to ascend into the “similarity, however great” only to fall into the “ever greater dissimilarity. . .” (Przywara, Betz, and Hart (2014), 352). Here *ana* means “above” or “according to” while *logos* is “meaning” so that *analogia* are a linked ladder of meanings perhaps from species to genus, or from lower levels of organization to higher ones, but in any case an ordering of beings. (Ibid., 196). In financial economics option price models are analogous to the heat equations of physics. They work as a mindset, a representation of a reality called the market.

various departments and functions in an organization; and in the development with vertical finality of the management trainee into a seasoned humanistic manager in the community of persons. Communities and their traditions of the movement of vertical finality, the culture of organizations, the growing up of generations in communities across the various goods of desire, order, reason, value, carry virtue and the habits of practical action with them. The highest vertical rungs are those of charity, a discerning, compassionate, merciful charity, willing the good for the other. The accumulation of strengths, not for the will to power, as power in itself is not a deprivation of the good as good, but to grow *orexis*, awareness, intelligence, rationality (especially self-rationality), responsibility centrifugally from the self of the manager, the maker, the *transcender*, out to others, exceeding one another in helping one another to the good. This guides the will to the good and uses power to help others attain the good. Utopian? Definitely! But plausible with agents striving for the good together in the universe and crafting a developing, liberating *moral life*.

We move far from the *homo faber* of a technology-led world where thought conforms being and *techne* governs persons. We have begun to extend our manager into the species *homo transcendens* where instead being conforms thought and responsible action and persons intend *techne* to enhance and sustain the flourishing of persons in community. The distinction between what precedes and what follows is essential. We start with truth, facts, the data of our own experience including what we value and prize. When we conform what is in us to the reality of those around us as managers we can join Romano Guardini in his notion of managers who master the conforming of thought, design, decision, and action with reality and being.⁷⁰

Guardini realizes there are two ways in which the moral agent, our humanistic manager, knows and can inquire. One way “sinks into a thing and its context.” The goal, the good, the end of this first kind of knowledge “is to penetrate, to move within, to live with.” In a word, this knowledge tends to the second style of knowing which “unpacks, tears apart, arranges in compartments, takes over and rules.” (Guardini (1994), 45). He labels the first “inspection” and the second “analysis.” (Ibid., 46). Mastery with inspection and examination of the whole from where the parts derive their good, their truth and reason for existence, is by “service, creation out of natural possibilities, which did not fail to transgress set limits or observe final directions.” Processes, their inputs and outputs, are discovered, invented in the sense of the origin meaning of the word, put to use to serve a higher good. On the other hand, mastery of the moral universe by the humanistic manager with analysis invents formulae, programs them into machines, to produce the desired results. “[Formulas] are detached from their organic links and arbitrarily pressed into service. The new desire for mastery does not in any sense follow natural courses or observe natural proportions. Indeed, it treats these with complete indifference.” (Ibid., 47).

This approach builds rational and arbitrary grounds where, once the machine with its tools and contrivances is unleashed, managers can now use the machines independent of whatever rationality might have been deployed to make the thing in the first place. “No inner relations are manifested. And since a formulation of natural forces is at work, obedience can be arbitrarily enforced.” (Guardini (1994), 47). If we imagine obedience as a one-sided compliance with rules and regulations, or even the instructions implied by technology, then is this a fitting end, a good, for the humanistic manager? Or is there another side to obedience? The anthropology of gift would indicate that persons precede technology. The good, the goal, the end is gift. The form of gift is love, freely given for excellence. Managerial action which build technology imperatively must then conform to the advancement of willing the good for one another.

The machine as *techne* might be technology as another “Golem of Prague” or the *roboti* of Karel Capek’s play *R.U.R.*⁷¹ manifested in the material technology ranging from cell phones with their Golem apps to the cultural technology of we call regulations and laws devoid of feeling⁷² embedded in a global governance structure. Such rules, duties, and their enabling technology might seem to be devoid of the original intention

⁷⁰Guardini (1994), Letter 6, “Mastery”. This view intends that being precedes essence (limitation), act, work, operations. In turn act will result in (more) be-ing. In the realm of understanding, judgment, decision and reality, reality conforms thought.

⁷¹Collins and Pinch (1998) and Capek (1920) provide the references to these mythical creatures. The Golem is an organic, unthinking animated clay artifact programmed by the instructions of its creator. An algorithm is such a Golem. Both mimic certain human traits such as sounding intelligent. Neither can understand or seek interpretive meaning in wisdom.

⁷²We might recall Aristotle’s dictum: “law is mind without desire.” Much related to this notion is the idea that *artificial* “intelligence [sic]” while certainly artificial in the sense of not natural, that is, as manufactured, cannot rise to the level of *inter-legere* (L. “reading between [the lines]”), an act of discernment. This discussion, ongoing, will intersect with an ethical analysis of gift, and thus perhaps a bit beyond the scope of this essay into the polity of technology.

of the creator of the technology. Other rules and compliance with those rules might preserve life, promote progress. But other rules and compliance with those rules might lead to a degradation of the human good. How might we choose? This is core of an ethics. The notion of conscience, as in the second and third Chestertonian sanities with which we began this exploration, might be the path by which we transcend, not simply make, our decisions, actions, current states of experience, understanding and judgment.

Nussbaum (1992) finishes her concluding essay on “Transcendence” (p. 375) with the Sophoclean ending from the play *Trachineai*. (Sophocles, *Trachineai* 1264-1269). These verses involve us in the drama of “fellow-feeling-knowing,” *suggnomosunen*, of humans versus the gods and the gods’ simple lack of bother to know or feel for or on behalf of another, *agnomosunen*, all components of gift and relationality.

airet’, opadoi, megalen men emoi touton themenoi suggnomosunen, megalen de theon agnomosunen eidotes ergon ton prassomenon, oi phusantes kai kleizomenoi pateres toiaut’ ephorosi pathe.

(Raise [him], [you who] accompany [me], for showing me [more] great fellow-feeling-judgment than the complete lack of recognition by the gods those who cunningly begat us, such celebrated blow-hard fathers who allowed such suffering.)⁷³

Hulios is the son of Heracles, who dies, we think, in the previous verse. His mother Daethia had sent him in search of his father after so many years of absence doing the seemingly required bidding of the “celebrated,” *kleizomenoi*, gods, whom I depict as “blow-hards,” *phusantes*, which follows one very visual rendering of *phuseo*, “blow up a bladder.”

We are all on pilgrimage, a journey, buffeted by all too many storms and absences of loved-ones, often caused by agents like government leaders who war on other government leaders, transnational actors, including corporations, who dominate markets not just preserve wealth, but to seek wealth, whether in monetary or cultural forms, and the power wealth endows, as the end, the good. Unlike natural events like tsunamis and fire-storms which have no conscience, demagogues and so-called leaders up and down the social and cultural strata do. We all have some inkling of the *suggnomosunen* as “fellow-thought-and-feeling,” perhaps the beginning of compassion.⁷⁴ We know in ourselves and others of the opposite, often dispositive and intentional “lack-of-thought-and-feeling,” *agnomosunen*, which some of us possess to the point of acting like the notorious wind-bag gods, who are just humans, these that pose as gods, or who act as if unwitting beasts. This is the location of the conscience of the humanistic manager, formed in cauldrons of successes and failures, always in community with others.

An Expanding Agenda

How can we possibly deploy the transcendent humanistic manager into real-life management situations? Conceiving the humanistic manager as a person endowed with an anthropology of gift, the nexus of the ethical, stakeholder, governance, technology, public and private partnership arrangements of complex organization could well be captured by the growing literature of workplace spirituality in Lawrence et al. (2022), Baykal (2021), with examples in Seitz et al. (2020). In the renderings of these authors, spirituality is not at all necessarily the practice of a religious commitment to God but just a nexus of deep and transcendent commitments to other persons. However as Tamir, Connaughton, and Salazar (2020) surveys religious and spiritual attitudes of country respondents, her findings indicate the very high degree of divergence in beliefs across countries of the need for God and religion, and thus a spirituality of some sort, in a person’s moral life. The upshot of such longitudinally recurrent attitudes would likely influence respondents in any study let alone one focused on workplace spirituality.

⁷³This is not a literal rendering, but one which paraphrases many musings on this tragedy. I follow Martha Nussbaum’s lead with prompts from Liddell and Scott (2007).

⁷⁴As Martha Nussbaum renders it with Liddell and Scott (2007), 657.

Marschke, Preziosi, and Harrington (2009) develop strong perceived relationships among organizational commitment and workplace spirituality.⁷⁵ I would argue that the authors instrumentalize workplace spirituality in the service of competitive advantage. This inverts the anthropology of gift offered here. The spirituality in any place, work, on the sidewalk, in the home, on vacation operates as a potentially observable manifestation of participating in the ends of a person, the flourishing of persons as gifts to one another. To instrumentalize spirituality to avert employee turnover would subvert the role of spirituality as the gift relationship itself among persons in communities of persons.

Ahmed et al. (2022) align relationships among workplace spirituality, compassion, others at work, spiritual orientation, organizational value and alignment of personal values, with psychological well-being and dignity. Pagliaro et al. (2018) examine the role of ethical climate in counter-productive work practices and moral disengagement. Dal Corso (2020) contrast scenarios for employee burnout and mediation with workplace spirituality. Rastelli et al. (2021) demonstrate the positive impact of retreats, meditation, education, and time to together in groups on a variety of indicators of perception of well-being and life-satisfaction, in a word, happiness. Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021) develop a typology of the caring and healing organization around “Emergent, Endeavoring, and Exemplifying” healing spaces, for the sake of healing persons. (Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021), 390) These well relate to the various facilitations of the daily rhythms, discernments, work, governance, solidarity and subsidiarity found in Seitz et al. (2020) and by Kleymann and Malloch (2010) in a Trappist community and Baumann (2017) in Jesuit communities. The non-economistic practice of finding roles for persons in organizations as opposed to defining a person by her role is common across humanistic organizations. Again order of precedence matters. The latter economistic approach to hiring and governance breeds conflict in the alignment of organizational goals and personal roles and capacities. The humanistic development of persons will simultaneously provide yet another tool to manage conflict with practices which heal the embodied spirit participating in a the community of persons as gifts to one another.

The anthropology of gift as practical for living in community, working in an organization, and managing humanistically implies spiritual workplace practices. Schindler (2011) embodies the guidance of Benedict XVI (2011) in a discussion of the practice of spirituality in monastic communities through the *Rule of St. Benedict*. (Benedict and Fry (2016), hereinafter *RuleSB*). Workplace practices abound in this rule and in St. Ignatius Loyola’s *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. (Ignatius Loyola (1996), hereinafter *ConstSJ*). Kleymann and Malloch (2010) associate the “five pillars” of *RuleSB*, that is, *lectio, acesis, labor, fraternitas, simplicitas* (life-long learning, moderation, work, solidarity, subsidiarity) with inspired workplace governance, strategy, hiring, operations practices. Baumann (2017) associates spiritual principles with the governance and decision making apparatus, that is, communal discernment, of the global operations of the Society of Jesus. These principles include the *magis*, or whatever is the greater glory of God, *discreta caritas*, or “spiritual reasonableness” inherent in a *discernment of spirits* relative to all individual and communal decisions, only *tantum quantum*, that is, insofar as actions lead to a greater good, *detached* from any material or instrumental concern. The design of these practices of workplace spirituality is a anthropology of gift whose form is love, that is, the willing of the good for the other for the sake of the other. The end, the final cause, of the monk / Jesuit as exemplified in the several “portraits” of monks in various roles in the monastery and similar organizational roles for Jesuits, is the salvation⁷⁶ of the monk’s / Jesuit’s soul in the community of monks / Jesuits seeking the same end. (RuleSB, 72.4-6 and Ganss (1991) “First Principle and Foundation”, n. 23).

Kleymann and Malloch (2010) interviewed several members of a Trappist brewery, which, by market standards, added considerable financial value to the surrounding community. The brothers emphasized complementary principles of subsidiarity (e.g., go to the lowest levels of competency to solve problems) and solidarity (e.g., all members pitch in relative to their complementary capabilities) (Kleymann and Malloch (2010), 215-217). The frame of “good governance” pervades the interviews. But by “governance” is meant three aspects relative to oneself and the self with others in the enterprise. First, “take time for reflection be-

⁷⁵The authors state that “The potentially groundbreaking nature of this research leaves no doubt that the intuitively positive relationships between spirituality in the workplace and organizational commitment have a relationship to transform individual and organizational life in ways unrestricted by natural laws. In the years to come, organizations must seek to develop any option possible that can result in a competitive advantage. Developing a spiritual vision will bind an employee to the company and enhance job performance and organizational commitment.” (Marschke, Preziosi, and Harrington (2009), 44).

⁷⁶From the Lat., **salva* meaning “healing,” radical in this context.

fore making decisions . . . It is like advancing at a certain rhythm . . . The rhythm of steps, of things, is very important.” Second, in all dealings and issues one always begins with “the principle that there is always a solution.” Third, through discernment “[t]he question one must always ask oneself is “what is a source of life for the long-term?”. This question then entails both an interior habit of not “let[ting] oneself be dominated by one’s own fears and worries . . . includ[ing] the fear of asking things from people.” Self-discernment relies on the community of persons to “shar[e] issues, with your abbot and also with the other monks.” Fourth, “live a certain non-attachment, in the sense of not becoming the slave of one’s work. One should not identify oneself with one’s job or jobs.” (Kleymann and Malloch (2010), 213) In this community responsibility is shared and delegated according to individual ability from the bottom to the top of the hierarchy.

Baumann (2017) notes that the practice of Ignatian spirituality as “cooperation is union” pervades the labor and mission (the work and mandate) of the Jesuit, the personal life of prayer balanced with work, life in community, and work with those associated with the Jesuit mission. Along lines similar to those evinced by Kleymann and Malloch (2010), Rothausen (2017) develops a leadership model and process corresponding to Ignatian learning, reflection, discernment, and exemplifying the saints. She notes the need for relating spirituality, leadership and religion as coexistent realities of human beings who happen to work in organizations. Regarding the personal development of leaders Carey and Tran (2023) draw on the experiences of Ignatius from his convalescence in Pamplona to his conversion, communal discernment of the first Jesuit fathers, and the governance of an over 450 year old global organization. Noted governance expert Orsy (2020) summarizes governance in Jesuit communities as “discernment by a community of persons is the discovery of a gift by another gift.” For the Jesuit “all is gift” (Orsy (2020), 24). Au (2008) uses this insight to brand the Jesuit practice of “lead through gratitude in gifted service to others.” Listening directly to Ignatius we can hear: “With humble awareness that love . . . must constantly grow in order to come to maturity, we should use all the supernatural and natural helps available for this. Among these, however, we prefer those that are positive, such as probity of life, generous dedication to ones assigned task, great desire for the glory of God, zeal for solid virtues and spiritual concerns, openness and simplicity in dealing with and consulting with superiors, rich cultural attainments, spiritual joy, and above all true charity.” (ConsSJ 147)

Consonant with experience of religious and security communities of persons is Simola (2023)’s work relating the conscious and willing “cultivation of an agapeic organizational culture . . . conscience . . . and agapeic responsiveness to healthy and health-sustaining, politically aware and engaged forms of relational resistance against potentially morally injurious events.” The adjective *agapeic* derives from the highest form of love *agape*, the Greek for the form of the humanistic anthropology of gift, namely love, as developed in this essay.

Similarly Sferrazzo (2021) demonstrates how current incentive systems which rely on economic performance are radically incompatible, at least according to the anthropology proposed in this essay, with agapic behaviors of generosity, humanity, kindness, compassion, help for others and mercy. In an anthropology of gift, and according to the Jesuits and Trappists and the workers at Grayston Bakery in Yonkers, these behaviors are hardly irrational and instead can be fostered to “allow fraternal relationships -as conceived in the Civil Economy tradition- to arise within organizations,” the same “cooperation as union” of the Jesuits and the *fraternitas* of the Trappist monks.

At the least we can begin along with Livne-Tarandach et al. (2021) and Ramachandran et al. (2023) to help managers understand their role, their stewardship of the critical dimensions of compassionate leadership including empathy, openness and communication, physical, mental health and well-being, inclusiveness, integrity, respect and dignity. Managers will discover new ways to heal and grow humanistic organizations. Qualitative tools to assist us in the journey will join studies of human dignity with a priori mindsets of managers along the axis of an anthropology of gift. Progress in developing mindsets, much like virtue, will require new orientations for education within and outside of humanistic organizations.

Statement of Conflicting Interests

The corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Abel, Joseph. 2023. "A Day in the Life: Working the Ovens." *Bethlehem Steel Legacy Project*. <https://www.thebmi.org/working-the-ovens/>.
- Acevedo, A. 2012. "Personalist Business Ethics and Humanistic Management: Insights from Jacques Maritain." *Journal of Business Ethics* 105 (2): 197–219.
- Adler, M. J. 1993. *The Difference of Man and the Difference It Makes*. Fordham University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=K3dWcgAACAAJ>.
- Ahern, K. 2015. *Structures of Grace: Catholic Organizations Serving the Global Common Good*. Orbis Books. <https://books.google.com/books?id=9qmaBgAAQBAJ>.
- Ahmed, Rizwan Raheem, Farwa Abbas Soomro, Zahid Ali Channar, Alharthi Rami Hashem, Hassan Abbas Soomro, Munwar Hussain Pahi, and Nor Zafir Md Salleh. 2022. "Relationship Between Different Dimensions of Workplace Spirituality and Psychological Well-Being: Measuring Mediation Analysis Through Conditional Process Modeling." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811244>.
- Anderson, E. 1995. *Value in Ethics and Economics*. Harvard University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=1oBpfbE2c5IC>.
- Aristotle. 1941. *Nicomachean Ethics (Trans: Ross Wd)*. New York: Random House.
- Au, W. 2008. "Ignatian Service Gratitude and Love in Action." *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 40 (2).
- Ayer, A. J. 1963. *The Concept of a Person*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Baumann, R. J. 2017. "Our Jesuit Constitutions: Cooperation as Union." *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 49 (4). <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/jesuit/issue/view/1015>.
- Baykal, Elif. 2021. "Understanding Religion as a Phenomenon in Workplace Spirituality: A Durkheimian Approach." *Spiritual Psychology and Counseling* 6 (2): 27–41. <https://dx.doi.org/10.37898/spc.2021.6.2.134>.
- Bell, D. E., H. Raiffa, and A. Tversky. 1988. *Decision Making: Descriptive, Normative, and Prescriptive Interactions*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=R2dleyi_iTMC.
- Bendak, Salaheddine, Amir Moued Shikhli, and Refaat H. Abdel-Razek. 2020. "How Changing Organizational Culture Can Enhance Innovation: Development of the Innovative Culture Enhancement Framework." Edited by Lorenzo Ardito. *Cogent Business & Management* 7 (1): 1712125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1712125>.
- Benedict, St., and T. Fry. 2016. *The Rule of St. Benedict in English*. Liturgical Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=KpkkDwAAQBAJ>.
- Benedict XVI. 2011. "The Origins of Western Theology and the Roots of European Culture." *Communio* 38 (Summer): 237–78.
- Biggar, Nigel. 2013. "Evolutionary Biology, 'Enlightened' Anthropological Narratives, and Social Morality: A View from Christian Ethics." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 26 (2): 152–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0953946812473018>.
- Byrne, Patrick. 2018. *Ethics of Discernment*. University of Toronto Press.
- Capek, Karel. 1920. *R.U.R.: Rostum's Universal Robots*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/13083/13083-h/13083-h.htm>.
- Carey, Michael R., and Dung Q. Tran. 2023. "Deconstruction, Choice, Reconstruction, and Integration: Insights from Ignatius of Loyola's Conversion Process on the Professional Formation of Organizational Leaders." *Humanistic Management Journal* 8: 181–90.
- Chen, Peter Pin-Shan. 1976. "The Entity-Relationship Model—Toward a Unified View of Data." *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 1 (1): 9–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/320434.320440>.

- Clarke, W. Norris. 1993. *Person and Being*. Aquinas Lecture. Marquette University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=UwLXAAAAMAAJ>.
- Collins, H. M., and T. Pinch. 1998. *The Golem: What You Should Know About Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.
- Copleston, F. C. 2003. *Logical Positivism and Existentialism*. A History of Philosophy. Continuum. <https://books.google.com/books?id=Z2oraxSkm8oC>.
- Costanza, Joseph. 1951. "The Graeco-Roman Politeia: The City of Men." *Fordham Law Review* 1 (1): 119–55.
- Dadosky, John. 2020. "Further Along the Fourth Stage of Meaning: Lonergan, Alterity and 'Genuine' Religion." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 85 (1): 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021140019889214%0A>.
- Dal Corso, Alessandro AND Carluccio, Laura AND De Carlo. 2020. "Employee Burnout and Positive Dimensions of Well-Being: A Latent Workplace Spirituality Profile Analysis." *PLOS ONE* 15 (11): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242267>.
- Dantzig, George B. 1949. "Programming of Interdependent Activities: II Mathematical Model." *Econometrica* 17 (3/4): 200–211. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1905523>.
- Descartes, R. 1985. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes [Tr. J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff and d. Murdoch]*. Cambridge.
- Descartes, R., and D. A. Cress. 1998. *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy (Fourth Edition)*. Hackett. <https://books.google.com/books?id=r7F27Ra9ecoC>.
- De Vitoria, Francisco. 1991. *Vitoria: Political Writings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dewar, Carolyn, Scott Keller, and Vikram Malhotra. 2022. *CEO Excellence: The Six Mindsets That Distinguish the Best Leaders from the Rest*. Scribner.
- Dierksmeier, C. 2016. "What Is 'Humanistic' About Humanistic Management?" *Humanistic Management Journal* 1: 9–32.
- Dolan, Timothy E. 2018. "Framing Indeterminacy: Dialectical Analysis and Futures Studies." *World Futures Review* 10 (1): 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1946756717739628>.
- Domingo, Vianney, and Domènec Melé. 2022. "Re-Thinking Management: Insights from Western Classical Humanism: Humanistic Management: What Can We Learn from Classical Humanism?" *Humanistic Management Journal* 7 (1): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-021-00115-z>.
- Donceel, J. F. 1967. *Philosophical Anthropology*. Sheed; Ward. <https://books.google.com/books?id=VC-aAAAAIAAJ>.
- Dorfman, R., P. A. Samuelson, and R. M. Solow. 2012. *Linear Programming and Economic Analysis*. Dover Books on Computer Science. Dover Publications. <https://books.google.com/books?id=rPjBAGAAQBAJ>.
- Fischer, Thomas, and Sim B. Sitkin. 2023. "Leadership Styles: A Comprehensive Assessment and Way Forward." *Academy of Management Annals* 17 (1): 331–72. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0340>.
- Frankfurt, Harry G. 1971. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person." *The Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1): 5–20.
- Friedman, Milton. 1970. "The Social Responsibility of Business Is to Increase Its Profits." *The New York Times Magazine (September 13, 1970)*.
- Galenson, David W. 1984. "The Rise and Fall of Indentured Servitude in the Americas: An Economic Analysis." *The Journal of Economic History* 44 (1): 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002205070003134X>.
- Ganss, G. E. 1991. *Ignatius of Loyola: The Spiritual Exercises and Selected Works*. Classics of Western Spirituality. Paulist Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=mIviS0cDbnUC>.

- Gelman, A., J. Hill, and A. Vehtari. 2020. *Regression and Other Stories*. Analytical Methods for Social Research. Cambridge University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=fILoDwAAQBAJ>.
- Gelman, Andrew, Matilde Trevisani, Hao Lu, and Alexander Van Geen. 2004. "Direct Data Manipulation for Local Decision Analysis as Applied to the Problem of Arsenic in Drinking Water from Tube Wells in Bangladesh." *Risk Analysis: An International Journal* 24 (6): 1597–1612.
- Georgantzias, Nicholas C. 2015. "Politeia: A High-Technology Human System." *Human Systems Management* 32 (4): 91–104.
- Gitig, Diana. 2018. "Chinese Ban on Small Coal Burning Ovens Took 15 Years." <https://arstechnica.com/science/2018/02/chinese-ban-on-small-coal-burning-ovens-took-15-years/>.
- Gray, Steven M., J. Stuart Bunderson, Gerben S. van der Vegt, Floor Rink, and Yeliz Gedik. 2023. "Leveraging Knowledge Diversity in Hierarchically Differentiated Teams: The Critical Role of Hierarchy Stability." *Academy of Management Journal* 66 (2): 462–88. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2020.1136>.
- Gronbacher, Gregory M. A. 1998. "The Need for Economic Personalism." *Journal of Markets & Morality* 1 (1): 1–34.
- Guardini, Romano. 1994. *Letters from Lake Como: Explorations on Technology and the Human Race*. Wm B. Eerdmans.
- Hacker, P. M.S. 2011. *Human Nature: The Categorical Framework*. Wiley. <https://books.google.com/books?id=gCT1eMxuNXQC>.
- Hamilton, Edith, Huntington Cairns, and others. 1961. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*. Vol. 18. Princeton University Press.
- Harari, Y. N. 2017. *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow*. HarperCollins. https://books.google.com/books?id=H2t_CwAAQBAJ.
- Hegi, Kevin E., and Raymond M. Bergner. 2010. "What Is Love? An Empirically-Based Essentialist Account." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 27 (5): 620–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407510369605>.
- Henrich, J., D. E. Blasi, C. M. Curtin, and et al. 2023. "A Cultural Species and Its Cognitive Phenotypes: Implications for Philosophy." *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 14: 349–86.
- Henrich, Joseph, and Richard McElreath. 2003. "The Evolution of Cultural Evolution." *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* 12 (3): 123–35. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10110>.
- Herfeld, Catherine. 2022. "Revisiting the Criticisms of Rational Choice Theories." *Philosophy Compass* 17 (1): e12774. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12774>.
- Hirschfeld, Mary L. 2018. *Aquinas and the Market*. Harvard University Press.
- . 2019. "Rethinking Economic Inequality: A Theological Perspective." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 47 (2): 259–82.
- Hong, Ze, and Joseph Henrich. 2021. "The Cultural Evolution of Epistemic Practices." *Human Nature* 32 (3): 622+.
- Hopkins, Jasper. 1985. *Nicholas of Cusa on Learned Ignorance: A Translation and Appraisal of de Docta Ignorantia*. A. J. Benning Press, Minneapolis.
- Ignatius Loyola. 1996. *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts (John W. Padberg, S.J., General Editor)*. The Institute of Jesuit Sources. <https://jesuitas.lat/uploads/the-constitutions-of-the-society-of-jesus-and-their-complementary-norms/Constitutions%20and%20Norms%20SJ%20ingls.pdf>.
- Illich, Ivan. 1971. *Deschooling Society*. Harper & row New York.

- Kant, I. 2008. *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith. Lightning Source Incorporated. <https://books.google.com/books?id=CoLg8Ij60CgC>.
- Kearney, Richard. 2016. "Transcendent Humanism in a Secular Age: A Dialogue with Charles Taylor." In *Reimagining the Sacred: Richard Kearney Debates God*, edited by Richard Kearney and Jens Zimmerman. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Keenan, James. 2015. "Redeeming Conscience." *Theological Studies* 76 (1): 129–47.
- . 2022. *A History of Catholic Theological Ethics*. Paulist Press.
- Kleymann, B., and H. Malloch. 2010. "The Rule of Saint Benedict and Corporate Management: Employing the Whole Person." *Journal of Global Responsibility* 1 (2): 207–24.
- Kouzes, J. M., and B. Z. Posner. 2010. *The Leadership Challenge*. J-B Leadership Challenge: Kouzes/Posner. Wiley. <https://books.google.com/books?id=t6WT1jA8Hg4C>.
- Krugman, P., and R. Wells. 2021. *Economics*. Worth Publishers. <https://books.google.com/books?id=zUQQEAAAQBAJ>.
- Lawrence, A. T., J. Weber, V. D. Hill, and D. M. Wasieleski. 2022. *Business and Society: Stakeholders, Ethics, Public Policy*. McGraw-Hill Education. <https://books.google.com/books?id=e3DHZgEACAAJ>.
- Leeson, Peter T. 2006. "How Much Benevolence Is Benevolent Enough?" *Public Choice* 126 (3): 357–66.
- Lewis, C. S. 2009a. *Mere Christianity*. HarperCollins. <https://books.google.com/books?id=OF-YSMKCVwMC>.
- . 2009b. *The Abolition of Man*. HarperCollins. <https://books.google.com/books?id=ST87o-KSzp0C>.
- Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott. 2007. *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, Abridged: The Little Liddell*. Simon Wallenberg Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=jmFGHwAACAAJ>.
- Livne-Tarandach, Reut, Erica Steckler, Jennifer Leigh, and Sara Wheeler-Smith. 2021. "Cultivating Organizations as Healing Spaces: A Typology for Responding to Suffering and Advancing Social Justice." *Humanistic Management Journal* 6: 373–404.
- Livne-Tarandach, Reut, Erica Steckler, Jennifer Leigh, and Sara Wheeler-Smith. 2021. "Cultivating Organizations as Healing Spaces: A Typology for Responding to Suffering and Advancing Social Justice." *Humanistic Management Journal* 6 (3): 373–404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41463-021-00112-2>.
- Lonergan, Bernard. 1957. *Insight*. University of Toronto Press.
- . 1972. *Method in Theology*. Herder; Herder.
- . 2005. "Finality, Love, Marriage." In *Collection: Volume 4 (Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan)*, edited by Frederick Crowe. University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.
- Luce, R. D., and H. Raiffa. 1957. *Games and Decisions: Introduction and Critical Survey : A Study of the Behavioural Models Project, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University*. Wiley. <https://books.google.com/books?id=72WSAQAACAAJ>.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1990. *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mankiw, N. G., and M. P. Taylor. 2020. *Economics*. Cengage Learning. <https://books.google.com/books?id=0WhIygEACAAJ>.
- Maritain, Jacques. 1947. "Human Rights and Natural Law." *UNESCO Courier* 23 May 2023. <https://courier.unesco.org/en/articles/human-rights-and-natural-law>.
- Marschke, Eleanor, Robert Preziosi, and William Harrington. 2009. "Professionals and Executives Support a Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and Spirituality in the Workplace." *Journal of Business & Economics Research* 7 (8): 33–45. <https://clutejournals.com/index.php/JBER/article/view/2320/2368>.

- McCloskey, Deirdre N. 2003. "Why Economists Should Not Be Ashamed of Being the Philosophers of Prudence." *Eastern Economic Journal* 28 (4): 551–56.
- McCloskey, Dierdre. 2022. "Economic Development and Love." *The QoG Podcast* 3 (1). <https://shows.acast.com/the-qog-podcast/episodes/deirdre-mccloskey-economic-development-and-love>.
- McCloskey, D. N. 1998. *The Rhetoric of Economics*. Rhetoric of the Human Sciences. University of Wisconsin Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=RDwsPG2KmXYC>.
- McCloskey, D. N., and S. Ziliak. 2010. *The Cult of Statistical Significance: How the Standard Error Costs Us Jobs, Justice, and Lives*. Economics, Cognition, and Society. University of Michigan Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=opVFDwAAQBAJ>.
- Meissner, W. W. 1986. *Psychoanalysis and Religious Experience*. Yale University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=cx1CsDm_qcC.
- Melé, D., C. Cantón, and C. G. Cantón. 2014. *Human Foundations of Management: Understanding the Homo Humanus*. IESE Business Collection. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://books.google.com/books?id=5WqpBQAAQBAJ>.
- Melé, Domènec. 2012. "The Firm as a "Community of Persons": A Pillar of Humanistic Business "Ethos"." *Journal of Business Ethics* 106 (1): 89–101. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41413246>.
- . 2016. "Understanding Humanistic Management." *Humanistic Management Journal* 1 (1): 33–55.
- Noce, A. D., and C. Lancellotti. 2014. *The Crisis of Modernity*. McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Ideas. McGill-Queen's University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=60C3BQAAQBAJ>.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1992. *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford Paperbacks. Oxford University Press, USA. <https://books.google.com/books?id=oq3POR8FhtgC>.
- . 2001. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511817915>.
- . 2011. *Creating Capabilities - the Human Development Approach*. Belknap Harvard Press.
- Onians, R. B. 1988. *The Origins of European Thought: About the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate*. Cambridge University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=cjDy2O2jDmUC>.
- Orsy, L. 2020. *Discernment: Theology and Practice, Communal and Personal*. Liturgical Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=Kaz3DwAAQBAJ>.
- Pagliaro, Stefano, Alessandro Lo Presti, Massimiliano Barattucci, Valeria A. Giannella, and Manuela Barreto. 2018. "On the Effects of Ethical Climate(s) on Employees' Behavior: A Social Identity Approach." *Frontiers in Psychology* 9 (960).
- Pesic, Peter. 2014. "Francis Bacon, Violence, and the Motion of Liberty: The Aristotelian Background." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 75 (1): 69–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43289651>.
- Pieper, Josef. 2009. *Leisure: The Basis of Culture*. Ignatius Press.
- Pieper, J., and B. Wald. 2014. *Über Das Ende Der Zeit: Eine Geschichtsphilosophische Betrachtung*. Topos-Taschenbücher. Butzon & Bercker. <https://books.google.com/books?id=w3pqnQEACAAJ>.
- Pirson, M. 2016. "Editorial: Welcome to the Humanistic Management Journal." *Humanistic Management Journal* 1: 1–7.
- . 2019. "A Humanistic Perspective for Management Theory: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being." *Journal of Business Ethics* 159 (1): 39–57.
- Pirson, Michael. 2017. "Humanistic Management." In *Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pirson, M., R. L. Piedmont, and N. Nagy. 2023. "Establishing a Dignity Scale - Measuring Intrinsic Value Within Social Contexts." *Humanist Management Journal* 8: 97–112.

- Przywara, E., J. R. Betz, and D. B. Hart. 2014. *Analogia Entis: Metaphysics: Original Structure and Universal Rhythm*. Ressourcement: Retrieval and Renewal in Catholic Thought (Rrrct). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. <https://books.google.com/books?id=0v-AEAAAQBAJ>.
- Ragsdale, Cliff. 2021. *Spreadsheet Modeling and Decision Analysis: A Practical Introduction to Business Analytics*. Cengage Learning.
- Ramachandran, S., S. Balasubramanian, W. F. James, and T. Al Masaeid. 2023. "Whither Compassionate Leadership? A Systematic Review." *Management Review Quarterly* April: 1–85.
- Rastelli, Clara, Lucia Calabrese, Constance Miller, Antonino Raffone, and Nicola De Pisapia. 2021. "The Art of Happiness: An Explorative Study of a Contemplative Program for Subjective Well-Being." *Frontiers in Psychology* 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.600982>.
- Rorty, Amélie O. 1976. "A Literary Postscript: Characters, Persons, Selves, Individuals." In *Identities of Persons*, edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, 301–24. University of California Press.
- Rothausen, Teresa J. 2017. "Integrating Leadership Development with Ignatian Spirituality: A Model for Designing a Spiritual Leader Development Practice." *Journal of Business Ethics* 145: 811–29.
- Scheler, Max. 1994. *Ressentiment [Trans., Louis Coser, (German) Das Ressentiment Im Aufbau Der Moralen, 1915]*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.
- Schindler, David L. 2011. "America's Technological Ontology and the Gift of the Given: Benedict XVI on the Cultural Significance of the Quererere Deum." *Communio* 38 (Summer): 237–78.
- . 2016. "Being, Gift, Self-Gift (Part Two)." *Communio*, 409.
- Schindler, D. C. 2019. *Freedom from Reality: The Diabolical Character of Modern Liberty*. Catholic Ideas for a Secular World. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Schwartz, P. 2004. *Inevitable Surprises*. Penguin Publishing Group. <https://books.google.com/books?id=hE-ydUjBl8YC>.
- . 2012. *The Art of the Long View: Planning for the Future in an Uncertain World*. Crown. <https://books.google.com/books?id=T-r36bIZA44C>.
- Seitz, J. C., C. F. Hinze, G. J. Beyer, A. C. Greene, K. Holscher, M. Naughton, M. Pirson, et al. 2020. *Working Alternatives: American and Catholic Experiments in Work and Economy*. Catholic Practice in North America. Fordham University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=aFjsDwAAQBAJ>.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books.
- Sen, Amartya K. 1977. "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 6 (4): 317–44. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2264946>.
- Sferrazzo, R. 2021. "The 'Agapic Behaviors': Reconciling Organizational Citizenship Behavior with the Reward System." *Humanistic Management Journal* 6 (1): 19–35.
- Simola, Sheldene. 2023. "Exploring Agape in the Organizational Prevention of Work-Related Moral Injury." *Humanistic Management Journal* 8: 355–77.
- Singer, Irving. 2009a. *The Nature of Love, Volume 1: Plato to Luther*. MIT Press.
- . 2009b. *The Nature of Love, Volume 3: The Modern World*. MIT Press.
- Taleb, N. N. 2010. *The Black Swan: Second Edition: The Impact of the Highly Improbable Fragility*. Incerto. Random House Publishing Group. <https://books.google.com/books?id=GSBcQVd3MqYC>.
- Tamir, Christine, Aidan Connaughton, and Ariana Monique Salazar. 2020. "The Global God Divide." *Pew Research Center*, no. July 20. <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/07/20/the-global-god-divide/>.
- Taylor, Charles. 1988. "Book Review: The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 18 (4): 805–14.

- Teehankee, Benito L. 2008. "Humanistic Entrepreneurship: An Approach to Virtue-Based Enterprise." *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review* 8 (1): 89–110.
- Town, Sophia, Matthew C. J. Donovan, and Emily Beach. 2021. "A 'Gestalt' Framework of Emotions and Organizing: Integrating Innate, Constructed, and Discursive Ontologies." *Management Learning* 52 (5): 519–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620972238>.
- Turing, A. M. 1950. "I.—Computing Machinery and Intelligence." *Mind* LIX (236): 433–60. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433>.
- Werder, Olaf. 2019. "Toward a Humanistic Model in Health Communication." *Global Health Promotion* 26 (1): 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975916683385>.
- West, Andrew. 2018. "The Role of Virtue in Good Management." In *Handbook of Philosophy of Management*, edited by Cristina Neesham and Steven Segal, 1–12. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48352-8_13-1.
- Whetstone, J. Thomas. 2002. "Personalism and Moral Leadership: The Servant Leader with a Transforming Vision." *Business Ethics: A European View* 1 (1): 1.
- Williston, B. 1997. "Descartes on Love and/as Error." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 58: 429–44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.1997.0031>.
- Wittgenstein, L. 2022. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. e-artnow. <https://books.google.com/books?id=uVVODwAAQBAJ>.
- Wojtyla, K., G. Ignatik, and C. A. Anderson. 2021. *Person and Act and Related Essays*. The English Critical Ed. O. Catholic University of America Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=TxYpEAAAQBAJ>.
- Yeager, David S, and Carol S. Dweck. 2020. "What Can Be Learned from Growth Mindset Controversies?" *The American Psychologist* 75 (9): 1269–84.