

Ora Setter

Tel Aviv University

and

Laszlo Zsolnai

Corvinus University of Budapest

Care, and its Relevance to Today's Economy

Care is an central aspect of human existence. What we care about and who we care for largely determine our way of being. The subjects of care present a frame of reference for our human functioning.

The survival of the fittest, and other Darwinian notions, have become slogans for the business world which favors competitive, instrumental and capitalist values. However, in his *Descent of Man*, Darwin (1871: 403-404) wrote the following:

Important as the struggle for existence has been and even still is, yet as far as the highest part of our nature is concerned there are other agencies more important. For the moral qualities are advanced either directly or indirectly much more through the efforts of habit, by our reasoning powers, by instruction, by religion, etc., than through natural selection.

David Loye (2009) found that *In The Descent of Man* Darwin writes 95 times about love....

Of moral sensitivity I found he wrote 92 times....Of competition, he wrote 12 times; of cooperation—called mutual aid in Darwin's time—27 times....For Darwin the prime driver for human evolution—and completion for his theory of evolution....is our capacity for the “moral sense,” i.e. moral sensitivity, an evolutionary inbuilt thrust within us for the development of a sense of right versus wrong.

Care and ethics then, are considered by Darwin as higher level imperatives, and more important than fighting and competition.

Care is essential to our life, and caring is an essential part of who we are.

We need care for our survival. Attachment theory (Bowlby 1982) proposes that all individuals are born with an innate desire to seek proximity to others in times of need or distress in order to enhance their survival prospects. Children as well as other mammalian infants are largely unable to feed or protect themselves as their survival is dependent on their ability to maintain proximity to older, wiser, and more capable adults. The ability of an individual to form an emotional and physical "attachment" to another person – by being taken care of – gives them a sense of stability and the security necessary to take risks, branch out, and grow and develop as a personality. This sense of security (or lack thereof) then becomes the basis of their own individual style of attachment which then remains relatively fixed over the lifespan of the individual. Ainsworth (2015) discovered that attachment formation is an "innate" or instinctive form of human behavior.

Caring for others is also essential part of our humanity. Our brain is wired to react empathetically to the pain of others as a means of signaling danger and eliciting help. Functional MRI scans show that if an individual watches someone undergo electric shock, their brain lights up in the same areas as those in the brain of the person in pain (Bufalari, Ilaria et al. 2007). When we have feelings of caring or love for other people, we feel better. Moreover, a growing body of evidence shows that providing care can be beneficial to the caregiver, leading to reduced stress, increased happiness, and an increased sense of social connectedness (Inagaki and Orehek 2017).

1 Care in organizations, caring organizations

Within organizational settings, caring is usually thought of as pertaining either to leadership roles or to team and peer social ties. But from the organizational or management point of view, there are more stakeholders to care about.

The problematic of care appears in management in relation to how to manage the stakeholders of an organization. Stakeholder theory (Freeman et al. 2010) says that businesses and other organizations should consider the interests and claims of stakeholders and manage their activities accordingly. From this perspective, the effective management of stakeholders is a strategic activity that is necessary for the success and the long-term survival of an organization. Ignoring stakeholders is dangerous, not just because it is morally inappropriate, but also because it does not make economic sense.

There are two interrelated problems with the stakeholder approach: (i) the narrow conception of stakeholders, and (ii) the fallibility of stakeholders concerning their own well-being (Zsolnai 2018).

Companies usually define their stakeholders in a narrow way. Only owners, managers, employees, creditors, suppliers, and local communities are considered stakeholders. This narrow definition of stakeholders is often a recipe for disaster in terms of organizational functioning.

Mitroff (1998) argues that when stakeholders are defined too narrowly, and/or are not identified correctly, this leads to the solving the wrong problems precisely. When managers confront a problem which is located at the edge of their competence, especially a novel problem, or a case outside the bounds of accepted thinking and practice, they are either stymied to the point of paralysis, or fall back on the only resource they have: reducing a novel or unique situation to a problem that they already know how to solve. “The trouble is that the problems that one knows how to solve may bear little resemblance to the actual problems one needs to solve. As a result, extreme cases and outlier problems and situations pose a real and a serious challenge to the professions and to accepted modes of thinking. In the extreme, they lead to serious errors, catastrophic failures, and major disasters and crises” (Mitroff and Silvers 2009).

Psychology and behavioral economics have revealed that people are rather poor at predicting their own future well-being. They are fallible in understanding what they will like in the future, and how they will feel in future states of affairs.

Based on experimental research, Nobel-prize-winning Daniel Kahneman (2011) states that people are myopic in their decisions, lack skill at predicting their future tastes, and can be led to make erroneous choices through their fallible memories and incorrect evaluations of past experiences.

Kahneman suggests differentiating between experienced utility and predicted utility. The experienced utility of an outcome is a measure of the hedonic experience of that outcome. The predicted utility of an outcome is defined as the individual’s beliefs about its experienced utility at some future time. Predicted utility is an ex-ante variable, while experienced utility is an ex-post variable in the decision-making process.

According to the rational choice model used in stakeholder theory, decisions are made on the basis of predicted utility. If experienced utility greatly differs from predicted utility, then this may lead to sub-rational, or even irrational choices. The problem of predicted utility raises the question “Do people actually know what they will like?” The answer is a definite “No.” The accuracy of people’s hedonic predictions is generally quite poor.

Related experimental studies suggest two conclusions: (i) people may have little ability to forecast changes in their hedonic responses to stimuli; and (ii) even in situations that permit accurate hedonic predictions, people may tend to make decisions about future consumption without due consideration of possible changes in their tastes (Kahneman 2011).

Since people use their evaluative memories to guide their choices about future outcomes, deceptive retrospective evaluations may lead to erroneous choices. Kahneman identifies two major obstacles to maximizing experienced utility: People lack skill at predicting how their tastes might change, thus it is difficult to describe as rational agents those individuals who are prone to making large errors when predicting what they will want or enjoy in the future. The other obstacle is a tendency of individuals to use the affect associated with particular moments as a proxy for the utility of extended outcomes. Errors in lessons drawn from experience will inevitably be reflected in deficient choices about the future (Kahneman 2011).

Managing for a narrowly defined set of stakeholders cannot guarantee that the functioning of an organization is ecologically sustainable or beneficial for society more generally, including future generations. Considering the interest of stakeholders solely on the basis of the latter’s own calculations may lead to unacceptable outcomes. Business and other organizations should expand their set of stakeholders and go beyond trying to meet goals rationally founded on calculated self-interest.

In his opus magnum, *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*, Hans Jonas (1984) describes the impact of modern technology on the human condition as follows:

- (1) The nature of human activities has been altered and enlarged due to their magnitude and novelty, and their impact on man’s global future.
- (2) Responsibility is correlated to power, and must be commensurate with the latter’s scope and its exercise.

(3) To replace the former projections of hope, an imaginative ‘heuristics of fear’ should be developed to inform us of what may be at stake, and what we must beware of.

(4) Ethics are created and underpinned by how man perceives his duties towards himself, his distant posterity, and the plenitude of life under his dominion. (Jonas 1984: x).

Jonas argues that an imperative of responsibility might be framed like this: “Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life.” Or, expressed negatively: “Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such life” (Jonas 1984: 11).

Human responsibility is never formal, but it is always substantive. It involves humans being responsible not primarily for their own conduct and its consequences, but for the matter that has or will make a claim on present action. The well-being, the interests, the fates of others have, by circumstance or by agreement, come into *our care*, which means that our control over them involves at the same time our obligation towards them (Jonas 1984: 92-93).

The imperative of responsibility implies that nature, human beings, and future generations should be accepted as primary subjects of care in business (Zsolnai 2018). Business actors must develop practices that incorporate genuine interest in and caring for the existence and well-being of these primordial “stakeholders.” The papers presented in this book illustrate some of the different ways (and practical models of how) this may be possible.

2 Issues and themes

In his paper, “Authentic Human Relations and the Economy,” *Imre Ungvari-Zrínyi* (Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania) reflects on the ideas of Martin Buber in terms of establishing authentic human, social and environmental relations in today’s economy, which is characterized by pervasive problems such as growing inequality, alienation from the workplace, precarious work, work-life imbalance, consumerism, and environmental decay.

Ungvari-Zrínyi suggests that *Martin Buber’s philosophy of dialogue* is a good starting point for re-conceptualizing current economic and social thought. In Buber’s philosophy, the clear distinction between personal, authentic relationships (“I-Thou”) and objectifying relations (“I-It”) is central. In an I-Thou relation one person confirms the other as being of unique value

and a sense of mutual responsibility is created, whereas people engaged in the objectifying relation of I-It tend to reduce relationships to their use value.

The distinction between authentic and inauthentic human relations is a good basis for the criticism of the idea of “homo oeconomicus” – which is an artificial device in economic theorizing whose essence is far from that of a real human being who is faced with complex challenges and takes responsibility for others. Ungvari-Zrinyi shows that Buber’s philosophy of *human encounters* can be used to address the contemporary problems of economy and society, including encounters with people of different faith, different nationalities, and even non-human beings.

Jeremy Rifkin’s idea of the *empathic civilization* appears to be relevant here. Rifkin considers empathy to be the ability of human beings to show solidarity – not only to each other, but also towards their fellow non-human creatures with whom they share the planet. In agreement with Rifkin, Ungvari-Zrinyi believes that new technologies are allowing people to connect their empathy “to the entire human race in a single biosphere.” People are not just “materialistic, self-interested, utilitarian, pleasure-seeking” creatures, but beings at various stages of consciousness, and theological, ideological, and psychological development. The emergence of an empathic civilization seems to be a consequence of the existential similarity of finite beings, combined with the possibilities engendered by the third industrial revolution. Ungvari-Zrinyi emphasizes that we find this vision in the religious (Chassidic) spirituality of Buber’s philosophy.

In his paper, “Caring for Being and Caring for Other,” *Luk Bouckaert* (Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium) argues that caring can be considered to be an attitude that underlies all human activities. Bouckaert recalls that in his “*Sein und Zeit*” German philosopher Martin Heidegger developed an ontological analysis of *Sorge* (care) as the basic structure of our being-in-the world (*Dasein*). Confronted with the threat of death, human beings are driven by anxiety and worry. Hence, their first act of caring concerns their survival and the meaning of their own threatened existence. But Bouckaert warns that, in sharp contrast with Heidegger’s concept of care, French Jewish philosopher *Emmanuel Levinas* interprets caring as a non-chosen *responsibility* for the other. Bouckaert believes that caring for the other is a more genuine starting point than having concern about one’s own existence.

Bouckaert explores the notion of vulnerability and differentiates between negative and positive forms of it. The Heidegger-Levinas controversy comes to the fore when one

addresses the question which and whose vulnerability should be awarded priority. Bouckaert applies caring to the sphere of economics and highlights the contrast between philanthropy and relational economics as two different forms of economic care. He illustrates the implications of the Heidegger-Levinas dilemma with a business case taken from Goethe's *Faust*. As a successful entrepreneur, Faust is confronted with a choice between entrepreneurial success and caring for the other. In the early nineteenth century Goethe was optimistic about economic progress, but today we need a much stronger focus on addressing the vulnerability of our planet and of people.

Bouckaert suggests that our notion of progress must *not* be primarily embedded in a notion of mastering the world. We need a type of caring entrepreneurship inspired by a deep understanding of our human condition and the vulnerability of our planet. This can be supported by concrete practices of relational economics, servant leadership, and sustainability. To avoid escapism, future managers need to have concrete confrontations with the most vulnerable forms of life upon our planet which deserve a better future.

In his paper, "Getting to the Heart of Compassion in Philosophy and Economic Life," *Kevin T. Jackson* (Solvay Brussels School of Economics and Management, Brussels, Belgium and Fordham University, New York, USA) links philosophical reflection with business-and-society considerations concerning a *culture of compassion* for economic life. He explores the concept of compassion, revealing it as a primordial feature of the human condition. Jackson highlights several of the tensions that attend alternative interpretations of the concept of compassion that appear throughout ancient, medieval, modern, and postmodern treatments in the Western philosophical tradition. He then proceeds to extend some of these interpretative perspectives about compassion into contemporary economic life, focusing on models of hybrid social enterprise.

Jackson uses the examples of Yunus' social enterprise and Porter and Kramer's shared value model as illustrations, but many other socially-engaged business models and initiatives within the "conscious capitalism" movement may be classified into the same category (benefit-corporations, certified B-corps, economy of communion, cross-compensation, and market-connection frameworks). Jackson emphasizes that supporting both Yunus' social enterprising and Porter and Kramer's shared value model is the notion that the logic of gift and the logic of exchange exist in a state of tension that involves *counterbalancing opposing elements* such as the promptings of love with the restraints of justice. In facing that challenge, Jackson believes,

compassion can constitute a motivation and inspiration for pro-social entrepreneurial business solutions in our deeply divided and profoundly needy world.

In his paper, “Consciousness Approach to Management and Economics,” *Garry Jacobs* (World Academy of Art and Science and The Mother’s Service Society, India) recalls the importance of *consciousness* in business and management. He refers to Steve Jobs of Apple as an embodiment of the spiritual principle that one person can change the world. This case also illustrates the spiritual power behind the aspiration of the human spirit for freedom, empowerment and mastery, rather than passive submission to the machinery of technology and mechanisms of social organization. Jobs perceived the powerful stirrings of a deep evolutionary social movement, and Apple delivered creative, new products to meet this. Apple’s collective accomplishments, like those of Leonardo da Vinci and the Italian Renaissance, exemplify the virtually infinite potential for innovation and creativity.

Jacobs emphasizes the *value* of *values*. Values determine the ultimate level of accomplishment. Values are an expression of what we regard as valuable. The power of values depend on the intensity and sincerity with which we value them. Values embrace all aspects of life and encompass the subjective as well as the objective dimension. But, aside from their specific individual relevance, they always reflect on and refer back to a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts, for the implementation of any value necessarily requires the implementation of many others. The perfect manifestation of any value requires a perfect manifestation of the whole, which is one.

Jacobs states that a *spiritual view* of *life* and *management* involves regarding responsibility and relationships as inseparably interdependent factors – for the latter is based on the premise that the outer objective conditions in which we live and act and the inner subjective conditions that constitute our personal consciousness are intimately related. The outer world influences and in most circumstances shapes, defines, directs and limits our consciousness. The essence of spirituality is to discover that reality within ourselves that is not determined by the external social and physical conditions around us, but is free and untouched by its pressures and compulsions. It also tells us that, once free, we discover that we have the capacity to alter the conditions around us not only through the action which we initiate, but also, and much more powerfully, by acting on and altering our own consciousness. When we do that, we discover the deeper truth that the inner always determines the outer; our inner consciousness always

determines our response to the conditions of external work to us. In this way, consciousness means the power to change things our life, including management and business.

In his paper, “New Metrics for a New Economy: The B2T by 2020 Project,” *Yehuda Kahane* (Tel Aviv University) states that there is an urgent need for a paradigm shift towards a new multi-dimensional, multi-objective economy that serves a diversity of values alongside economic goals. In such an economy, “doing good” (socially, environmentally and ethically) will support rather than stand in contradiction to “doing well” (economically). The level of environmental and social threats is developing at an exponential rate and the need for drastic transformation is pressing.

Kahane warns that any system is guided by the metrics it uses. Metrics do not merely serve as tools for measuring results. They actually act as a compass or dash-board, leading us on our way. Using inappropriate metrics leads us in the wrong direction. At present, we serve the economy, rather than having the economy serve our values. In recent years there have been many attempts to create an updated multi-dimensional dashboard. The OECD countries, for example, have developed what they call "Well-being Indicators." The Kingdom of Bhutan has created a "Gross National Happiness" index, and the UN the Millennium Sustainable Goals. In addition, many corporations around the world have helped developed and use the rules of the GRI (Global Reporting Initiative) for measuring their non-economic impacts, in addition to publishing regular financial statements based on traditional accounting metrics.

Kahane emphasizes that such a paradigm shift requires immense investment; trillions of dollars per annum in impact investment. The only potential source of long-term financing is retirement programs. These can be either public sector (governmental budgets, and especially social security programs), or the pension plans, retirement and saving programs, and long-term life insurance products of the private sector. The financial institutions in the private sector currently manage for their customers an immense portfolio of approximately \$80 trillion.

In their paper “Catholic Social Thought and the Economy of Communion as a Business Model,” *José Luis Fernández Fernández* and *Cristina Díaz de la Cruz* (Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Madrid, Spain) investigate how Catholic Social Teaching can contribute to the creation of fairer and more humane business models. To do this, they give an outline of the main historical moments in the development of Catholic Social Teaching with regard to the economy and business management. They then analyse the proposal of the *Economy of*

Communion as a potential framework for companies that wish to implement Catholic Social Teaching in their activities.

The Economy of Communion model suggests that company profits should be distributed in three parts. The first part should be dedicated to the company's growth, development and economic sustainability; the second towards the most needy people in the social environment of the organization (to helping them overcome their situation of poverty); and the third part invested in the education of young people that is premised on creating a new type of economic culture that is at the service of people and of the common good.

The companies that belong to the Economy of Communion movement are for-profit businesses which consider *reciprocity* and *gratuity* an integral part of their businesses. Both reciprocity and gratuity are guided by the logic of the gift which is innate to human relations and should be promoted so businesses become more authentically human and favor the development of people. Fernández Fernández and Díaz de la Cruz emphasize that although the business management methods of Economy of Communion companies can be carried out by anyone, regardless of their beliefs or personal motivation, it is difficult to imagine that they will be implemented by those that do not have a genuine spiritual motivation for doing so.

In his paper “Social Entrepreneurship, Conscience, and the Common Good,” *Pavel Chalupnicek* (Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium) observes that while the current body of research on social entrepreneurship contains many insights into the practical functioning of *social businesses* (setting-up, networking, financing, scaling, etc.), surprisingly little attention has been paid to exploring the “social” part of the concept. Questions such as “What is the most pressing social concern that should be addressed?,” “How may social business help prevent the undermining of important societal values?,” and “How can we handle conflicts of values resulting from the hybrid nature of social enterprises?” are rarely directly addressed.

Chalupnicek argues that a relational understanding of *conscience*, *discernment*, and *common good* can provide basic guidelines for ethical decision-making for social entrepreneurs. He challenges the widespread individualistic vision of an entrepreneur as a natural-born hero who has been called to transform society for others. On the contrary, an entrepreneur can support communication, understanding, and solidarity between social entrepreneurs and the communities they work in. It is these relationships that can make social entrepreneurship truly social and caring.

One important illustrative example of genuine social entrepreneurship is the *Mondragon Corporation*, founded as a co-operative in 1956 by José María Arizmendiarieta, a Catholic priest, in the Basque region in Spain. It is today a network of over 260 companies with more than eighty thousand employees in fields such as finance, industry, education, and retail. Despite its size, its values still retain its original co-operative spirit: it does not define itself simply as “a business,” but as a “business-based socio-economic initiative” which values – among other things – democratic organization, the subordination of capital to labor, participatory management, and wage solidarity. Mondragon challenges existing management theories by showing that cooperation and solidarity can be the basis of a successful enterprise.

In his paper, “Human Dignity, Love and Servant Leadership,” Tibor Héjj (Proactive Management Consulting, Budapest, Hungary) observes that CEOs and other top managers often think about their employees as “cost factors” to be minimized. This is not a genuinely human approach. Considering other human beings as “human resources” or “human capital” means that they are used only as a means of generating financial value. There is, however, an alternative approach emerging in management theory and practice, according to which all employees are considered and treated as persons and as ends in themselves; i.e. individuals with dignity.

Tibor Héjj shows that a personalistic approach might contradict the principles of short-horizon profit maximization, but still support the long-term economic sustainability of the company – but only in the case that the latter is not just considered another “managerial tool” aimed at maximising performance, but is rather deeply rooted in the company’s DNA as part of its ethos. The fundamental principle of such an organization is implemented mutual love. Ideally, all employees and even external stakeholders will share the same value-set. Key to sustaining such a culture is the leader. When top managers focus on establishing and maintaining this type of culture they should follow a “servant-leadership” model. In his paper Tibor Héjj proves the logic of the above-described approach and what it means in terms of day-to-day management, focusing on the leader-employee relationship.

In his paper, “The Caring Attitude of Christian and Buddhist Entrepreneurs,” Gabor Kovacs (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary) analyzes the way a spiritual value-orientation influences entrepreneurs to develop a caring attitude in business. Kovacs presents the results of his explorative study about Christian and Buddhist entrepreneurs working in Hungary. Christian and Buddhist entrepreneurs have different ontological beliefs. Christianity is an

anthropocentric tradition, while Buddhism emphasizes the intrinsic value of all sentient beings (human and non-human). Nevertheless, caring for others is of major relevance in both spiritual traditions. It is expressed as solidarity in the practice of Christian entrepreneurs, and as compassion in the practice of Buddhist ones.

Kovács finds that caring appears in different but intertwined fields of business, and is realized through the *similar business practices* of Christian and Buddhist entrepreneurs. The observable shared features are as follows: (i) Such entrepreneurs take into account the interests of their employees to a great extent; (ii) They treat their stakeholders equally, as they award the same importance to suppliers and all other partners in business as they do their customers; (iii) They pay attention to preserving culture and the natural environment; (iv) They have a long-term orientation, and aim to achieve a state of long-term sustainability; (v) They define the goals of business more broadly than profit-maximization.

Kovács concludes that the main goal of spiritual-based entrepreneurship is not the cultivation of material wealth, but rather the realization of *human development*, in which caring for others plays a major role.

In his paper, “Caring Entrepreneurship and Ecological Conscience – The Case of Patagonia Inc.,” *Knut Ims* (NHH Norwegian School of Economics, Bergen, Norway) argues that entrepreneurship is critical for increasing the capacity for innovation and responsiveness of business. However, not all entrepreneurial activities are geared to solving the real and most serious problems facing society. One of the biggest challenges today – Ims warns – is *climate change*, which is the major problem for Earth and, in particular, for future generations.

Ims asks what characterizes the development of the character of entrepreneurs who genuinely care about nature as a primordial stakeholder. He presents the case of *Yvon Chouinard*, founder of *Patagonia*, a clothing company which has succeeded in creating innovative solutions and has implemented a number of pro-social and pro-environmental activities that inspire other business leaders and organizations to create more sustainable practices.

Ims gives an account of the background of Chouinard’s ecological consciousness that makes him and his business a role model for other companies. The paper also reflects upon what would be a fitting education for business leaders at a time when management theories and the field of economics are dominated by abstract conceptions according to which narrow self-interests and a mechanical worldview reduce nature to sets of resources.

In her paper, "Spirituality and Caring in Organizations: The Covenant Metaphor," *Ora Setter* (Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel) underlines the fact that *metaphors* determine the way we perceive and understand our world. There are a wide variety of metaphors for organizations, many of which depict rationality, but only a few of which express their spiritual and human side.

Setter discusses three metaphors by which the mutual entitlements and obligations of employees and organizations can be understood. The first is the transactional, *market-based* "balance sheet" metaphor which is used in exchange and equity theories, where accountant-style "quid pro quo" exchanges are pertinent. The second is the *legal-like* "contract" metaphor where agreements, promises and tacit expectations about exchanges and the rules of exchange are prevalent. Finally, the spiritual metaphor of the "*covenant*" in the Jewish tradition is presented, by which obligations and entitlements are not dependent on other parties' fulfilling their role, and where "horizontal" relations between employees and management are complemented by "vertical" obligations to a higher cause.

Setter refers to empirical studies to show that the covenant elements are pertinent in the mutual obligations of members of business firms. Some new findings are presented in the paper that validate the idea that the employee-organization relation is partially covenantal. The paper concludes that the covenant metaphor can be fruitfully used to describe and explain care and spirituality in organizational settings.

In his paper, "Creative Spirit in Management Education: Insights from Rabindranath Tagore," *Sanjoy Mukherjee* (Indian Institute of Management, Shillong, India) argues that in the wake of pervasive globalization and the triumph of capitalism and consumerism, *mainstream management education* has responded by churning out "products" equipped to combat aggressive competition due to demand from market forces. Business schools have become like the assembly lines of a manufacturing behemoth, where an emphasis on quantity has overshadowed the quest for quality and human excellence.

Mukherjee believes that excessive predominance of analytical, logical and quantitatively oriented left-brain activity has led to the numbing of creative, intuitive and holistic right-brain development. *Creativity* and *joy* in the learning experience has been sacrificed on the altar of this fossilized system just to ensure the "rigor" of pedagogical methods and processes. The victims of this mechanized and often mindless acquisition of information and utilitarian

knowledge are not only students but also faculty, who are hard-pressed to manage the academic workload in the rush for promotion and tenure.

Mukherjee raises the voice of the "Other" to offer alternative sources and methods of learning in the light of valuable insights from the life and work of *Rabindranath Tagore*, the Nobel Laureate poet from India who was not only a literary genius but also a musician, philosopher, artist, and a pioneer in experimenting with alternative education. He outlines the salient learning points from Tagore to enrich the presently ossified education system and bring in fresh air and new light that promotes the all-round *humanistic development* of individuals and the creation of a joyful and creative learning environment. Learning from Nature, immersion in silence, and the integration of input from the Humanities into mainstream management education are of extreme importance.

In his paper, "Spirituality, Caring Organizations and Corporate Effectiveness – Are Business Schools Developing such a Path towards a Better Future?," *Henri-Claude de Bettignies* (INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France, China-Europe International Business School, Shanghai, China, and Stanford University, USA) states that if "spirituality" could induce entrepreneurs and leaders to build "caring organizations" that are also effective, then hope may be around the corner. But can spirituality – conspicuously absent from the core curricula of present-day management education – be taught and "developed"? If so, could business schools then begin to contribute to the building of spiritual capital and develop effective "caring" organizations? Challenging questions, but highly relevant now, particularly if business schools really desire to walk their talk: to be a "force for good."

Creating the path toward the future for the good of society – de Bettignies believes – will involve going through a tough process of *questioning current management fashions and practices*; it will require revisiting some of the "postulates" in which common management practices are rooted; it will demand intellectual curiosity that broadens the scope of our teaching in order to develop truly globally responsible leaders.

Learning from the benefits of the powerful medicine of spiritual practice – which has made clear the link between spiritual life and health – business schools and business leaders should together explore how to call on *spirituality* for the benefit of leaders, of entrepreneurs, of corporations and of society. As violence in the street becomes a common way of expressing dissent, we must hope that business schools will not become the scapegoats of a society that increasingly attributes the ever more dangerous situation of our planet to their teachings.

Hans Jonas (1984) has forcefully argued that responsibility-based caring does not presuppose any right or reciprocity. Human responsibility basically involves the non-reciprocal duty to guarding beings. Responsibility implies “that of an ought - first of an ought-to-be of something, then of an ought-to-do of someone in response to the first.” This is the most evident in the case of a new-born baby “whose mere breathing uncontradictably addresses an ought to the world around”, namely, the need to take care of him or her. Not only does the new-born call us in this way, but also does “the unconditional end-in-itself of everything alive and the still-have-to-come of the faculties for securing this end.”

We care for others not because they have rights that we should respect, or because we expect something in return from them. We care for others because of *our humanity*. However, this does not mean that care is always disinterested. Caring for others in many cases serves our best interest. But the primary motive for caring is not self-interest, but our responsibility for the existence and well-being of others.

The papers in our book represent the hope that true humanity and genuine care are possible, even in the hard world of business and entrepreneurship.

References

Ainsworth, M.D., Blehar M.D., Waters, E. and Wall, S.N. 2015: *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. New York, Psychology Press.

Bowlby J. 1982: *Attachment and Loss*. New York, Basic books.

Bufalari, I., Aprile, T., Avenati, A., Di Russo, F. and Aglioti, S.M. 2007: “Empathy for Pain and Touch in the Human Somatosensory Cortex” *Cerebral Cortex* 17:11, pp. 2553–2561

Darwin, C. 1871: *The Decent of Man and Selection in Relation of Sex*. 2nd Volume, London: John Murrey Press.

Freeman, E. et al. 2010: *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jonas, H. 1984: *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Kahneman, D. 2011: *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Loye, D. 2009: "The Ghost at the Birthday Party"
www.commondreams.org/view/2009/02/12-10

Mitroff, I. 1998: *Smart Thinking for Crazy Times: The Art of Solving the Right Problems*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Mitroff, I. and Silvers, A. 2009: *Dirty Rotten Strategies - How We Trick Ourselves and Others into Solving the Wrong Problems Precisely*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Orehek, E. and Inagati, T. 2017: "On the Benefits of Giving Social Support: When, Why, and How Support Providers Gain by Caring for Others" *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 26:2, pp. 109-113

Zsolnai, L. 2018: *Ethics, Meaning, and Market Society*. New York: Routledge.