University of Cumbria

Stanberry, Joanna ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1184-2874 (2025) I am, I can, I ought, I will: responsible leadership and the failures of ethics. International Journal of Ethics and Systems .

Downloaded from: http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/8668/

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available here) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
- a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found here.
Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

I am, I can, I ought, I will: Responsible Leadership and the Failures of Ethics

Author: Joanna Stanberry*

Author Affiliation: *Initiative for Leadership and Sustainability, University of Cumbria, Ambleside

Date article accepted for publication: 23 January 2025
Article publication date: 3 March 2025

Acknowledgements
The author expresses their gratitude to John K. Roth for their exchanxges regarding this paper. The author also extends thanks to Peter Case, Steve Kempster, Art Middlekauff, David F. Murphy, Jamie Mcphie, Janis Bragan Balda, participants in the 2023 International Studying Leadership Conference (ISLC) Paper Development Workshop, Special Issue editors and anonymous reviewers for detailed and thoughtful comments on previous versions of this manuscript. The author is grateful as well for the guidance offered by Harry J. Van Buren III and for proofreading assistance from Wesley D. Balda. Ethics Approval obtained from the University of Cumbria Ethics Committee.

Citation
Stanberry, J. (2025), "I am, I can, I ought, I will: responsible leadership and the failures of ethics", International Journal of Ethics and Systems, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-08-2024-0268

Deposit License
This Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) is deposited under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial International Licence 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) and any reuse is allowed in accordance with the terms outlined by the licence. To reuse the AAM for commercial purposes, permission should be sought by visiting https://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/publish-with-us/author-policies/author-rights#contact.

Abstract

Purpose

This paper develops a heuristic ethical stance as a provocation for responsible leadership scholarship and practice within entangled human-environment systems. Through consideration of the failures of ethics – in particular Uyghur mass atrocities and their residues in global supply chains – the stance offers a reflexive pathway between the inner value orientation of leaders and the scope of interconnected interests affected by leader action and inaction.

Design/methodology/approach

Through an autoethnographic narrative the applied ethic brings together work by the contemporary Holocaust philosopher John Roth with a motto spread by Anglican educational philosopher and social entrepreneur Charlotte Mason (1842-1923). The failures of ethics centre material, sensorial, religious, and relational tensions explored through three conversational vignettes relating to current mass atrocities of the Uyghur Turkic Muslims in the Xinjiang region of China.

Findings

The resulting ethical stance relates individual personhood to meso and macro levels through Mason's motto 'I am, I can, I ought, I will' and is developed to contain 1) self-reflexivity and identity, 2) conscience informed by testimony, 3) consciousness of the power to protest and resist, and 4) intention to pivot. The paper brings to responsible leadership novel philosophical perspectives to link reflexivity between individual and governance level responses and enliven the imagination of conscience through the ubiquity of complicity.

Originality

The lack of serious and sustained attention to the ethical in responsible leadership, in particular ethical failures and religious ethics, limits its relevance within entangled systems The paper brings to responsible leadership novel philosophical perspectives to link reflexivity between individual and governance level responses and enliven the imagination of conscience.

Keywords

Responsible leadership; Genocide; supply chain management; applied ethics; Sustainable Development Goals

I am, I can, I ought, I will: Responsible Leadership and the Failures of Ethics

Responsible leadership encompasses an orientation (and reorientation) for leadership practice and research that attends to the relationship between inner values and actors external to the organization (Jackson et al. 2023; Pless and Maak, 2022; Stahl, & Sully de Luque, 2014). It points leadership studies away from a leader-follower dynamic and towards a leader-stakeholder continuum (Jackson et al. 2023; Kempster & Jackson, 2021), itself a social movement and idealistic aim (Gosling, 2023).

Responsible leadership holds within it a commitment to ethical principles and their development within and between people. Various formulations of ethics to aid in this include utilitarian ethics (Jackson et al. 2023), moral capitalism (Kempster, 2021), an ethic of care related to servant leadership (Maak & Pless, 2005), an ecocentric ethic based on commoning (Curran, 2021), and reflexive ethics premised on the personalist Ricoeur (Schmiesing, 2000) to prompt an embedded ethical code (Cunliffe & Ivaldi, 2021) and an "echo of conscience" (Gosling, 2023). Research on responsible leadership has sought to develop the ethical relationship between inner values and these outer human-environment realities by arguing for studying decisions and outcomes (material spillovers of behaviours), and including notions connected to sustainability leadership such as longer time frames, place-centric inquiries, stewardship, and collaboration (Jackson et al., 2023). These reorientations speak to a greater degree of relationality broadly and towards defining responsibilities along relational lines (Curran, 2021; Miska & Mendenhall, 2018).

However, the aim of responsible leadership to relate inner worlds to external interests is rife with friction and ambiguities not adequately expressed in these ethical framings. The impossibilities of responsible leadership become visible through entangled human-environment systems (Stanberry et al., 2024), political polarisation (Brewer & Stonecash, 2015), and widening inequalities (Fujimoto & Uddin, 2022). Examples of these eco-social challenges include business concerns in negotiating responsibilities for the production and disposal of plastics (Walker, 2024), conserving biodiversity (Milner, 2022), as well as loss and damage due to climate change (Mackie, 2023; Sharma et al., 2022). These ensuing polycrises fall like a

shadow on the social landscapes where leadership is co-constructed in communities and organizations.

Embedding notions of human rights in business practices bridges material, economic, cultural, social, political, and environmental contingencies (Schrempf-Stirling & Van Buren, 2024; Saks, 2022; Bolden et al., 2023; Redekop et al., 2018; Pless and Maak, 2022; Iszatt-White, 2024), and ethics is the often unseen thread that joins up these processes as ethics is at the heart of all leadership questions. As Ciulla (2021, p. 35) observes: “leadership is a human relationship and ethics is embedded above and below the surface of all human relationships”. Leadership scholars often mention ethics, as they “genuflect at the altar of ethics and speak with hushed reverence about its importance to leadership…[Yet] it is remarkable that there is still relatively little sustained and systematic treatment of the ethical challenges that are distinctive to leadership” (p. 21). Not just developing, but *habituating* character and competence in leaders requires broad interdisciplinary knowledge and perseverance of the will (Crossan et al., 2024). This noticing, nurturing, and cultivating of ethical considerations is perhaps not greater than within the personal and social spaces in which business practices transgress or transform the situation of human rights. Following the thread of ethics is to encounter, over and over again, its failures (Roth, 2015). Even for individuals oriented from a position of religious ethics, ethics is multifaceted and itself a possible object of critical reflexivity.

Wicked problems and grand challenges are euphemisms and easy abstractions for the more specific issues and frameworks of sustainable development that contain human rights. Ethical failures create seismic quakes that reverberate and cause aftershocks for victims, making good work difficult and opening opportunistic spaces for bad actors (Balda & Stanberry, 2022; Durant, 2022). In this regard, ideas come to life in those stories that awaken awareness of the broader system and the material and sensorial relationships illuminated in particulars (Cunliffe, 2018; 2022). The autoethnographic narrative in this article develops such a story as a way into situating ethics in responsible leadership as a matter of knowable material failures and illuminating the imagination of conscience.

These tensions between inner and outer worlds signal how the treatment of ethics in studies of responsible leadership must not only be strengthened and made cohesive (Ciulla, 2023), but also *activated*. As Roth (2015) would argue, “if ethics is to be a safeguard against its own failures, then people who try to be ethical have to acknowledge the failures, own them when

they should, and protest against them" (p. 7). The actors who perpetrate and knowingly do harm can also be held responsible. Leadership scholars Reicher and Haslam (2006) have begun shifting public opinion through the BBC Prison Study and their work delegitimizing Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (2006 [1963]), and the experiments of Stanley Milgram, and Philip Zimbardo (Haslam *et al.*, 2020). Responsible leadership must account for the fact that evil is often banal, the casual dismissal of essentially inhumane acts. However, wicked acts are also the result of conscious and even ingenious individuals capable of making moral judgements and engaged in subjectively 'meaningful', yet patently evil, work. The ethical stance developed here is a reflexive pathway to explore activating ethics for responsible leadership and requires conscious reflection, while acknowledging that applying reflection to cultivate intentionality is clearly insufficient protection from these failures.

The article is structured as follows. First, this autoethnographic inquiry is described in the methodology section, and brings to responsible leadership an investigation of the relationship between inner and relational considerations of responsibility. Second, to develop the ethical stance two philosophical approaches to ethics are introduced that until now have been absent from the management and organisation literature. These include John Roth, a contemporary Holocaust philosopher, especially his work in *The Failures of Ethics*, and the Anglican educational philosopher Charlotte Mason (1842-1923) through a motto. Finally, a heuristic ethical stance is developed through a case study of mass atrocities against Uyghur Turkic Muslims in China and discussed in three vignettes. This is captured as 'I am, I can, I ought, I will' and encompasses 1) self-reflexivity and identity, 2) consciousness of the power to protest and resist, 3) conscience informed by testimony, and 4) intention to pivot. This discussion works to develop ways for this ethical stance to uncover the material, sensorial, and relational elements of the ethical in responsible leadership, and to offer a sensitising resource for enlivening and deepening these inquiries to include the failures of ethics.

Methodology

This study develops an autoethnographic narrative to explore Charlotte Mason's educational motto—I am, I can, I ought, I will—within the context of ethical failures. Autoethnography allows the researcher to draw upon personal experiences to interrogate broader cultural, social, and ethical phenomena (Haynes, 2018). By bringing together reflective

narratives with critical analysis, this methodology seeks to bridge the subjective and the systemic, offering deeper insights into the intersection of inner worlds and wider responsibilities.

Mason's motto, foundational to her educational philosophy, provides the central lens through which this study examines the ethical, particularly ethical failures. Each element of the motto—"I am," "I can," "I ought," and "I will"—serves as a conceptual scaffold for exploring how identity, capability, responsibility, and volition intersect. The process for developing the reflections included various relational, aesthetic, and conceptual strategies to bring together the trifecta of Roth's work, Mason's motto, and responsible leadership. I corresponded with various colleagues in the three areas, including phone conversations with John Roth and Art Middlekauff, and developed notes from exchanges with responsible leadership colleagues including a paper development workshop. I familiarised myself with the 80 or so substantive Facebook posts I previously created in a Charlotte Mason group from 2015-2019, with the books on my shelf assigned by John Roth in his classes and photos from our research trip to Poland and the Czech Republic, and visited the Charlotte Mason archives at the Armitt Library & Museum in Ambleside, UK to read additional sources.

This autoethnography is composed of an interweaving of my experiences with Roth and Mason's ideas, as well as a series of short, illustrative vignettes, followed by my reflections on how these vignettes inform and support the relating of Mason's motto to Roth's philosophy. I draw out various questions for deepening the study of ethics in responsible leadership. The auto (or self) in the autoethnography is further explored below in the positionality section. Self, in this sense, is not something static and has more to do with identit*ies* than a singular identity and with cultivating a critical reflexivity that unpacks and even re-forms those identities. Leadership scholars applying autoethnography have demonstrated the ways intersectionality and social identity theory construct multiple selves that emerge in different relationships and contexts (Jones et al., 2012; Ladkin, 2021). In this sense, "Autoethnography does not merely require us to explore the interface between culture and self, it requires us to write about ourselves" (Kempster & Stewart, 2010) and so is both "a method and a text" (Reed-Danahay, 1997, p. 9).

The ethics of autoethnography are problematic, and the researcher is responsible "to communities, of practice, culture and influence, in which our self-experience is lived and richly recounted" (Edwards, 2021, p. 5). In the personal vignettes that follow I negotiate these responsibilities by obtaining written informed consent from the two people I chanced upon, itself

a relational process, and also by focusing the analysis on how these encounters shaped *my* development of the ethical stance. I intentionally left out any conclusive outcomes regarding my conversation partners. In developing the discussion I aim for what organisational wisdom methodologies suggest as “a tolerance of ambiguity, flexibility, independence and open-mindedness” through remote associations and unexpected links (Rooney, 2013, p. 94).

Positionality

In regards to my positionality, I hold the privileged positions of being white, cisgender, North American, and highly educated, at the same time that I occupy the less privileged identities of being a neurodiverse woman, and a foreigner living in Europe. My identity informs the the loyalties I hold to: 1) emancipatory means and ends evidenced through my Christian religion within the social action tradition; and, 2) for critical leadership studies oriented to the Global South (Bendell et al., 2016, p. 7; Stanberry & Balda, 2024). The axiology that informs my epistemology is based on personalism, i.e., the value of persons as unique and of infinite value.

From this, I concur with Amartya Sen that the ends and means of sustainability require that we treat people as agents who can think, act, agitate, and “reshape the world” (Sen, 2013, p. 7) and in Mason’s personalist philosophy I see the potential for new ways to perceive inner and intersubjective reflexivity towards this. She defined ‘living ideas’ as living mind meeting living mind – when we receive knowledge clothed in emotion and informing ideas and so it is palatable to us as embodied persons *owed* knowledge. The ‘auto’ in this autoethnography locates my interrogation of Mason’s motto in the shadows of mass atrocities through living ideas, and the ‘ethnography’ covers the social interactions where this stance acted to convey living ideas.

The French philosopher and sociologist Jacque Ellul, a key figure of the 1930s Bordeaux School of personalism (Roy, 1999), charged that the Christian intellectual must create a new language to perceive how the modern world has instrumentalised individuals through technique.

> We can no longer communicate with one another because our neighbors have ceased to be real to us. Intellectuals today no longer believe in the possibility of joining with others. They speak into the void and for the wasteland, or else they speak for the proletariat, the nazi, the intellectual, and so on. People have never spoken so much about human beings while at the same time giving up speaking to them. (Ellul, 2016, p. 75).

The vignettes developed in the discussion section are meant to respond to Ellul’s warnings to avoid flight into the abstract or ideal, “We must not think about ‘human beings’ but about my

neighbor Mario. It is in the real life, which I can easily come to know about this particular person, that I see the true repercussions of the machine, the press, political speeches, and government" (Ellul, 2016, p. 79). Cunliffe (2018) would be sympathetic with Ellul's methods. She proposes a way to resist 'normalised' scholarship that dehumanises research and leans on abstractions. She proposes commensurate ways of theorising such as developing sensitising resources as ways to mediate the dominant masculine narratives for what counts as research and as theory (Cunliffe, 2022).

Literature Review

A philosophy of mass atrocities and the failures of ethics

As an undergraduate student twenty years ago, I was deeply impacted by the teaching of the Holocaust philosopher John K. Roth. Roth was named the US National Professor of the Year in 1988. In his twilight professorial years, I was a student in several of his courses at Claremont McKenna College, joining a trip to Eastern Europe to study Holocaust memory post-communism, and participating in forming what is now the Mgrublian Center for Human Rights. Roth's deep insights and the humanity he exhibits in such work carries forward the notion of fidelity to people and place. He was singular among my professors in the way he would speak to our multiple prospective identities not only as future professionals, but also as parents, neighbors, and community members.

My own scholarly research on leadership and sustainability proceeds with these transformative experiences and learnings always in mind, recognising that projects conducted in the name of ethics must account for the failures of ethics made evident in repeated genocides and other mass atrocities. *The Failures of Ethics: Confronting the Holocaust, Genocide, and Other Mass Atrocities* (Roth, 2015), captures the influences on his thought, and provides a tour of the ideas threaded through his courses. In it Roth explains how human choices and decisions, including the choice to stand by and not act, results in violent acts.

> 'Nothing human, natural, or divine guarantees respect for the ethical values and commitments that are most needed in contemporary human existence, but nothing is more important than our commitment to defend them, for they remain as fundamental as they are fragile, as precious as they are endangered. While existence is shot through with

> failure, ethics remains and persists. An irreplaceable safeguard, it still possesses the indispensable corrective for its own failures (Roth, 2015, p. 25).

The fundamental truth is that ethical behaviour is hard and requires volition. The utilitarian ethic for responsible leadership developed by Jackson et al. (2023) suggests that human rights is a question that needs to be 'balanced' and 'properly weighed' (p. 218), but that, ultimately, through levels of transcendent consciousness that consider future generations and the community-planet, more regenerative mindsets can pervade business practices. However, the weighing and balancing of human rights is not easily resolved by legal, compliance, or stakeholder engagement processes, nor leadership models that map them.

Religious Ethics

The ability of ethics to supply meaning and therefore power becomes activated when we, and ethics itself, "confront mass atrocities, inspire protest and resistance against them, support humanitarian responses to the suffering inflicted by those crimes, and strengthen efforts to prevent their recurrence" (Roth, 2015, p. 25). In this regard mass atrocities are not one CSR concern equal among others. Roth draws out themes that weave through the philosophy of history and the facts of mass atrocities, especially the Holocaust, using poetry, testimony, integral figures, and the arts to do so. In particular, he highlights possibilities and limits — of trialogue between the Abrahamic faiths, of confronting God, of research and knowing, of relationships to each other and to the natural world — towards equipping a resilient, lucid, and wise work of restoring ethics.

Integral to Roth's influence as a scholar and teacher is his position as a philosopher who speaks from and to the Christian tradition. Roth's long career as a Christian engaged in interreligious dialogue began as the son of a Presbyterian minister and evokes a grappling with the underside of Christianity, evolving as part of his response to Jewish traditions of 'protest'. For him, these traditions provide a 'quarrelsome interrogation of texts and God alike' (Roth, 2015, p. 112) that asks if God's relationship to history is beyond redemption and wonders if suffering will have the last word. This relates to questions calls from religious ethicists to focus inquiry beyond exclusion and domination, on "the negotiation of a commons, seeking possibilities for nourishing ways of inhabiting shared space and time that are more hospitable, less unjust, more supportive of flourishing life" (Herdt, 2023, p. 6).

In this view, humans–their individual acts, their organisations, institutions, governments–and God, are all held to account. Roth argues that religion was a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the Holocaust. In this regard, ethical traditions, including ethical *religious* traditions, surrendered their essential moral sensibilities, signalling "the collapse or collaboration of ethical traditions" (Roth, 2015, p. 3). Through the near extermination of European Jewry, God is implicated and the Holocaust "resonates and collides with the theological and ethical traditions of biblical religion" (ibid, p. 87). Nothing is the same. It is not that these failures continue to the point that ethics is dead, however; "they show that ethics is vulnerable, subject to misuse and perversion, and that no simple reaffirmation of ethics, as if nothing disastrous had happened, will do" (ibid, p. 3). On our research trip together, I studied church iconography and architecture after the Holocaust, experiencing in the cold red tiles underfoot and the carvings of SS officers removing Jesus from the Garden of Gethsemane a sensorial and aesthetic encounter with God's interrogation.

For some organisations – for example, family owned businesses, religious organisations, or corporations in theocracies such as Islamic countries – religious ethics are clearly visible. In many cases, however, the working out of religious ethics occurs in confessional booths and Bible studies, a leader's private thoughts at synagogue, or listening attentively to the Khutbah during Friday prayers. The vulnerabilities and possibilities of ethics also reveal themselves through sacramental and mystical possibilities for activating ethics and the imagination. In a phenomenological study of Spirit-led decision-making among Christian leaders in organisations, one manager described this influence as "feathers falling on the mind" (Balda, 2005).

While this article centres religious ethics, particularly for Abrahamic faiths (Jewish, Christian, and Muslim), I am not an ethicist. Both Ellul (2016) and Rooney (2013) describe a role for the scholar who is neither theologian nor philosopher to develop practical theology and practical ethics - "our task in fact is to consider presence in the world" (Ellul, 2016, p. 64). I see the religious human person then as distinct in this regard from the institutions of religion. Mentioned previously, Ladkin (2021) raises the impossibilities of an 'authentic' self in light of intersectionality expressed in context, and in the same way religious ethics and religious identit*ies* are constantly negotiated and expressed in relationships and so are locations for critical reflexivity. This becomes evident in Roth's journey as described in *The failures of ethics* (2015) and in my own development of the narrative. Religious identities are animated, living, and

multifaceted companions and their construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction is always possible.

Additionally, greater understanding and research on religious ethics and responsible leadership may be vital for studying and developing leadership. More than half of the world's population follows an Abrahamic faith, only sixteen percent of people around the world have no religious affiliation, and as a share of the total population that number is decreasing because population growth is focused in the most religious countries (Wormald, 2015). Interpreting these and other trends, a *Financial Times* Op-Ed suggests, "you don't have to 'do God' to worry that the secular standpoint may therefore lack something when it comes to understanding global currents" (Cavendish, para. 2, 2025). The fraught relationship between the failures of ethics and religious ethics is not peripheral but embedded, central, and evident in the questions raised by responsible leadership.

Historical approach of Charlotte Mason

Leadership development scholars propose that meeting the governance challenge of wicked problems such as those captured in the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) could flow from corporate programmes out into communities and families (Vogel et al., 2020, p. 16). This autoethnography relates a counter-example from the marginalised histories of home education through the theory and practises of Charlotte Mason. Mason was a British educational philosopher and social entrepreneur whose influence transformed educational systems as well as the broader cultural landscape. Despite being orphaned as a child, she grew a movement on the basis of her ideas and was considered the foremost educationalist of her day, a pioneer in sane education, and her pedagogy 'revolutionary' (Middlekauff, 2016). Mason argued that she had discovered an Aladdin's cave of treasures unlocked by her philosophy and methods (Mason, 1923, p. 27), and once wrote that after her lifetime her work would "be seen to be one of the greatest things that has happened in the world" (Bernier-Rodriguez, 2009, p. 44). Her ideas are considered the pivotal spark that Robert-Baden Powell needed to launch the Scout Movement (Mason, 1923) and Rudyard Kipling visited her to learn about her methods. Key to framing her ethical stance is first understanding how these innovations were deployed through the Parent's Union School (PUS) school motto as a revered and powerful tool in the diffusion of Mason's principles that unified the organisations she created.

Mason's first principle, that "children are born persons" (Mason, 1905a, p. 5), "with all the possibilities and powers included in personality" (Mason, 1886, p. 4), continued throughout her work as primary, revolutionary in its own right, and central to the interpretation of her other ideas: the "crux of her crusade" (Cholmondeley, 1960, p. 109). By this she meant that all people have dignity and individuality, capacities for self-knowledge and for owning their development as people. Van Pelt and Spencer (2023) summarise, "The point is not to clip children like bonsai trees to reflect the shape of virtues that we value; rather, it is to instruct the child's conscience and help him to train his will and consider ideas carefully, so that he may grow to live with intention and continually work towards becoming the best version of himself as *he* conceives it" (p. 20). Yet her works, including *Ourselves* (1905a), titled from the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer* "Ourselves, our Souls and Bodies", shows how this was still a normative aim based on her religious beliefs (ibid., frontispiece). Writing for older children, Mason explores their personhood and situates human identity as children of God and made in his image.

As a result of Mason's first principle that children are born persons, the only instruments left to the educator (or I would interject, the leadership development consultant), are the atmosphere of environment (organisational culture), cultivation of habits (habituating acts of the will), and the presentation of living ideas (narrative and lively forms of knowledge inclusive of the natural world). Mason's philosophy of education was more akin to lifelong formation, describing education as the science of relations. She believed that human beings need to be fed knowledge, and that in the forms which are assimilable, are *living* ideas. The acceptance or rejection of these ideas are the basis for behaviour and for character. In her critical approach to the most current science and the nascent psychology literature, including William James, she resisted dualistic 'faculties' and concluded that the reason could reason itself into any course of action.

Mason regarded her philosophy as one "aimed at the public good", including adults as well towards lifelong learning, to develop socially responsible and ethical people who care about their community and the wider world, regardless of social class. She saw the village hall as the epicentre of cultural and economic transformation in its ability to be the conduit and forum for transforming inner and outer selves. Thus Mason advocated for the autonomy of communities to improve their situation through cultivating wide interests together, and learning foreign

languages so as to become hospitable and neighbourly. She did not isolate children as separate from this context, and applied her theory broadly across the lifespan.

Charlotte Mason's motto: 'I am, I can, I ought, I will'

Mason describes the instructed conscience as 'judge and lawgiver' giving her the impetus for the PUS motto, ''I am, I ought, I can, I will' (1886).

> 'I am'—we have the power of knowing ourselves. 'I ought'—we have within us a moral judge, to whom we feel ourselves subject, and who points out and requires of us our duty. 'I can'—we are conscious of power to do that which we perceive we ought to do. 'I will'—we determine to exercise that power with a volition which is in itself a step in the execution of that which we will (Mason, 1886, p. 330).

In the first 'I am', she draws together the sense of self-knowledge and reflexivity and brings to it the added dimensions of identity and personal latent capacities. In the second, "I can" she brings in self-efficacy and resilience, a sense of 'I can do hard things'. In the third, "I ought", Mason calls forth conscience and the responsibilities that relationships between self and others prescribe. In the fourth, "I will", she offers the power of the will to override the lower elements of human nature and to redirect people back to what they know to be right.

As a motto shared in the PUS and therefore also amongst the PNEU branches globally it activated ethics beyond formal learning spaces. Mason wrote that the PNEU movement contains the 'ardour' and 'force' of "people working out inspiring ideas", and writes, "Expectation strikes another chord, the chord of 'I am, I can, I ought' which must vibrate in every human breast, for 'tis our nature to.' The capable, dependable men and women whom we all know were reared upon this principle" (Mason, 1897, p. 251). Here and elsewhere, Mason applies the motto to adults as well as to children, and did not view its power as only meant for formal schooling but as an animating and vital energy in the movement itself.

The Motto as an applied ethic of responsibility

Living through the Great War in her seventies, Mason responded to the horrors of trench warfare in part by demonstrating the need for a kind of broad and responsible citizenship in Great Britain. Mason writes in *A Philosophy of Education,*

> There are good and evil tendencies in body and mind, heart and soul; and the hope set before us is that we can foster the good so as to attenuate the evil… The community, the nation, the [human] race, are now taking their due place in our religious thought. We are

> no longer solely occupied in what an Irish woman called 'saving yer dirty sowl.' Our religion is becoming more magnanimous and more responsible and it is time that a like change should take place in our educational thought (Mason, 1923, p 46).

Mason developed a close friendship with Henrietta Franklin, a liberal Anglo-Jew who became a close confidant and advocate for Mason's methods (Buckingham, 2017). This relationship offered a challenge to broaden the intent of the motto beyond Anglicanism towards shared interreligious meaning (Gibbons, 1960, p. 43). Franklin developed an understanding of *I can* to profess "I can think kindly thoughts of God's creatures in the past and in the present, in this and other countries, of people who do not think as I do in religion and politics." (Mason, 1923, p. 114). These developments illustrate how Mason herself worked to make religion more magnanimous and more responsible through the inclusive motto and the contemporary movement of Mason practitioners includes a vibrant kaleidoscope of secular, Jewish, Muslim, as well as Christian interpretations, among others.

Mason and the failures of ethics: 'Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled'.

For more than a generation the words of the motto inspired thousands of students, and formed leadership based on vibrant citizenship, understanding of the natural world, and responsible action in the face of 'hard times'. Mason deeply considered the imperatives of responsible leadership. For example, arguing that the work of the Salvation Army by William Booth (1890) demonstrated that people were capable of change, and were not fixed into morally degenerate identities (e.g., alcoholism). She contended that anyone in contact with children must face these controversies as a "moral crisis" and make up their minds on such matters as they influenced the lifelong inclinations of children (1897, p. 150). She urged young people to consider it unethical to purchase items made inexpensive due to sweatshop labour. Mason also reflected on mass atrocities in respect to the motto. Referring to them as 'outrages' Mason argued that they demonstrate that there is no infallible sense of 'ought'.

> That there is in the human breast an infallible sense of 'ought' is an error prolific of much evil … a very slight acquaintance with history demonstrates that every persecution and most outrages…are the outcome of that same majesty of 'ought' as it makes its voice heard in the breast of an individual or of a community. (Mason, 1897, p. 103).

Mason responded with force to the 'period of national crisis' during the Hamidian massacres of Armenians in the Ottoman interior which reached their height between 1894 and 1896. She urged

attention '*Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled',* commissioning a prayer for *The Parent's Review*, and posting practical ways to aid refugees. Mason determined that responses to the massacres were a "moral question of duty to our neighbour in distress" and that "what is distressful to the national conscience is no less intolerable to the individual conscience: (Rawnsley, 1897, p. 684). She observed in England a heightened sense of responsibility for others, suggesting that tracing the stages of ethical thought marked by the uses of 'responsibility' would further demonstrate that "this sharpened sense is not a malady of the age, but a sign of the times" (p. 25) and "is an encouraging sign that we are being taught from above, and are, on the whole, getting on" (p. 26). In this way, her motto was pointedly directed towards responsibility for mass atrocities and towards considering this to be a measure of progress.

Locating living ideas in materialities: The case of Uyghur mass atrocities

Important to any application of *I am, I can, I ought, I will* as an ethical stance to evoke responsible leadership in situations of business and human rights is knowledge of the concrete realities of people and places residing within the failures of ethics. It is frequently in the abstractions that rationalising relocates and absolves ethics. As Mason understood, our learning must come in the form of concrete facts, tied to their broader meanings and embedded in their context, in order to become meaningful and comprehensible. Similarly, Roth notes,

> Honest ethical efforts to protest and resist those conditions take place on the scarred planks of life's workbenches, and a premium belongs on candid appraisal of the human predicament. That appraisal, which cannot be sound unless it tackles the failures of ethics, must not be general or abstract but needs to bear down with lucidity on historical particularities" (Roth, 2015, p. 2).

Living ideas conveyed in recent history, news reports and updates on human rights violations are similarly a premise for practices of responsible leadership. Knowledge of these facts reveals a myriad of connections between what is visible and what is invisible. As Roth writes, the failures of ethics expose "fault lines in nature and flaws in reality itself, those failures abound in the multiple shortfalls and shortcomings of *thought*, *character*, *decision*, and *action* that tempt us human beings to betray what is good, right, virtuous, and just, and incite us to inflict incalculable harm" (Roth, 2015, p. 1, emphasis mine). Mason's motto reveals the same intervention points of thought (*I am*), character (*I ought*), decision (*I can*), and action (*I will*).

Some of these are visible, seen through photographs, testimonies, bystanding, and statistics. Others become visible when we consider reverberations from these facts, even encountering sensorial artefacts. What matters when following the thread of the failures of ethics is locating all the unseen bits as well, following to its ends and grounding the process in "questions raised to keep us awake, tempered by spirits of resistance against despair, and steeped in commitments to mend and repair so that what is broken can yet be of good use" (Roth, 2015, p. 4). Mason called knowledge information touched with emotion – not a store upon which we draw but a state in which we move in and out. Ethics is temporal and requires activating sensorial capabilities about the material situation of human beings.

At the same time Ladkin (2018) challenges that emotional and aesthetic accounts of business ethics can be too narrowly applied: "Without recognizing the lure of aesthetic craving or the potential seduction of ideological framings, 'the beautiful' itself is not sufficient to provide guidance as to what might be ethical in a given situation." (Ladkin, 2018, p. 43). The following case does not equate 'the good' with awareness only, but aims for critical reflexivity that goes beyond the self and its biases to "be open to something apart from it" (Ladkin, 2018, p. 44). It is an effort responding to Roth's call to expose particularities of the failures of ethics, and to show how individual leaders can and do consider what might be done.

The case of Uyghur mass atrocities and three vignettes

In revisiting the case of the Uyghur people in China, living ideas emerged from scholarly research in business and human rights (Schrempf-Stirling & Van Buren, 2024; Wettstein, 2010; Polaschek, 2021; Kriebitz and Max, 2020; Salcito, 2023; Letnar Černič, 2021) and other fields (Turdush and Fiskesjö , 2021; Zenz, 2023; Finnegan; 2020); grey literature (Human Rights Watch, 2021; Lesegretain, 2022); and reports (Lehr, 2022; Murphy et al., 2022); as well as accounts such as the VICE news (2019) documentary available on YouTube, viewed over 11 million times. Over 386 Uyghur intellectuals are known to have been interned in camps, died in Chinese custody, or disappeared between April 2017 and September 2018 (Finnegan, 2020). Through this research I developed an understanding that the forced internment, imprisonment, and forced labour of Uyghur and Turkic Muslims is widely agreed to be systematic genocidal acts, especially in cultural terms.

In a rare legislative consensus, the US passed the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (UFLPA) in 2021 to ensure that American entities are not funding forced labour among ethnic

minorities in the Xinjiang region of China. In many ways the UFLPA demonstrates early signs of success, revealing the breadth of industries impacted and the rerouting of supply chains. In 2022 Bloomberg Law reported a 124% increase in import detentions traced to the XUAR postal code, from a growing number of countries and a “shifting yet comprehensive set of industries” including those originally targeted through the UFLPA such as cotton and apparel, tomatoes, and polysilicon, and new foci such as PVC, aluminium, vinyl flooring, chemicals, auto parts, and electronics (Kossick and Sliwoski, 2023, para. 24). This data collection continues through a CBP data dashboard available online [I]. Despite these inroads, much remains to be done to advance the cause of the Ughyurs and for public involvement in “informed agitations” (Sen, 2013, p. 7) beyond business compliance and risk assessments.

In developing this case study for a guest lecture to international MBA students, I encountered several ‘overflow’ spaces where the living ideas embedded in the stories of the Uyghurs became relationally meaningful. The possibilities for this ethical stance became more clear to me through these everyday interactions which colour and relate how Mason’s motto, reframed, became part of the flow of life and not an abstract dictum.

Vignette 1: *I ought* and the critical conscience. While self-renovating our Florida home we chose what the market terms luxury vinyl tile (LVT) because of its easy install and because it was deemed sturdy enough to withstand our three children often returning from the beach. Two years later while assisting a local charity in the UK I participated in meetings with architects to plan a new building for the organisation. I learned about the importance of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification and its reputation for signifying a quality building. When the Uyghur case was introduced to me a few months later, these two experiences collided as I linked PVC flooring to LEED certification. This provided a way to teach the global challenges of the holistic sustainability agenda for businesses. I also sensed my own complicity. I made the case the focus of my lecture and engaged the students, some who were Chinese, in discussion about what it would mean to ‘disrupt business as usual’.

Vignette 2: *I will* and the intention to pivot. While having coffee with participants at a conference I was discussing my research and someone asked about how I was applying Mason’s pedagogy to sustainable business. In sharing the particulars about plastics supply chains, the partner of a conference participant sitting across from me visibly lit up and he urgently wanted to share his response. He was the owner of a family-owned plastics company, and he discovered in

the facts I had shared a revelation for his business practices. He immediately explained how this knowledge had activated his personal Christian religious ethics, and that he would go home and work to see if he could source raw materials with clear links to more ethical origins.

Vignette 3: *I can* and activating identities and power. A recent acquaintance shared that she had an upcoming job interview for her first managerial role. Working as an individual contributor on the innovation team for a large manufacturing company she had advanced several new ideas about sustainability that had been included in company-wide communications. She was aware of the Uyghur situation and wanted to bring it into the job interview context but was unsure how. I suggested that her knowledge of the systems-thinking framework of the UN SDGs, especially in light of the European Union's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) coming into force, could provide a way of imagining innovative products that created whole-system thriving across the value chain as a way to position the company for the future.

These encounters brought to the fore three key overlapping areas including: 1) a critical approach to certification schemes through a broader systems lens; 2) interweaving the overarching framework of the UN SDGs to propose innovative framings of the ethics of value chains to transform business practices; and, 3) creating space for religious and personal ethics for leaders. By exploring the plight of the Uyghurs in these interactions, I perceived how the ethical stance uncovers and integrates the material, sensorial, and relational elements of responsibility.

Discussion: Re-Forming an Ethical Stance for Responsible Leadership

These vignettes provide openings for relating inner reflexivity to wider governance concerns, raising many questions. These might include: What stories are likely to activate the individual conscience? How can the possibilities of complicity become relevant for certifications like LEED? In what ways could living ideas communicated through internal corporate communications become conduits for informed agitations? What role do momentary encounters with ethical failures play in leadership decision-making? How can the failures of ethics be more meaningfully perceived in business ecosystems?

These impromptu moments created openings for me to explore how Mason's motto, in connection with the failures of ethics, emerged through the materialities of knowledge – living ideas – entering into inner values and new insights regarding the relevant scope of interests. I identify three aspects of these interactions as pivotal for capturing the ethical stance as a material and sensorial process. First, the knowledge I had pieced together regarding the Uyghur situation

found relationships with other key ideas, my background in Holocaust studies but also the challenges of human-environment sustainability made real through countless conversations, observations, readings, and pauses.

Thus my knowledge of even the linked ideas were similarly embedded in relational moments. Second, my memory in recollecting these encounters (however 'true' it may be) was linked with the feeling of sandy floors underfoot, the clink of a coffee cup, the cadence of the other speaking. These are as easily recalled as the conversation itself. Finally, my personalist values – for my neighbor Mario – cued my attention to be fully present in those moments of conversation. I regarded the 'other' as someone capable of dealing with all kinds of knowledge, and thus I spoke for myself and my own learnings and consciously worked to allow their own personhood to make sense of the ideas in a way that was meaningful to them.

The reframed motto is an ethical orientation for, and a resonant narrative about, responsible leadership. The vignettes are not meant to resolve these failures nor give progressive platitudes towards inculcating just responses. They offer living ideas as embedded in location, relationship, and engagement, noting access points for responsible leadership. The following formation of the ethical stance opens new questions regarding "leadership for what, why and for whom?" (Kempster & Jackson, 2021).

The vitality within these interactions expands the Uyghur case at specific places and times. They enriched Mason's motto in conversation with *The Failures of Ethic*s. The resulting ethical stance is embodied, sensorial, located in relationships, and regards knowledge not as dry facts but as living ideas taking on meanings as each person interprets and allows. The following section takes each piece in turn, describing possibilities for how *I am, I can, I ought, I will* could position the failures of ethics to bridge inner reflexivity towards wider scopes of interests in responsible leadership.

I am: Religious and personal, embodied self-reflexivity

The first part of the motto calls out latent capacities for reflexivity and brings to mind various identities. *I am* helps us explore what demands various identities make on us, where they align, and where they are at odds. As self- (or selves-) knowledge, these harmonies and dissonances are themselves sources of power. *I am* means that there lies within human beings the capacity, whether activated or not, to uncover our core commitments and values, as well as to question them.

This is not just a conceptual or cerebral knowing, but a knowing that comes through our embodied and sensorial experience in the world. It encompasses all of the relational ways in which we learn and become who we are, and therefore are additional resources we can draw from to ask if the *I am* that we are is the *I am* that we want to be – the prompt offered by the idea of integrity – that our insides match our outsides.

This embodied reflexivity enables the failures of ethics to intrude into our self-knowing. The vignettes capture how momentary this incursion can be. In Roth's discussion of rape and torture-as-policy he reminds us that the acts of mass atrocities accost the self, and recalls Holocaust survivor and essayist Jean Améry's statement, "'a part of our life ends and can never be revived" (in Roth, 2015, p. 31). The reality that ethical failures limit and end human life is a part of the reflexive imposition available through *I am* regardless of religious affiliation. For the Abrahamic religions, *I am* represents identities within God's created order and embodied participation in rites, festivals, and relationships in community. It commends privileges of access through prayer, as well as responsibilities for charity and for representing the interests of God.

However, the failures of ethics can also startle identities. For the religious person, towards a reckoning with God — a pondering, a quarrel, maybe an impasse — especially in regards to the sixth commandment 'thou shalt not kill' which unifies Abrahamic traditions. Roth notes a personal observation of how many theologians are changed forever by their encounter with the Holocaust. Self-study and self-criticism must also wrestle as interfaith dialogue, 'within and among the Abrahamic traditions' as a 'multifaceted soul-searching' (Roth, 2015, p. 79). The complicity of religion in the failures of ethics commands attention to various identities and capacities activated through *I am*. As is seen in the second vignette, it was the particular religious sense of the Uyghur as neighbor – *we are* – that activated the intended action.

I can: Consciousness of the power to protest and resist

The second part of the motto activated consciousness of power to do that which we perceive we ought to do. *I can* becomes especially important when we feel *I can't*, as an entry point for discovering within us fortitude and resilience that remains out of awareness until *I can* becomes a reality. Roth (2015) points out that 'most of us have some influence, power and leverage. How might the leverage we possess best be brought to bear on the scourge and after-effects of crimes against humanity?' (p. 17). In the vignettes both I and the persons I encountered articulated that we had agency to affect something meaningful, both in terms of

possible future material change but also in the moment itself. In our relating and sharing this power to act arrived almost as if it was another companion coming into view. We *can*, individually and collectively, discover pathways, take up discursive and physical space (such as in protest), and otherwise embody what Roth sees beyond the failures of ethics – a world where the Holocaust is irrelevant.

Through Mason's pedagogical use of living books, she understood that character was shaped by the compelling stories we believe. She saw self-efficacy as something activated by the knowledge that others have done hard things and conquered their will, and so might we. Through history we "trace cause to consequence and consequence to cause; to discern character and perceive how character and circumstance interact; to get lessons of life and conduct" (Mason, 1905b, p. 181). *I can* because others can, and have. The kind of systems thinking frequently used to develop awareness of ethical issues in supply chains comes close to this, but is often conveyed in systematised language that works for some and fails with others, deadening the possible living ideas embedded within (Stanberry et al., 2024). Through the vignettes I experienced a more relational, narrative, and lively interchange that awakened systems awareness without that framing. *I can* is a lively engagement with multiple sources of collective knowledge embedded in their rich cultural, linguistic, and historical contexts. *I can* draws its energy from relational knowledge, and from this the will to do the right and uphold what is good – as we can, where we can.

I ought: Conscience informed by testimony

In a time where public regard for facts has worn thin, the privileged place of testimony as an aid to conscience is both precarious and precious. In Mason's reflection on the Armenian massacres she urges at the least "a very slight acquaintance with history" (1904, p. 103). Responsible leadership similarly needs the weight of its history to sustain and deepen its study. Peter Drucker, a Christian, fled to the US following the burning and banning of his 1937 essay 'On the Jewish Question' by the National Socialists, or Nazi Party (McNeely, 2020). In 1954, Drucker argued that the social contract between business leaders and society only exists insofar as managers orient and perform towards the public good, "if management is to remain a leading group…it must make this rule the lodestar of its conduct, must consciously strive to live up to it, and must actually do so with a fair degree of success" (p. 391).

Thus, a ‘rule’ reflecting the same notions as Mason’s motto is found deeply in the history of management studies. Drucker later argued that the Hippocratic oath extended to all the professions, and that the first responsibility of the manager was not to “knowingly do harm” (Drucker, 1974, p. 369). He spent decades contending that inequalities are greatly exacerbated by CEO pay and represent a massive failure of ethics that dissolves the credibility of leadership. Drucker’s liberal protestant ethic provoked many managers to lead their organisations into more ethical practices. It also highlights that conscience must be informed, and that through knowledge and awareness leadership can become complicit.

Responsible leadership could consider how life experience raises the possibility that testimony could enrichen conscience. Drucker was a proponent of executive education, an innovation also supporting Henry Mintzberg’s arguments in his 2004 book *Managers not MBAs*. Mintzberg charges that teaching leadership and teaching ethics both fail because their substance is not understood and there is no agreement on how to teach them. Students without life experience have little to reflect on in the way of real world ethical scenarios and so they are often unable to articulate their own values in a leadership role. It is not just understanding of history — here just a few highlights in the past 100 years of management studies — that must inform conscience, but awareness and reflection on our own experiences where we narrate our encounters with simple and serious ethical dilemmas. The influential factors supporting an ‘echo of conscience’ mentioned previously similarly bring experience to bear on ethics (Gosling, 2023).

There are also many sources of ‘ought’ which traditionally inform and judge the conscience; these include religious ethics, and fundamental agreements such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 2030 Agenda preamble to the SDGs, ‘Transforming our world’, which includes a normative aim for vulnerable people and places, that “no one is left behind” (Stanberry and Balda, 2024). Because of their political power as actors, Wettstein (2010) ascribes to multinationals the same duty to protect as the state. These universalised standards and broad responsibility offer pluralistic support for ‘ought’ in the ethical stance. What the vignettes show is also the ways in which the testimonies that led to the Uyghur story needed to also connect to the governance frameworks, certifications, and contexts relevant for the situation. What matters for responsible leadership is that we open ourselves to allow testimony to connect to other living ideas, providing the moral power distinctive to its experience and memory.

I will: Intention to pivot

Mason suggests that we determine to exercise that power of *I can* with intention which is in itself a step in the execution of that which we will. In our intention to pivot away from practices that reveal our complicity–as offender or bystander–we have the power to protest and resist that which does not enhance human life. *I will* in the shadows of the failures of ethics also primes awareness of what Lawrence L. Langer calls choiceless choices. These do not "reflect options between life and death, but between one form of abnormal response and another, both imposed by a situation that was in no way of the victim's own choosing" (in Roth, 2015, p. 217). Roth argues that notwithstanding the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, its premise was ruptured by the choiceless choices instigated by the Holocaust. *I will* probes the possibilities of action, knowing that the failures of ethics renders many absurdities, and that ethical doings may be confusing, insufficient, and troublesome.

Mason knew that reason could come to any conclusion and cautioned against leaning on reason to point towards right action. Similarly, Roth remarks "Human propensity for rationalization and self-righteousness will try to justify killing as non-murder, thus explaining murder away" (Roth, p. 80). Pointing the will in the direction of ethical actions requires an open mindedness to these inherent tensions, a sort of feeling-our-way into new behaviours, policies, communications, and even trading partners and suppliers. These tensions were evident in each vignette. The casual on-the-way spaces where the case was shared evidenced the tensions of complicity as possible, somehow close but also very removed and toothless.

The ethical stance as sensitising resource

Cunliffe (2022) offers "sensitising resources" as one way of framing a response to the question,"how might we begin to understand the moment-by-moment unfolding details of our practical activities and relationships in ways that might provide new beginnings?"(p. 14). The heuristic of *I am, I can, I ought, I will* is then a resource for activating the imagination of the conscience, forming a place from which to consider leadership itself as an ethical stance – a dialogical space between conscious and unconscious action (Kahneman, 2012). Interweaving transcendental, ethical, social, emotional, and cognitive perspectives is central to understanding leadership challenges for sustainability (Balda and Stanberry, 2022). The Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas conceived of ethics as the 'first philosophy' that comes to us not from outside but from our intersubjective relationships, even the breath we each share (Peperzak,

2013). Mason argued that “men [sic] are spirits, that the spirit, mind, of a man is more than his flesh, that his spirit is the man, that for the thoughts of his heart he gives the breath of his body” (1925, p. 5). In this sense, it is an embodied interstice between and within individual and corporate life. An ethical stance is as Keane (2015) describes, a tension between latent capacities, awareness, and purposeful agency, and “these very tensions and the impossibility of resolving them once and for all help drive them to make new ethical discoveries and inventions” (p. 168). Understanding this embodied ethical stance, looking out from and towards the failures of ethics, offers a method or way into our individual and unique identities and our relationships of responsibility.

As an applied ethic, leadership ethics is concerned with the distinctive collection of challenges set out (Ciulla and Forsyth, 2011), in this case, for the emergence of shared responsibility and action on behalf of a future where human-environment systems flourish, as well as in the vision illuminating the SDGs, that no one is left behind (Saks, 2022; Stanberry & Balda, 2024). An ethical orientation in this regard is rooted with one foot in foundational agreements about human dignity and potential harms, and one in the failures of ethics. As former Unilever CEO Paul Polman said, capitalism has engineered perverse outcomes which are “a scar on the conscience of humanity” (Elkington, 2020, p. 17), for “business cannot succeed in failed societies, nor can it afford to be a bystander in a system that gives it life in the first place” (p. 18).

The development of responsible leadership may be less about models, frameworks, and conventional theorising, and more about paying attention to the knowledge process out of which ethical actions emerge. In an epigraph to Chapter 2, “Rape as Torture and the Responsibility to Protect” Roth quotes Jean Améry’s *At the Mind’s Limits*, “Somewhere, someone is crying out under torture. Perhaps in this hour, this second” (p. 29). Genocidal acts contain remarkably consistent characteristics across time, cultures, and contexts. At the centre is not only dehumanisation broadly, but also the bodies of women and girls as the site of systematic violence, a kind of genocidal intent present as well in the Uyghur case (Turdush and Fiskesjö, 2021). It is not that these orders need to be given as such, but that these acts are related and connected to histories and identified patterns of subjugation. The failures of ethics continue as the same failures, over and over and over again, and so the hurdles to perceiving their presence and grasping their significance are relatively low, and surmountable in an era of citizen

journalists, technology, and fact-checking resources. As described above, through locating living ideas for responsible leadership, actors who deprive others of their human rights and enable mass atrocities are thought-ful and even creative individuals who *can* be held responsible.

Conclusion

Per fer les coses bé cal: primer, l'amor a elles; segon, la tècnica

To do things right, first you need love, then technique

-Antoni Gaudí (2024)

In this autoethnographic narrative I connected Mason's motto with Roth's philosophy of mass atrocities to explore how living ideas are embedded in relational knowledge within entangled human-environment systems. The resulting ethical stance is captured as 'I am, I can, I ought, I will' and encompasses: 1) self-reflexivity and identity, 2) conscience informed by testimony, 3) consciousness of the power to protest and resist, and 4) intention to pivot. My aim was twofold. First, to offer a provocation to deepen and sustain ethics in responsible leadership by way of encountering failures, and the failures of ethics itself, as material, persistent, and porous. Second, to offer the ethical stance as a pathway towards safeguarding ethics by exploring the relationship between the inner values of individuals and the broader interests that constitute governance efforts.

I conclude that love and care for what is good, right, and true must precede our thinking, teaching, scholarship, and activism for responsible leadership. The techniques of management can flow out of the instruments of learning that Mason identified: honouring personhood, living ideas, the atmosphere of environment and vibe, and the habits that we cultivate together. This does not preclude the importance of governance-focused pathways for structural change in human rights. It *does* advance the possibility that these changes are also the outcome of relational everyday happenings.

Much of management and organisation scholarship is concerned with locating gaps to fill. Perhaps equally or even more important is developing sensitising resources for leaders, including those that enable leaders to reflect, to know, to protest, and to resist the failures of ethics. Mason asked that we bear with her, as it was necessary "to repeat again and again counsels which are like waves beating against the rock of an accepted system of things. But, in time, the waves prevail and the rock wears away; so we go to work with good hope" (1905b, p. 164). She also advised that, "Great occasions do not come to us at any time of our lives; or, if

they do, they come in the guise of little matters of every day. Let us be aware of this" (1905a, p. 142). This ethical stance visits and revisits the failures of ethics, allowing responsible thought and action in the everyday materialities and relationships of life, as waves of love aimed at *doing it right* and wearing away the rock. In this place we are pointed towards a world where ethics renews our commitments to each other, to our communities, and to fellow persons wherever they may live.

Note

I. https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/trade/uyghur-forced-labor-prevention-act-statistics

References

Améry, J. (1980), *At the Mind's Limits: Contemplations by a Survivor on Auschwitz and Its Realities*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, USA.

Arendt, H. (2006), *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Penguin, London, UK.

Balda, J. B. (2005), "Feathers Falling on the Mind: Spirit Led Leaders and Organizational Decision-making, a Phenomenological Study", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, CA, USA.

Balda, J. & Stanberry, J. (2022), "Finding Good Work in COVID-19: legal and ethical challenges for sustainability", *The COVID 19 Pandemic Collection*, Ethics Press, Cambridge, UK.

Bernier-Rodriguez, B.E. (2009), "Education for the Kingdom: An Exploration of the Religious Foundation of Charlotte Mason's Educational Philosophy", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

Bolden, R., Gosling, J. & Hawkins, B. (2023), *Exploring Leadership: Individual, Organizational, and Societal Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Booth, W. (1890), *Darkest England and the Way Out*, Salvation Army Social Campaign, London, UK.

Brewer M. D., Stonecash J. M. (2015). *Polarization and politics of personal responsibility*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Buckingham, B. (2017), "Charlotte Mason and Henrietta Franklin", *Charlotte Mason Poetry*, 7 April. Available at: https://charlottemasonpoetry.org/charlotte-mason-and-henrietta-franklin/

Cavendish, C. (2025, January 4). Secularists must remember that religion is on the rise. *FT*. https://www.ft.com/content/a942ca43-d8c9-408b-861b-c2b7d3b5d2b1

Cholmondeley, E. (2000), *The Story of Charlotte Mason, 1842-1923*, (1st ed.), The Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, UK, DOI: 10.2307/j.ctv24650kz.

Ciulla, J. B. (2021), "Why ethics is at the heart of leadership", Pless, N. and Maak, T. (Ed.s), *Responsible Leadership,* pp. 21-38, DOI: 10.4324/b22741-3.

Ciulla, J.B. and Forsyth, D.R. (2011), Leadership Ethics, The SAGE Handbook of Leadership, SAGE, pp. 229-280.

Crossan, M., Crossan, C., Newstead, T., & Sturm, R. E. (2024). Developing leader character: Finding a way forward. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *23*(4), 652–675. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2023.0520

Cunliffe, A.L. (2018), “Wayfaring: a scholarship of possibilities or let’s not get drunk on abstraction”, *M@n@gement*, Vo. 21 No. 4, pp. 1429–1439.

Cunliffe, A.L. (2022), “Must I grow a pair of balls to theorize about theory in organization and management studies?” *Organization Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 1–28, DOI: 10.1177/26317877221109277.

Cunliffe, A. L., & Ivaldi, S. (2021). Embedded ethics and reflexivity: narrating a charter of ethical experience. *Management Learning*, *52*(3), 294–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620960014

Curran, K. A. (2021). Responsible, relational, and intentional: A re-imagined construct of corporate-commons leadership. In D. P. Singh, R. J. Thompson, & K. A. Curran (Eds.), *Reimagining leadership on the commons* (pp. 97–118). Emerald Publishing.

Drucker, P. F. (1954), *The Practice of Management*, Harper, New York, NY, USA.

Drucker, P. F. (1974). *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. Harper & Row, New York, NY, USA.

Durant, J. M. (2022). Constitutional Ethics, Human Rights and Responsible Leadership. In *Responsible Leadership* (pp. 29–47). Routledge.

Edwards, J. (2021). Ethical autoethnography: Is it possible? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *20*, 160940692199530. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921995306

Elkington, J. (2020), *Green Swans: The Coming Boom In Regenerative Capitalism*, Greenleaf Book Group, London, UK.

Ellul, J. (2016), *Presence in the Modern World: A New Translation*, Wipf and Stock Publishers, Eugene, Oregon.

Finnegan, C. (2020), “The Uyghur Minority in China: a case study of cultural genocide, minority rights and the insufficiency of the international legal framework in preventing state-imposed extinction”, *Laws*, Vol. 9 No. 1, p. 1, DOI: 10.3390/laws9010001.

Fujimoto, Y., & Uddin, J. (2022). Inclusive leadership for reduced inequality: Economic–social–economic cycle of inclusion. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *181*(3), 563–582. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04920-2

Gaudí, A. (2024) The Sagrada Familia Museum, Barcelona, Spain [Viewed 14 February].

Gibbons, M. (1960), *Netta*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, UK.

Gosling, J. (2023). The echo of conscience: why responsible leadership should aim to change the rules. *Emerald Open Research*, *1*(11). ISSN: 2631-3952

Haslam, A., Reicher, S., & Platow, M. (2020), *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London, UK.

Haynes, K. (2018). Autoethnography. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research Methods: Methods and Challenges* (Vol. 0, pp. 17-31). SAGE Publications Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526430236

Herdt, J. (2023). Revisiting Religious Ethics as Field and Discipline. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, *51*, 32–43.

Human Rights Watch (2021), "'Break their lineage, break their roots': China's crimes against humanity targeting Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims", available at: https://www.hrw.org/report/2021/04/19/break-their-lineage-break-their-roots/chinas-crimes-against-humanity-targeting.

Iszatt-White, M. (2024), *Leadership as Stewardship: Honouring our Past While Ensuring our Future*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.

Jackson, B., Kempster, S., Liyanage, C., Shang, S., & Sun, P. (2023). Responsible leadership: from theory building to impact mobilisation. In D. Schedlitzki, M. Larsson, B. Carroll, M. Bligh, & O. Epitropaki (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 212–226). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529781892

Jones S. R., Kim Y. C., & Skendall K. C. (2012) (Re-) Framing authenticity: considering multiple social identities using autoethnographic and intersectional approaches. *The Journal of Higher Education* 83(5): 698–724.

Kahneman, D. (2012), *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, Penguin, London, UK.

Keane, W. (2015), "Varieties of ethical stance", *Four Lectures on Ethics: Anthropological Perspectives,* pp. 127–173. HAU Books, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA.

Kempster, S., & Stewart, J. (2010). Becoming a leader: A co-produced autoethnographic exploration of situated learning of leadership practice. Management Learning, 41(2), 205-219. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507609355496

Kempster, S., & Jackson, B. (2021). Leadership for what, why, for whom and where? A responsibility perspective. *Journal of Change Management*, *21*(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2021.1861721

Kempster, S. (2021). Responsible leadership and societal purpose. In *Responsible Leadership* (2nd Edition, pp. 97–116). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/b22741-7

Kossick, R. & Sliwoski, H. B. (2023), "Commercial, professional perspective - Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act & US SMEs", *Bloomberg Law*, available at: https://www.bloomberglaw.com/external/document/XFO4BFOG000000/commercial-professional-perspective-uyghur-forced-labor-preventi.

Kriebitz, A., & Max, R.(2020), "The Xinjiang Case and its Implications from a business ethics perspective", *Human Rights Review,* Vol. 21, pp. 243–265, DOI.org/10.1007/s12142-020-00591-0

Ladkin, D. (2018), "The aesthetic' and its relationship to business ethics: Philosophical underpinnings and implications for future research", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 147 No. 1, pp. 35-51, doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2928-2.

Ladkin, D. (2021). Problematizing authentic leadership: How the experience of minoritized people highlights the impossibility of leading from one's "true self". Leadership, 17(4), 395-400. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715021999586

Lehr, A. (2022), "Addressing forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region: toward a shared agenda", *Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)*.

Lesegretain, S. (2022), "China's 'sustainability': exploring tensions between the Uyghur genocide and China's economic leverage over international actors," *Consilience: The Journal of Sustainable Development*.

Letnar Černič, J. (2021), "The Reformed EU Human Rights Sanctions Regime: a step forward or an empty threat?", Business and Human Rights Journal, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 559–566, DOI:10.1017/bhj.2021.37.

Maak, T., Pless, N. M., & Voegtlin, C. (2016). Business statesman or shareholder advocate? CEO responsible leadership styles and the micro-foundations of political CSR. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53, 463–493.

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Responsible leadership: A relational approach*. Routledge.

MacKie, D. (2023), The Handbook of Climate Change Leadership in Organisations: Developing Leadership for the Age of Sustainability, Routledge, Taylor & Francis, London, UK.

Mason, C. (1886), *Home Education*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co, London, UK.

Mason, C. (1905a), *Ourselves, Book I: Self-Knowledge, Book II: Self-Direction*, 2nd, revised., Vol. IV, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

Mason, C. (1905b), *School Education*, Vol. III, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

Mason, C. (Ed.) (1923), *In Memoriam*, Parents' National Educational Union, London.

Mason, C. (1925), *An Essay Towards a Philosophy of Education: A Liberal Education for All,* Kegan Paul, Trench & Co, London, UK.

Mason, C. (1897). *Parents and Children*. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=83BEywEACAAJ

Mcneely, I. F. (2020), "Peter Drucker's Protestant ethic: between European humanism and American management", *Modern Intellectual History*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 1069–1097, https://DOI.org/10.1017/S1479244318000525.

Middlekauf, A. (2016), "A Revolution in Methods", *Charlotte Mason Poetry*, Sept 18, available at: https://charlottemasonpoetry.org/a-revolution-in-methods/.

Milner, E. (2022). Biodiversity and Responsible Leadership. In M. Saks (Ed.), *Responsible Leadership: Essential to the Achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Taylor & Francis.

Mintzberg, H. (2004), *Managers Not MBAs*, Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Miska, C., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2018). Responsible leadership: A mapping of extant research and future directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*(1), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2999-0

Murphy, L., (2021), *Laundering Cotton: How Xinjiang Cotton is Obscured in International Supply Chains,* Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Sheffield, UK.

Murphy, L., Vallette, J., & Elimä, N. (2022), *Built on Repression: PVC Building Materials' Reliance on Labor and Environmental Abuses in the Uyghur Region*, Sheffield Hallam University Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice, Sheffield, UK.

Peperzak, A. (Ed.). (2013), *Ethics as First Philosophy: The Significance of Emmanuel Levinas for Philosophy, Literature and Religion*, Routledge, London, UK, DOI: 10.4324/9781315822228.

Wormald, B. (2015, April 2). *The Future of World Religions: Population Growth Projections, 2010-2050*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2015/04/02/religious-projections-2010-2050/

Pless, N.M. & Maak, T. (2022), *Responsible Leadership*, 2nd ed., Routledge, London, UK.

Polaschek, R. (2021), "Responses to the Uyghur crisis and the implications for business and human rights legislation", *Business and Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 567–575, available at: DOI: 10.1017/bhj.2021.44.

Rawnsley, C. (1897), "Armenia", *The Parent's Review*, Vol. 7 No. 9, pp. 681–684.

Redekop, B. W., Gallagher, D. R., & Satterwhite, R. (2018), *Innovation in Environmental Leadership: Critical Perspectives*, Routledge, London, UK.

Reed-Danahay, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography*. Berg.

Reicher, S.D. & Haslam, S.A. (2006), "Rethinking the psychology of tyranny: the BBC Prison Study," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 45, pp. 1–40.

Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as Another* (K. Blamey, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226844541.001.0001

Roth, J.K. (2015), *The Failures of Ethics: Confronting the Holocaust, Genocide, and other Mass Atrocities*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Rooney, D. (2013), Being a wise organizational researcher: ontology, epistemology and axiology, Küpers, W. and Pauleen, D.J., Gower Publishing, *A Handbook of Practical Wisdom: Leadership, Organization and Integral Business Practice*, Farnham, Surrey, pp. 79, 98, doi: 10.4324/ 9781315564814.

Roy, C. (1999). Ecological Personalism: The Bordeaux School of Bernard Charbonneau and Jacques Ellul. *Ethical Perspectives / Catholic University of Leuven ; European Centre for Christian Ethics*, *6*(1), 33–44. https://philpapers.org/rec/ROYEPT

Saks, M. (2022). *Responsible Leadership: Essential to the Achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Taylor & Francis.

Salcito, K. (2023), “Automotive supply chain links to the Uyghur genocide: reversing a growing crisis,” *Business and Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 265–270, DOI: 10.1017/bhj.2023.15

Schrempf-Stirling, J., & Van Buren, H. J., III. (2024). The importance of human rights for management and organization studies. *British Journal of Management*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12799

Sen, A. (2013). The Ends and Means of Sustainability. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *14*(1), 6–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2012.747492

Sharma, T., Sinha Ray, R., & Mitra, N. (2022). *Responsible Leadership Sustainability Uncertain Times Social, Economic Environmental Challenges Sustainable Organizations*. Springer Nature.

Schmiesing, K. (2000). A history of personalism. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1851661

Stahl, G. K., & Sully de Luque, M. (2014). Antecedents of responsible leader behavior: A research synthesis, conceptual framework, and agenda for future research. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(3), 235–254. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0126

Stanberry, J. & Balda, J.B. (2024), “A conceptual review of SDG 17: picturing politics, proximity, and progress”, *Journal of Tropical Futures: Sustainable Business, Governance & Development*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 110-139, DOI: 10.1177/27538931231170509

Stanberry, J., Murphy, D. F., & Balda, J. B. (2024). Recognising Ecological Reflexivity: An Alternative Approach to Partnership Capabilities for Collaborative Governance. *Sustainability*, *16*(16), 6829. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16166829

Swanson, A. & Buckley, C. (2022), “Red flags for forced labor found in China's car battery supply chain”, *New York Times,* 4 November, available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/20/business/economy/forced-labor-china-supply-chain.html

Turdush, R. & Fiskesjö, M. (2021), “Dossier: Uyghur women in China’s genocide”, *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 22–43, DOI:https://DOI.org/10.5038/1911-9933.15.1.1834

Van Pelt, D. & Spencer, J. (2023), *Students as Persons: Charlotte Mason on Personalism and Relational Liberal Education*, Van Pelt, D. (Ed.). Charlotte Mason Institute, Ambleside, UK.

VICE News (2019). "China's vanishing Muslims: undercover in the most dystopian place In the world", 29 June, available at: https://youtu.be/v7AYyUqrMuQ

Vogel, B., Reichard, R.J., Batistič, S., & Černe, M. (2020), "A bibliometric review of the leadership development field: how we got here, where we are, and where we are headed", *The Leadership Quarterly*, p. 101381, DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101381

Walker, T. R. (2024). The tropics should not become the world's plastic pollution problem. Journal of Tropical Futures, 1(1), 12-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/27538931231165273

Western, S. (2019). *Leadership: A Critical Text*. SAGE.

Wettstein, F. (2010), "The Duty to Protect: Corporate Complicity, Political Responsibility, and Human Rights Advocacy", *Journal of Business Ethics: JBE*, Vol. 96 No. 1, pp. 33–47, doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0447-8.

Zenz, A. (2023), "The conceptual evolution of poverty alleviation through labour transfer in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region", *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp.649-673.

About the author

Joanna Stanberry lives in Lancaster, UK where she is the Vice Chancellor's Sustainability Research Fellow and a postgraduate researcher at the Initiative for Leadership and Sustainability, University of Cumbria. She has published on historical, governance, ethical and cross-sector approaches to sustainability leadership and co-leads the Private Governance Working Group of the SDG Taskforce for the Earth System Governance Project. Previously, Joanna taught at the MacArthur School of Leadership at Palm Beach Atlantic University, also working for 15 years in New York City in non- profit marketing, tech, finance and philanthropy. She holds a degree in Organizational Leadership from Eastern University, Pennsylvania and a degree in Government from Claremont McKenna College in Claremont, California. Joanna Stanberry can be contacted at: joanna.stanberry@gmail.com