

Dignity in International Service: In memoriam Dag Hammarskjöld

Simon Hollis, Swedish Defence Universit

Abstract

Climate change, Covid-19, cyberattacks and wealth inequalities represent a short list of the many global challenges facing world leaders. Well-intentioned agreements and initiatives have been designed to respond to these crises, mitigate risks and alleviate underlying vulnerabilities with some notable successes. Yet, the protracted utilitarian interests of leaders reduces their ability to manage today's turbulent risk environment effectively. In memory of Dag Hammarskjöld, this essay honours his legacy with a proposal to revitalize his concept of international service through the broadening of traditional education initiatives that take into account the centrality of personal dignity for global governance.

Policy Recommendations

- The concept of dignity ought to be restored by reclaiming its personalist roots.
- Reintroducing Dag Hammarskjöld's concept of international service as part of his personalist ethics on leadership can encourage persons to lead with dignity.
- Broadening education initiatives to include *educure*, in addition to *educare*, can provide a suitable learning platform for leading with dignity.
- Creating centres for global leadership can provide a space to equip ourselves and the next generation to think creatively about current and future global challenges.

On 18 September 1961 the second UN Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjöld, lost his life in a fatal plane crash while heading towards Congo to broker a cease-fire. He is often remembered for his sharp intellect, as a talented diplomat and as a dedicated leader who pursued international service with a passionate commitment to serving others. 60 years on, his actions and words remain a source of hope and inspiration for diplomacy and international service.

Instead of recounting his many achievements which has been done elsewhere (see for instance Berggren, 2016; Lipsey, 2016; Urquhart, 1994), this essay honours Hammarskjöld's legacy with a proposal to renew his personalist ethics as a much needed corrective in today's turbulent political environment.ⁱ From the politics of disinformation to the equitable distribution of Covid vaccines, we can learn much from the ethical leadership of Hammarskjöld. More specifically, and motivated by his speeches and writings, I suggest Hammarskjöld's idea of international service ought to be revitalized through a broadening of traditional education initiatives that take into account the centrality of personal dignity for global governance.

Global Vulnerability: An Insurmountable Challenge?

Lamenting on the destruction caused in the aftermath of the Lisbon disaster in 1755, Voltaire wrote: 'Come, ye philosophers, who cry, "All's well," And contemplate this ruin of a world. Behold these shreds and cinders of your race, This child and mother heaped in common wreck, These scattered limbs beneath the marble shafts – A hundred thousand who the earth devours....' The magnitude of suffering caused by the Lisbon earthquake, and proceeding Tsunami and urban fires, was not only about physical

and material harm; it also shook the fundamental values of European societies. Lisbon is often seen as a unique moment in the history of ideas where the 'death of God' and faith in science emerged as a counterpoint to pre-Enlightenment thinking. However, viewed from the lens of human history, Lisbon can also be seen as just another instance of disruption in human life. Just like the Peloponnesian War, the 526 Antioch earthquake, the Black Death, the Atlantic slave trade, the 1887 Yellow river flood, two World Wars, the Holocaust and 9/11, and the Covid pandemic, Lisbon illustrates the reality of our vulnerability as a common theme throughout human history. Vulnerability is one of our closest and most constant companions.

The difference today is that our vulnerability is multiplied by complex layers of inter-weaving threats ranging from the microscopic to the planetary. The emergence of the Anthropocene as a new and volatile epoch encapsulates much of this new reality where the modern dichotomy between human and natural history is no longer tenable: human activity, from terraforming to the emissions of carbon dioxide, has fundamentally altered our physical reality.ⁱⁱ Our human fingerprint can be seen in global warming, bio-diversity loss, the acidification of seawater and unpredictable weather patterns. This socio-natural volatility is often intertwined with a host of other risks including intra-state conflicts, internally displaced people, communicable diseases and cyber-attacks. The magnitude of our vulnerability can be overwhelming as experienced by many of us first-hand through the debilitating effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.

If humans possess the technology to change the shape of the earth or cause our own extinction, we also have the choice and the capacity to reduce risk

and seek sustainable solutions. However, we are often confronted with an inability to affect change where change can be made. 'Part of the uniqueness of our times' writes Os Guinness, 'is that we are the first to live when it is possible to know of almost all the world's atrocities as they happen. Yet a sad feature of the horrendous evils of the last century has been that strong leaders and decent people know what was happening when it was happening, but did little or nothing' (2005, p.5).

Facing up to the challenges of our global vulnerability, the international community has established a number of visionary agreements and institutions in an attempt to reduce such risks to humanity. The United Nations Charter, the Coal and Steel Community (as the forerunner to the European Union), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Humanitarian Imperative, the Sphere project, the Responsibility to Protect, Resolution 1325 and many other initiatives have sought to lessen the burden of tragedy. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) sum up these vested interests well: to 'free the human race from the tyranny of poverty and want and to heal and secure our planet'.

There is much to admire in these and other collective ambitions to produce global solutions to global challenges. Yet it would seem that no matter what type of agreement is produced or what type of structural changes are made within the UN Security Council, the power to change international governing systems will remain limited if states continue to act out of a utilitarian prerogative that favours the interest of one nation state, individual or organization over another. 'Top-down' solutions through increased international coordination and cooperation are certainly helpful, but it remains doubtful if this alone can provide any profound reduction to existing threats. Instead,

'bottom-up' initiatives that contribute to the welfare of persons by persons, which in turn strengthen creative capacities for global governance, ought to receive greater attention and improved investment.

Local Solutions for Global Problems

Addressing students at Amherst College, Massachusetts, on the 13 June 1954, Dag Hammarskjöld claimed: 'no education is complete, in a world basically united, which does not include man himself, and is not inspired by a recognition of the fact that you will not understand your enemy without understanding yourself' (1954a, p.207). If the international system is trapped within its own utilitarian confines and if nation-states remain the main authoritative and legitimate entities, then it is important to expand our horizons and look toward creative solutions that are practical, easily implemented as well as having a strong potential for positive change for future generations. Hammarskjöld's advice to the next generation of leaders in Massachusetts provides a simple yet profound key: if the problem lies within persons, then we should also seek the solution within us. If we can harness a new way of relating to ourselves, hope can emerge in how we interact with others: civil society, states and international organizations can collectively and effectually produce public goods by focusing on the predominant role of human agency.

Fostering global leadership through education provides a means for nurturing this possibility. Education can become the tiller that guides society toward the calmer waters of sustainability, resilience, global equity, peace and tolerance. However, if education is to empower future leaders to serve with dignity by seeking solutions from within, we must carefully re-examine what we mean by education.

Motivated by the writings and actions of Dag Hammarskjöld, this essay suggests that dignity needs to be reclaimed as the resounding ethos of global governance; and this best achieved through education initiatives that unite *educare* (to lead forth) with *educare* (the training of the mind). Moreover, Hammarskjöld's idea of international service ought to be revitalized not only for tomorrow's leaders but also as a basic principle that all of us can follow to the best of our abilities. For Hammarskjöld, international service is understood as a privilege and an obligation for *all* people:

International service requires of all of us first and foremost the courage to be ourselves...it requires that we should be true to none other than our ideals and interests – but these should be such as we can fully endorse after having opened our minds, with great honesty, to the many voices of the world (1955, p.64).

Understanding oneself is thus critical for achieving international service through dignity. In his speeches and personal reflections, Dag Hammarskjöld continually reiterates the importance of self-reflection and self-knowledge as a key for dignity in international service; for him, the centre of international life rests in personal ethics (Lipse, 2020, p.92).ⁱⁱⁱ Navigating society toward this objective can be achieved through a greater awareness and manifestation of the hope and responsibility that exists in every unique person populating our globe. From the poorest and weakest child to the most successful and intelligent adult, we all have an influence and we all have a co-responsibility for contributing to a darker or lighter world (Crosby, 2004, p.188). By hope I mean the unveiling of the unique qualities and abilities of every human being, not by limiting the individual or regulating the nation-state, but by celebrating the difference of our common humanity. It is through this approach that long-term change to global governance

can be achieved. The words so aptly spoken by Hammarskjöld, are equally true today: 'the mistrust between man and man has become existential. It is only within ourselves that we can hope, by our own actions, to make a valid contribution to a turn of the trend of events' (1958, p. 193, paraphrased from Martin Buber). Perhaps, after all, a greater sense of dignity can be established among humankind one person at a time.

Dignity in Global Governance

If one then wishes to seriously embark on changing the current system of global governance through personal influence then it is essential to imagine what this might look like and on what moral foundations it ought to rest upon. However, it is considered unavailing to speculate on the former without first delineating the latter. If the moral choices we commit to determine the future shape of global relations, then attention ought to be placed on the human capacity to lead, imagine and create a just, safe and equitable world, allowing future decision-making systems to emerge on the foundation of dignity. To be precise, the universal value of dignity is emphasised as an essential key for defining future international relations and for reducing fear and mistrust.

The meaning of dignity can be located in its original Latin form, *dignitatem*, which refers to worthiness. Dignity is the appreciation of others – and one's own – significance, beauty and worth as unique persons regardless of cultural tradition, creed, disability, ethnicity or colour.^{iv} Dignity is not a 'culturally relative invention' but a real and 'objective feature of personhood'; the question is thus not whether an individual has dignity but whether this inherent dignity is acknowledged by others (Smith, 2010, p.434; Hammarskjöld, 1955, p.151). When we acknowledge that every person is unrepeatable and that we all have

special gifts to give, community can be created by celebrating difference in unity. The opposite – a community established on fear of difference and intolerance – will produce rudderless societies that are blown into wars, conflict, inequity and undue poverty. It is imperative for a system of global governance to deliberately expound upon and reclaim the personal importance of dignity, as laid out in the preamble of the United Nations Charter, as an ethos for guiding international agreements.

An image of an improved system of global governance is one in which persons and representatives of states and civil society cooperate with one another on the basis of personal dignity. That is, when they can transcend their own utilitarian interests and actively seek and encourage the unique qualities of the *Other* state, person or organization for the collective good of a global community of persons. This is the integral link between dignity and global governance. It is about re-thinking how we as persons see ourselves and others in a global and interdependent community.

Most readers would surely agree that dignity is a good thing; yet, some might wonder: why trumpet the significance of dignity given it is a centrepiece of international life? Indeed, it is true dignity is an all-present concept embedded in human rights, international agreements and laced in global discourse. Yet, it remains unclear if the personalist meaning of dignity, as described above and practiced by Dag Hammarskjöld, has been remembered. Dignity is not an abstract label, nor is it merely an expression of common reason. Dignity is about our intrinsic value as unrepeatable persons. It is from this living source of creativity and wonder, and from our own self-acknowledgment of this truth, that we can inspire solidarity, equity and equality, hope, and other virtues that provide a

basis for international service in the spirit of Dag Hammarskjöld.

To be sure, promoting dignity for global governance is not a panacea for all cooperative problems. In a world of scarce goods, people, states and organizations are often geared toward pursuing material interests in a competitive environment: they aim to maintain and secure their own self-interests and identities. Yet assuming international cooperation emanates solely from this logic reduces the complexity of personhood into a one-dimensional being – a *homo economicus* – and risks colouring all that is seen through a utilitarian hue including morality.^v Dignity is thus stripped of its personalist core. Human motivation is not bound by satisfying self-interest and it would be unwise to define good and bad in terms of utility.^{vi} We are incommunicable beings who hold an astonishing and complex set of capacities for both good and bad: it would be unfair to accept a reductionist and one-dimensional understanding of persons, particularly if human dignity is side-lined.^{vii} Dignity ought to act as an important corrective in global governance. A global system of states acting on utilitarian premises will not only tempt violence, but will also remain locked within an iron cage of self-help. Dignity, on the other hand, can offer us the keys to unlock hope and freedom in community.

Personalist Education: A Long-term Strategy for Dignity in Global Governance

In 1934, T.S Eliot asked three haunting questions that ought to give us pause for reflection: ‘Where is the Life we have lost in living? Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information? (excerpt from *The Rock*).’ In the last two centuries of technological development, and the values placed on knowledge and

information, the person has become neglected. Doctors seem to be more interested in the disease than the person, lawyers see people as problems to solve, politicians see them as voters to be convinced, economists see people as numbers and teachers see students as empty vessels to fill with an excess of knowledge. It is vital that we look for wisdom in knowledge which can be achieved through an approach to learning that not only gives knowledge to learners but also allows them to discover themselves, to unravel their unique abilities, to test their creative ideas, grow in confidence and gain trust in difference. In short, an education founded on personal dignity can provide hope for a better world where persons can live a life worth living.

Education in this sense is not foremost about the transfer or production of knowledge (although this remains an important element) but it is about recognizing that each unique person has something special to offer. Speaking to students at Amherst College in 1954, Hammarskjöld could not have been clearer on this point:

Too often our learning, our knowledge, and our mastery are too much concentrated on techniques and we forget about man himself.... When I speak of knowledge in this context I do not mean the kind of knowledge which you can gain in textbooks, but the knowledge which you can derive only from a study of yourself and your fellow men, a study inspired by genuine interest and pursued with humility. The door to an understanding of the other party, with whom you have to deal in business, in politics or in the international sphere, is a fuller understanding of yourself...(1954a, p.207).

As Hammarskjöld so keenly reminds us, attaining this knowledge begins by self-reflecting on our unique capacities as

incommunicable persons as well as our weaknesses, limitations and vulnerabilities. Learning to live out of our inner centre enables us to have 'the courage to be ourselves' (1955, p.64). Crucially, this also provides a means for practicing empathy towards others: by recognizing the truth of ourselves, we can appreciate the dignity and value in others and find the courage to be ourselves (see Hammarskjöld, 1958, p.206).^{viii}

If *educere* is about 'knowing oneself', as a necessary step towards encouraging dignity, then how can we achieve this? Influenced by Dag Hammarskjöld's reflections, the following offers some guidelines categorized under the following headings: Giving, Creating and Trusting.

Giving. While it may sound paradoxical, a useful way of self-examination is through the giving of oneself to others. When we offer ourselves in the service of others we enter into communion with persons. Following the personalist philosophy of Karol Wojtyła, we not only exist as persons by living out of our inner centre via self-possession, but this self-possession empowers us to give ourselves to others in service: persons are 'never so much themselves as when they share their lives by self-donation' (Crosby, 2004, p.247). The act of giving oneself thus provides the opportunity not only for forging friendships with people from different backgrounds, religions or nationalities, but also for the self-discovery of oneself. In the words of Dag Hammarskjöld: 'how can we ask others to sacrifice if we are not ready to do so?' (1953, cited in Lipsey, 2020, p.6). This begins with knowing oneself.

Giving, especially to those who are most vulnerable in our community, can also usefully challenge the prejudices and limitations hidden within oneself that surface when confronted with the challenges of genuinely caring for others.

This is well put by Henri Nouwen: 'We will never believe we have anything to give unless there is someone who is able to receive. We discover our gifts in the eyes of the receiver' (1975, p.87; Hammarskjöld, 1958, p.193). This very personal and difficult self-reflection can encourage a realisation of a cosmopolitan sensibility that the 'line separating good and evil passes not through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either – but right through every human heart – and through all human hearts' (Solzhenitsyn, 1975, p.615; Hammarskjöld, 1958, p.206). A deeper realisation of dignity can emerge from this type of self-reflection, invoking sympathy and self-discovery. Encouraging community service as part of one's education could create an important space for personal and moral development through the giving to others.

To be clear on this point, giving as a part of one's education is not about encouraging or re-affirming power structures between the rich and poor or a paternalistic attitude evident in some humanitarian and development aid programmes (see Barnett, 2011, pp.34-5). The intention of giving is about gaining a better realisation of our non-repeatable selves through mutual inter-subjective exchange.

Creating. Music, drawing, painting, poetry, dance and other forms of the aesthetic represent powerful forms of creativity through which an understanding of oneself and others can be enhanced. There are two interrelated aspects of the aesthetic that are emphasised for global leadership.

First, art has the ability to express the 'inner problems of our generation' and for creating hope in solving some of these challenges (Hammarskjöld, 1954b, p.217). Aesthetic devices can offer alternative insights into world affairs: it is not just about the practice of dance,

photography or painting but also about how these movements, images and sounds can engender new insights and understandings (Bleiker, 2012, p.2; Danchev & Lisle, 2009, p.775). Dag Hammarskjöld uses the example of Beethoven's ninth symphony, for instance, to express how music can motivate us to look beyond present day difficulties and imagine what could be (1960, p.215).

Second, art can encourage emphatic communication by making us more aware of others and ourselves. Research has shown that literature and music, for instance, can reveal a deeper understanding of the other and help to form community (see W.H. Auden, 1938, cited in Robinson, 2002, p.43). As art has the ability to merge emotions with intellect and transcend the self and the other, it can offer a path beyond technocratic education and toward a space where creative ideas can be formed and where inspiration can arise. The profundity of the aesthetic is well expressed by Christian Smith: 'human capacity for creativity and transposition...emancipates humanity...and opens up human futures to immense possibilities of originality and innovation' (Smith, 2010, p.48).

Trusting. Physical exercise in controlled risk environments, especially in team sports, such as hiking, orienteering or sailing, can help to increase personal self-esteem and create trust through collective problem solving. Relying on and recognizing the unique capacities of each person provides not only a means for problem solving, but also a position from which inter-personal trust and love can emerge. An increase in confidence in oneself is vital for revealing and cultivating the hidden talents in each person. Physical activity can help to elevate the self-evaluation of one's own worth, value and importance (Robinson, Shaver & Wrightsman, 1991, p.115). Furthermore, physical activities can also

provide the space in which important relationships can be forged with fellow students of different beliefs and cultural practices.

Understood as a whole, giving, creating and trusting are educational devices used to cultivate the dignity of persons. A focus on the intellectual, physical and moral development of individuals provides them with the capacity to enter international service, which, in the words of Dag Hammarskjöld, is understood as a privilege and an obligation for *all* people.

Serving Leaders

New modes of teaching that incorporate and encourage the person to 'lead forth' on the basis of giving, creating and trusting ought to be encouraged at all levels of education, especially at the tertiary level and postgraduate programmes that educate students who wish to enter international service.

Combining *educare* with *educure* is not an easy task, but one that is essential if we wish to see future leadership guided by a strong sense of dignity. Global leadership is generally understood as the capacity to 'guide' or 'show the way' (Harper, 2017). War, torture, genocide, rape, violence, slavery and other despicable acts can be prevented when leaders guide society away from anticipated pain and destruction. This requires leaders to have the courage to be themselves, who can take a reflective step back to observe the normative direction of society and understand their own involvement within it. Fostering dignity is an important tool to steer society and states toward peaceful relations via humility.

We are all leaders. We are all co-responsible. If leadership is about the influence one person has on another then we all have the *response-ability* to act with dignity within our own sphere of

influence. No matter how great our influence – whether it is one person, one nation, or one world –everyone has some form of responsibility to ensure that their behaviour has a positive influence on the lives of others and contribute to reaffirming or challenging social norms. At a deeper and more insightful level, Dag Hammarskjöld's words once again echo with piercing relevance in today's world of distrust and hyper-communication:

But all of us, in whatever field of intellectual activity we work, influence to some degree the spiritual trend of our time. All of us may contribute to the breakdown of the walls of distrust and towards checking fatal tendencies in the direction of stale conformism and propaganda (1958, p.195)

This is the practical value of establishing education with *educure*: to encourage tomorrow's leaders to ground their actions and influence on dignity and hope. This can cultivate trust and arm leaders with the fortitude to stand-up in the face of adversity for the greater good of humanity. It will be leaders who possess such qualities that can guide persons, states and societies toward a better world. True leaders therefore also become true servants who are fully aware of the responsibility and service they can provide to others.

A personalist policy prescription

In the words of Dag Hammarskjöld, the prescriptive element of this essay is to have the courage to be ourselves. This requires regaining the personalist ethics practiced in the life of Dag Hammarskjöld; it requires that you and I recognize who we are as unrepeatable persons, who can regain or further our ability to grant others the dignity they possess as persons.

This may seem like an awkward, abstract and superficial prescription for

practitioners geared toward maximizing gains and quantifying achievements. However, just like Dag Hammarskjöld, I disagree that this is 'just an expression of noble principles, too far from the harsh realities of political life' (1954, cited in Lipsey, 2020, p.6). Dignity is not only directly relevant for political life and international service, but there is also a need to reinstate the *personal* aspect of dignity as a cornerstone of cooperation. Too often, the person is considered an instrumental means to an end, a figure to calculate, or a collection of atoms formed and reformed under the ebbs and flows of societal norms. These one-sided concepts of the person do a severe injustice to who we are as persons. We need to return to Hammarskjöld concept of international service, marked by treating persons with dignity, as a primary point of departure in the design and implementation of international policy. Moreover, this prescription is valid for everyone. Everyone has personal influence and hence a co-responsibility to adhere, create or challenge those policies and norms that affect our lives and the lives of others.

As already expressed throughout this essay, a complimentary policy prescription is to establish learning initiatives at all levels of education that acknowledge the unrepeatability and incommunicability of persons. If we are to take this understanding of international service seriously, then we also need a space where we can test our ideas and find the courage to be ourselves in a secure environment. A 'Dag Hammarskjöld Centre for Global Leadership', for instance, could provide such a space and equip tomorrow's leaders to think creatively about current and future global challenges. Forming such a learning space would promote dignity as the basis for global leadership through a focus on intellectual and moral development. An emphasis on giving, creating and trusting would dovetail into

personal dignity as a versatile perspective that needs to reemerge at the forefront of global decision-making. Such a centre for global leadership would not, by any means, aim to indoctrinate students in a particular set of beliefs or persuade students to adopt a particular way of thinking. Rather, it would be founded on a commitment to dignity and the flourishing of personal capacities. Through the complimentary tracks of *educare* and *educure*, the role of mentors, tutors and instructors would be to recognize and encourage students to develop their own creative and distinctive perspectives and approaches to global challenges. Akin to the idea of hospitality, this unique form of learning would occur in 'a free space where the stranger can enter and become a friend instead of an enemy. Hospitality is not to change people, but to offer them space where change can take place' (Nouwen, 1975; also see Crosby, 2004, p.163). It is on this philosophical grounding that such a centre for global leadership could offer a unique learning opportunity to foster the intellectual and personal development of each person.

Conclusion

Social, ecological and political systems are unlikely to improve if persons lack a credible sense of self-worth and a bleak vision of the future. Creative solutions are needed to overcome global challenges for developed and developing states. A significant step toward this goal can be achieved by emphasising the value of personal dignity in international service. Motivated by the writings and reflections of Dag Hammarskjöld, this essay advocates education via *educure*, in addition to *educare*, as a means for fostering the value of dignity for tomorrow's leaders. Including *educure* helpfully goes beyond a series of technocratic obligations by including the flourishing of each unique person. This is why dignity is emphasised as an important theme for the future education

of global leaders. Commenting on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Dag Hammarskjold notes that it is a 'reminder of what must be the goal for the individual as well as for governments; the recognition in action of the dignity of man and of the sanctity of those freedoms which follow from such recognition (1956, p.153).

Simon Hollis is Associate Professor in Political Science at the Swedish Defence University. His research interests, teaching and publications focus on transnational aspects of crisis management, resilience and disaster risk reduction. Key publications include Resilience in the Pacific and the Caribbean: The Local Construction of Disaster Risk Reduction (Routledge, 2021) and The Role of Regional Organizations in Disaster Risk Management: A strategy for global resilience (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Bibliography

Archer, M. (2000) *Being Human: The Problem of Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnett, M. (2011) *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.

Berggren, H. (2016) *Dag Hammarskjöld: att bära världen*. Stockholm: Max Ström.

Bleiker, R. (2012) *Aesthetics and World Politics*. Basingstoke; Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chakrabarty, D. (2009) 'The Climate of History: Four Theses', *Critical Inquiry*, 35 (2), pp. 197-222. DOI: 10.1086/596640

Crosby, J. F. (2004) *Personalist Papers*. Washington D.C. The Catholic University of America Press.

Crutzen P.J., & Stoermer, E.F. (2000) 'The "Anthropocene"', *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, pp. 17-18.

Danchev, A., & Lisle, D. (2009) 'Introduction: Art, politics, purpose', *Review of International Studies*, 35, 2009, pp. 775-779. DOI: 10.1017/S0260210509990179

Frank, J. (2010) *Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Guinness, O. (2005) *Unspeakable: Facing up to the challenge of Evil*. New York: Harper Collins, 2005.

Hamilton, C. (2017) *Defiant Earth: The Fate of Humans in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1954a) 'Address at Amherst College, Massachusetts, 13 June 1954', in K. Falkman (ed.), *To speak*

for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961. Stockholm; Atlantis, pp. 207-8.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1954b) 'Speech at the Museum of Modern Art, 19 October 1954', in K. Falkman (ed.), *To speak for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961*. Stockholm; Atlantis, pp. 217-18.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1955) 'Address at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, 14 June, 1955' in K. Falkman (ed.), *To speak for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961*. Stockholm; Atlantis, pp. 63-64; 151.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1956) 'Address at Williamsburg, Va., 14 May 1956', in K. Falkman (ed.), *To speak for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961*,. Stockholm; Atlantis, pp. 151-3.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1958) 'Address at 'The Walls of Distrust', Cambridge University, 5 June 1958', in K. Falkman (ed.), *To speak for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961*. Stockholm; Atlantis, 2005, pp. 193-5.

Hammarskjöld, D. (1960) 'Statement made on the United Nations day, 24 October 1960', in K. Falkman, (ed.), *To speak for the world: Speeches and statements by Dag Hammarskjöld Secretary-General of the United Nations 1953-1961*. Stockholm; Atlantis, pp. 213-17.

Harper, D. (2017) 'Leader' in the Etymological Dictionary [online]. Available

from: <http://www.etymonline.com>
[Accessed 22 March 2017]

Lewis, S.L. & Maslin, M. A. (2018) *The Human Planet: How we created the Anthropocene*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Lipsey, R. (2002) *Politics and Conscience: Dag Hammarskjöld on the art of ethical leadership*. Boulder: Shambhala.

Lipsey, R. (2016) *Hammarskjöld: A Life*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Nouwen, H. (1975) *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life*. New York: Image Books Doubleday.

Paipais, V. (2019) 'First Image Revisited: Human Nature, Original Sin and International Relations', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 22, pp. 364–388. DOI: [10.1057/s41268-016-0072-y](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-016-0072-y)

Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R. & Wrightsman, L.S. (1991) *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes*. Vol. 1. San Diego: Academic Press Inc.

Robinson, P. (2002) *Poetry, Poets, Readers: Making things happen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, C. (2010) *What is a Person?* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1975) *The Gulag Archipelago*. Vol. II. Trans. Thomas P. Whitney. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Urquhart, B. (1994) *Hammarskjöld*. New York; London: W.W. Norton & Company.

ⁱ Personalism is an approach in philosophy that emerged in the early 20th century which is centred around the value of the person: *persona est sui iuris et alteri incommunicabilis*. Its proponents include, amongst others, Max Scheler, Martin Buber, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Karol Wojtyła and Emmanuel Mounier.

ⁱⁱ Chakrabarty, 2009; Crutzen & Stoermer, 2000; Hamilton, 2017; Lewis & Maslin, 2018.

ⁱⁱⁱ On self-reflection see Lipsey, 2020, pp.10, 15, 31, 84, 93, 95-6, 108-9 115-16.

^{iv} Note: definitions of dignity abound and the concept is debated on philosophical grounds; a point also reflected upon by Hammarskjöld (1958, p.206).

^v The 'person' has been inadequately theorized in theories of international relations. Realism, assumes,

for instance that at the core a person is evil and liberalism assumes the opposite (see Paipais, 2019). Also see Archer (2000) for a critique of how sociology and the social sciences have conceptualized the person.

^{vi} This is perhaps best reflected in the underlying message of Dostoevsky's prose (also reflecting one of the main themes of western literature), where Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment* pitted 'a cold and calculating reason against all the moral dictates of conscience standing in the way of an unbridled pursuit of self-interest' (Frank, 2010, p.389).

^{vii} For a comprehensive definition of a person see Smith, 2010, p.61.

^{viii} Here, again, we see a convergence of Dag Hammarskjöld's reflections with personalist ethics.

Max Scheler maintained, for instance, that ‘when we live out of our personal center, we never lose ourselves in the beings with which we have to do; we remain intact as persons, standing in ourselves in

relation to all other beings. Thus in the properly personal act of *Mitgefühl* (sympathy)’ (Crosby, 2004, p.153).