*Downloaded from UvA-DARE, the institutional repository of the University of Amsterdam (UvA)*
*http://hdl.handle.net/11245/2.106209*

| | |
|---|---|
| File ID | uvapub:106209 |
| Filename | Summary |
| Version | unknown |

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):

| | |
|---|---|
| Type | PhD thesis |
| Title | Decency and the market: the ILO's Decent Work Agenda as a moral market boundary |
| Author | M.L. Biermans |
| Faculty | FEB: Amsterdam School of Economics Research Institute (ASE-RI) |
| Year | 2012 |

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:
http://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.387032

*Copyright*

*It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use.*

*UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)*
*(pagedate: 2014-08-22)*

# Summary

Markets do not bring about morally beneficial results by and of themselves. The moral evaluation of market outcomes depends to a large extent on the way markets are allowed to operate, i.e. by the boundaries that determine where and how the market is to function.

Labor standards and the ILO's Decent Work Agenda, which was launched in 1999 and is based on the normative concepts of human dignity and decency, can be seen as fulfilling this boundary function.

This dissertation discusses the relationship between markets and morality by way of this Decent Work Agenda, focusing not only on the content of that agenda but also on the interaction between markets and the two foundational normative concepts. With regard to decency, the writings of the philosopher Avishai Margalit on the Decent Society are used in the appraisal of the ILO's Decent Work framework.

This evaluation shows that the agenda will not be able to function effectively as a moral market boundary. This is predominantly the result of the method that was deployed (e.g. framing decency in positive terms rather than progressing *ex negativo*) as well as general opposition against the idea of decency as an evaluative concept.