

ETHICS AS SCIENCE: a guide to success and happiness through ethical living

By Marvin C. Katz, Ph. D.

ETHICS AS SCIENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

	Page
What is Ethics?	2
Advisors' Coaching Method	3
What is Character?	5
The Dignity Movement	7
Can Ethics be Scientific?	8

SECTION TWO

The Conscience	11
The structure of character	12
Why should I be moral?	15
How to determine what is right	16
Dimensions of Value	17
Fairness criticized	18

SECTION THREE

What does "Better" mean?	21
How <u>value</u> controversies can be <u>factual</u>	22
Difference between selfishness and self-interest	23
The systematic meaning of other value terms	24
Morality	26
The Ethical scientist	30
Is morality absolute or relative?	31
Core values to live by	32
Business Ethics revisited	34

SECTION FOUR

Does Social Ethics have principles?	35
Inclusivity	35
Competition	39
Shared Responsibility	40
Social Synergy	41
Ends and Means	41
The best moral activity	46

Section One

Preface: Before readers click on any of the web-links offered below it is suggested that they read this entire essay first. A grasp of the 'package' as a whole is necessary for a true understanding of its parts.

Let's get to the bare facts about Ethics. It's a new science currently being developed by researchers from Oslo to Daytona Beach to Chicago to Knoxville to Salt Lake City to Los Angeles.

We will cover such topics as Morality, Integrity, Social Responsibility, Conscience and Character formation.

WHAT IS ETHICS?

Ethics, as understood in this essay, is the discipline that arises when persons are viewed as unique, as of high value, and as having a story to tell. They are seen as special in their own special way. {Admittedly, this is a novel usage. In this essay a new young science will be introduced, and the reader will see why it is reasonable to name it: Ethics.}

In Plato's Republic, Glaucon, the poor shepherd boy, finds a ring (the ring of Gyges) which can make him invisible. He can do anything he pleases. Should Glaucon be moral?

(In fact, he murders the King and marries the Queen).

If we were invisible there are lots of things we might do. However we are NOT invisible. Many do think they can get away with something, and they attempt it, but, as we will show in the following pages, they are only kidding themselves.

Should Glaucon, or any other person, be moral? Yes, as we shall explain in a later chapter, by the definitions and results of scientific Ethics, he, and we all, should be moral. [“Formal Axiology,” which is the new science which analyzes and understands values, just as a chemist analyzes and understands chemicals; and “scientific Ethics” which is a discipline derived from value-science, are topics which will be clarified below.]

THE "SIX ADVISORS" COACHING METHOD

In Utah, Dave Blanchard and Harvey Schoof are making remarkable progress in changing people for the better utilizing their “Six Advisors” method. {Here is a link to the website: www.sixadvisors.com } Blanchard, using materials developed by Schoof, has given an assessment report to over 800 people. They found that the vast majority of them believe that if they only could HAVE -----then they will be able to DO and BE.

Actually Blanchard counsels them that it is just the other way around: If they figure out who they ARE, then they more effectively are able to DO; and eventually they will HAVE. Once they take his advice and try it out, they have found he was very correct about this. Their lives work much better, and they tend to be rid of their low self-esteem. They then no longer focus on the discrepancy between their imagined goals and their actual reality, feeling pain about that gap. Instead they focus on and build on their strengths -- which they have now become aware of due to Blanchard's assessment -- and they feel pretty good about themselves: they have happier lives. His work is based upon Formal Axiology.

I ask him: How do good people make good decisions, using good judgment?

“The good news,” he told me, “is that we can now measure a person's thoughts. In fact, we measure 36 specific areas. All of the 36 measurements we make with our Test (-- he is referring to The Hartman Value Profile --) have significance;, and we have given each of them a proper name, such as Empathy, Intuition, Practical Judgment, Role Awareness, Self-Direction, etc. Each of them can be in three conditions: over-focused, under-focused, and balanced.

The ideal is for a person to have balanced thoughts in each area of thinking.”

“One interesting type is what is known in value-scientific circles as “the Systemic,” as shown by the over-focusing on two scores: S-super-S and S-sub-E together. This type is sure he is right about his thoughts; he does not know the difference between fantasy and reality; he lives in a dream world and is obsessed with it. Every morning he awakens and is confronted with reality -- bills to pay, etc. This is very stressful for him. He tends to quit his job. He tends to be dogmatic. He likes to tell people they’re wrong.”

We have an antidote for his disappointment and anxiety, Dave Blanchard will tell you: We teach him role awareness, in the here and now. At first, we invite him to sit at the head of a boardroom table, and become aware of his advisors sitting around the table: they are his thoughts. We teach him three principles -- (1) YOU are not your thoughts. (2) You can step back from your thoughts and hear them. (3) You can make a conscious choice to change your thinking, and thus reach your goals.

Que.: Do you know the difference between a "dream" and a "goal"?

Answer: A dream is something you indulge in and fantasize about. It is something you want.

In contrast, a goal is something you work for. It is something you are willing to do to become the kind of person who has the things you want already.

“Now picture this” he tells his counselees: “You are sitting at the head of the boardroom table, and listening to these ‘advisors.’ They are actually your thoughts.” We want to identify these thoughts without being judgmental. (With the aid of our interpretation of his test, we can tell the counselee what some of those thoughts are. This impresses him, and he wants to hear more.) “Right now” says Blanchard, “your systemic advisor is starting to oppose what I'm saying; it wants to resist it, isn't that so? Now, you can be right or you can be rich. Which would you rather be? Your systemic advisor is telling you something. What happens

when you listen to it?"

At this point the person being coached often tells of his own weaknesses and fears. He confides in the coach.

Here is Blanchard's Antidote to Disappointment and Anxiety:

1) Define what you want out of life. Do it as specifically as you can.

2) What would the attributes be of a person who already had these things you want?

3) Define for yourself the specific actions that would have to be taken to acquire the attributes of a person who had the things that you want to have in your life. Spell out the day-to-day and week-to-week actions necessary.

**Then start to do one of them, at first. Become (like) that person -----
--- and the stuff will follow !!!**

It's all very logical. And it works! First you BE; then you DO; then you HAVE.

What do we mean when we say: "Then you do...."? We explain to him that "balanced" people work hard for their goals, while those who are over-focused or under-focused become dropouts and quitters. We teach them the value of persistence -- to never quit in reaching for a worthwhile goal!

This is sane and rational decision-making.

WHAT IS CHARACTER?

The issue is: shall we give in to every passing temptation, as Glaucon did, or do we want to be persons of character, who have

***principles* (based upon *good values*) and who have the *moral courage* to put those principles into *action*? [That question is based on the motto of a firm named Axiometrics International, Inc.] Two researchers in this new discipline are Wayne Carpenter and K.T. Connor. I interviewed them for this report and in the process am able to grasp the structure of character better than ever before. I'll present in the following pages what I learned.**

Let's talk a bit about character. We lack it if we give in to temptation.

For instance, we could "scratch every itch" -- that is, we men could chase after every pretty girl we encounter -- or girls could pursue every hulk or rock star as a 'groupie' -- or we could remain faithful to our soul mate, once we have committed to one. We could engage in theft and fraud, and could 'shaft' our fellow human beings to add to our own personal wealth or power. However, if we are governed by principle, if we are aware enough to know how an ethical society is in our self-interest, if we have reached that stage of enlightenment, we will respect the fundamental 'axiom' of Ethics, namely, All persons always deserve positive regard, and will put that into action, will implement it. (In Section Two we will delve into the nature of character in greater detail.)

[Here is a link to Carpenter's website: <http://www.axiometricsinternational.com/>]

[This link is to K.T. Connor's site: <http://cfaam.org/>].

THE BASIC PRINCIPLE

Thus we will not want to hurt our spouse or soul mate by our infidelity; we will not want to cause pain to the owner(s) of the property we can easily steal; we will not want honest, hard-working employees to be stripped of their pensions or their health-care benefits, with all the anguish that might cause; etc.

Causing such pain would violate the basic principle that all persons always deserve positive regard.

This formulation of the basic principle is by William J. Kelleher, who has succeeded in applying Value Science to Political Theory. He

learned the principle from the writings of Robert S. Hartman, the founder of Value Science, also known as Formal Axiology. *{A bio on Hartman is available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_S._Hartman}*

[The basic principle does not preclude disapproving of certain actions, and harboring critical judgments of the ones who act stupidly or immorally. Disapprobation, satire, ridicule, in private, are not ruled out. Our thoughts are free. But negative actions that 'dis' another person or violate their dignity or injure them in any way are ruled out by the fundamental principle.] One way to violate dignity is to invoke one's status or rank as an excuse or rationalization for committing an ethical fallacy. We will soon specify the two major ethical fallacies. Let's first give some attention to two other positive trends – the good news.

THE DIGNITY MOVEMENT

To fight for equality of wealth is futile. To fight for equal recognition as human beings, for human dignity, is do-able. Let's put an end to 'Rankism' (the abuse of rank.) Thus Robert Fuller's Golden Rule:

“Protect the dignity of others as you would your own.”

“Dignity is innate, nonnegotiable, and inviolate. No person's dignity is any less worthy of respect, any less sacred than anyone else's.... Rankism is an indefensible abridgement of the ... dignity of every person.”

----Robert Fuller, former Columbia University physicist, and Oberlin College president.

{Here is a link to his website: <http://www.breakingranks.net/movement.html>}

MORE GOOD NEWS

Students' lives are being changed for the better, according to testimonials by students who have taken a course, offered at Daytona Beach Community College. It is a course in “Ethical

Decision Making for the 21st Century” taught by Richard Davidson with materials prepared by Dr. Frank G. Forrest. This course teaches how to make ethical decisions based upon the insights of Formal Axiology applied to ethical science. It will soon be available over the internet as a Distance Learning Course offered by the College. Dr. Forrest opined that if everyone on earth would adopt the basic principle of Ethics as their own personal precept, human malignancy would disappear. Meanwhile, he says, society must be able to protect itself against terrorists and other criminals. [We will have more to say about this in Section Four.] He believes that Ethics can be as legitimate an established science as Geology or Anthropology.

CAN ETHICS BE SCIENTIFIC?

The philosophical critic complains: ‘Science of Ethics’ seems a little contradictory to me because science is inherently descriptive/predictive, not prescriptive. However an ethic must be prescriptive.

There is no contradiction here.

A science is a frame-of-reference employing logic or math which when applied to a set of unordered data orders and explains the data. It is a Model of models; some bridge laws; and some data to be accounted for. A science describes, explains, and hence, predicts (when a time-factor is introduced.)

There is nothing in the nature of scientific method that says it must be descriptive only. But let's grant that science is 'inherently descriptive' for the sake of the discussion. Value science, and its subset, Ethics, are disciplines, resembling music theory. They don't tell you what melodies to compose; they add a dimension of understanding and appreciation to the enjoyment of the "music of life." You compose the music. They let you follow it 'with the score.'

What they do is to inform how much value there is in a given situation, and then it is up to the individual, or the group, to "shop

for value." I believe many people enjoy shopping for the best value, finding a bargain, especially a rare bargain! Analogously, when one learns that one particular way of life provides high quality, a rational person would aim to experience that degree of sublimity. He or she would conclude: "I want to be like that!!" and turn the descriptive norm of ethical science into a personal norm, a prescription, an imperative for living. It becomes obligatory for that individual due to a personal, voluntary choice to make it so.

Thus, say, the finding that: Optimists are well-balanced and tend to achieve happiness and success... may result in your saying to yourself: "I intend to be an optimist, to speak and think constructively!!!! or "Since I want to be a happy and successful person, I shall from now on look for the good side in everything, and shall name things and situations so that they turn out to be what can be called 'good'"

In this manner the descriptive becomes the prescriptive.

The research in this area of science shows that in most cases to be highly moral would be a far greater good than any seeming value a person could obtain through deceit. The intention behind the deceit matters. We make an exception of deceit used to entertain us, or deceit used to save a life.

To be moral also provides us with far greater value than could be obtained through treating people as if they were less important than ideas. To make that mistake is what Dr. William J. Kelleher calls "The Ideological Fallacy." We also lose an enormous amount of value in life whenever we do anything which reduces a person to the value of a thing or an instrument, using the person as a means merely to achieve some end we want (--what Dr. Kelleher calls "The Instrumental Fallacy" --). An enlightened person would avoid committing these ethical fallacies. They are forms of immorality

What is Integrity? It is being clear about moral codes and principles along with a commitment to act ethically. We will have more to say about this later.

Here is another principle of individual ethics:

Have a single standard, not one for others and another for yourself. Be consistent. Let's speak of this as The Consistency Principle. This is one of the ways to avoid hypocrisy. Another way to avoid that disvalue of hypocrisy is to live what you believe, to "walk the talk."

Moral inconsistency results in logical and psychological discomfort, according to the exciting research being done by Wade Harvey in Wilmette, Illinois. He adds: "It makes the person's life chaotic." A psychological disturbance may be on a subconscious level. The person's judgments will not be as sound as they could be. An example would be a person dwelling on how "unfair" the world is, in his or her perception of it.

If I feel hatred for X, (where 'X' is the name of some other person), I think I'll get away with it; but deep down that discomfort will be there. Hating is a failure to observe the fundamental principle that all persons always deserve positive regard. It causes a person who is otherwise a kind individual to be morally inconsistent, and this sets up an internal conflict. With such a conflict, his or her life does not work well. He feels torn, dismayed, anxious, and often, fearful. Hate is *negative* attention. Ethics teaches us to give *positive* attention, to intrinsically value ourselves and others. As the extensive research of Dr. Albert Ellis has concluded, there is no room in a healthy mind for hate, nor for guilt, for burning insecurity, for perfectionism. If I did something immoral, admit the mistake, and work out a program so as not to make that mistake again. If at all possible, make compensation.

It is healthy, according to value-psychologists who know Ethics, to strive for excellence. It is healthy to have regret or feel disappointment if one has transgressed and made a mistake, or failed to be fully moral. However, it is not healthy to insist on being perfect; nor on burdening oneself with thoughts of guilt. The "world may be unfair" but I can be fair in the sense that I treat all alike, including myself, when it comes to dispensing love. Self-respect and respect for others is imperative.

What is right? It is right to be good, and to do good. Thus it helps to understand goodness, especially moral goodness. In Section

Three the topic will be examined in greater depth.

What is Social Responsibility? It is knowing the difference between right and wrong while paying attention to doing the right thing. Section Four will be devoted primarily to social concerns, including responsibility.

Section Two

THE CONSCIENCE

What reminds a person both to have integrity and to attend to social responsibility? It is his or her personal conscience. It tells a person that he or she has personal accountability to develop a respect for moral principles and for the moral codes based upon the findings of value science. One such principle is that every person always deserves positive regard, to be expressed in action toward a person. One may be critical and discriminating in one's judgments regarding another, and disapprove of their conduct or their ideas, yet even as we do this, Ethics points us in a certain direction. It calls for positive treatment of other persons if we wish to gain the most value in our lives. An educated conscience serves to keep us aware of how we can, so to speak, "shop for value," find the best bargain in the art of living, do what is truly in our self-interest. It teaches us to be constructive rather than destructive.

Conscience, in addition, is that faculty that directs us to implement the moral principles of which we are aware, to put them into action.

What constitutes good character? There are three basic components: good principles, good judgment, and good courage. Good character is what we admire in an individual. It is what these individuals have in common: Albert Schweitzer, Angelo Roncalli (Pope John XXIII), Rosa Parks, the Dali Lama, Mother Theresa, Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi, Daisetz Suzuki, Martin Buber, Martin Luther King. We admire them for their compassion. The science of Ethics, among its many other accomplishments, will explain why these person are good (as human beings.)

It would eventually also indicate what not to do, by spelling out, in a highly organized fashion the logical structure of every currently-known kind of perversity and perversion. It will show specifically how each may be neutralized, or overcome. We have presented examples of some people who have good character. At this point it would be appropriate to analyze the structure of character in greater depth, so let us turn to this task.

THE STRUCTURE OF CHARACTER

Since we generally find a good character to be admirable, let's see if we can understand the structure of character. K. T. O'Connor, in Georgia, has researched this area and will help us to explore the subject.

{A brief bio of her is seen at this we blink; scroll down to the fifth presenter mentioned here: <http://www.flcreativity.com/presenters.htm>}

Before we do, she explains, we need to briefly offer some historical background.

“Galileo took Aristotle’s Physics and through creativity made a breakthrough. He came up with the formula $V = S/T$.” In plain English it tells us that ‘velocity (or rate of speed) equals space-units divided by time-units.’

“Years later, Dr. Robert S. Hartman looked at Aristotle’s Ethics, found that it could use some improvement, and he came up with the formula:

$$I > E > S.$$

This is known today as the hierarchy of values.”

It tells us that some specific values are better than others. (Intrinsic Value is infinitely more valuable than Extrinsic Value; and Extrinsic Value is itself far more valuable than mere Systemic Value.)

Hartman showed that values – which after all are intangibles – could actually be measured. He came to the following conclusion, “Valuation,” he wrote, “(is) a well-ordered, systematically accessible and richly differentiated form of experience, comparable in richness and comprehensibility to the experience of facts.”

Here is another formulation he deduced:

$$D + B = n + n/2 - m = 1.5n - m$$

What it says, in a highly compact way, is that if you see something bad, and you neutralize it by adding some good, the result is worth more than the original good. It says, in effect, to gain more value in life overcome evil with good. If you attempt on the other hand to overcome evil with another evil, you will get less value than you started with.....and this is counterproductive.

Dr. Hartman invented a test to enable us to *measure intangibles* such as the thinking involved in a person’s evaluations. It is in the making of such value judgments that an individual reveals the nature of his character.

How do we develop *character*? There are three stages: Decide what we want. Find out what we have. Thirdly, Take steps to close the gap.

Stages One and Two are greatly facilitated if we measure, that is, we determine what exactly do we want? And what measurable amount of capabilities, resources, and talents do we now have? What are our strengths that we can build on? What deficiencies can we compensate for, and how? Measurement really helps if we want precise answers.

By actually making measurements with The Hartman Value Inventory, value scientists found – among many other interesting

results -- the following:

In the corporate world both employees and management had shared sensitivities in two respects, namely, they had sensitivity to unfair actions, and also sensitivity to fraud.

However, employees – but not management – had sensitivity to inconsistent codes and rules, as well as sensitivity to a lack of accountability. Employees showed this in their test results. Management did not.

We have spoken earlier of principles. They are a major constituent of that quality in a person that we call *character*. Another major element is *the capacity for making good judgments*. Therefore let's turn our attention to judgment to see what its components are.

PROPERTIES OF GOOD JUDGMENTS

What do we know about good judgment in a person?

He or she will treat each person as unique and valuable; will build up confidence and competence; will respect the rights of each person. K. T. Connor has designated this cluster the “Trust” component of good judgment. Persons of good judgment know the value of cooperation as well as to trust others until they prove untrustworthy. A healthy skepticism is appropriate.

Next we focus on accountability, also known as ‘walking the walk,’ keeping promises. It amounts to being responsible, and accountable, as well as respecting principles, standards and codes derived from scientific Ethics.

Good character entails in addition a personal will to change and to grow. It means acting as a change agent and risk taker. It means being inventive, spontaneous and creative. It means having vision. This, in turn, means having optimism and expecting the best.

Then if we wish to get results and develop what leadership abilities we may have it would be advisable to consider Strategy and Tactics. A person should ask himself: Do I prioritize actions? In other

words, do I set priorities? Do I put myself into my work? Do I pay attention to getting things done? Do I, in fact, get results?

All of the above goes into developing good character. We need to keep in mind our moral principles, make sound judgments, and put them into action in proper sequence. Each aspect has several subdimensions, and each of these is measurable by tools which exist currently. That is the good news coming lately from the new science of Ethics. Many a young person growing up hears about morality, wonders if it is relevant to his/her own life, and asks: should I myself be moral?

WHY SHOULD I BE MORAL?

Value scientists who specialize in the discipline known as Ethics maintain that there is a definite answer to the question: "Why should I be moral?" It comes from Formal Axiology.

By the definition of 'should' and by the definition of 'moral' the answer is "Yes, I should be moral." Soon we shall offer the ethical-science definition of morality. To the issue of "Why be moral?" we can respond here and now: It comes down to self-interest.

We should do what overlaps with our Self, with our nature -- what is compatible with advancing, and enhancing, our own true self.

To be moral is to intrinsically value a self (including our own), that is, to value it highly by giving it our full attention, by getting involved with it, by loving it..... and all the implications that follow, e.g., to have integrity, to express authenticity, to be a sincere person, to be transparent as to your true motives, to be ready to cooperate with other good people, to serve them, to find common ground with those who disagree with us, to be diplomatic, to think constructively, etc.

So the bottom line is: we should be moral if we want to get the most

meaning out of life. It is in our self-interest to do so.

[Unfortunately, many people act in a self-defeating, counter-productive manner. They engage in verbal abuse of others, in violence, in armed combat, etc.]

It is not so much values that are moral; it is persons who are moral, and it is a matter of degree as to how moral they are.

Morality is to an individual what *value* is to a thing or an idea. And *wholeness* or 'congruence' is to an individual what *goodness* is to a thing or an idea.

Any thing, item, category or idea can be good, such as "A good meal" or "a good headache" or "a good mess" or "a good theory of ethics."

And any person might achieve wholeness (*i.e.*, complete morality.)

To be moral you must be true to your own true self. You may get a better idea of what this entails if you study the paper "What The World Needs Now....." by clicking on the following link:

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/WhatWorldNeedsNow.htm>

Sincerity, authenticity, honesty, integrity.....they all are saying the same thing: namely, be true to your own true self -- rather than being some kind of phony. A young person may decide that this does apply to him, and will say to himself, "Okay, I want to do the right thing, but how do I know what that is?"

HOW TO DETERMINE WHAT IS RIGHT

The question is often asked: "How does a person determine what is right?" Let me explain it this way. It is right -- or morally correct -- to do good. It is wrong to do the bad. If the pursuit of goodness is our purpose, then we are oriented toward the morally right.

So the question comes down to: What is "good"? This will be

discussed more fully in Section Three. Even before we do that we can explain some basics of Value Science, such as the fundamental dimensions which value scientists have deduced.

DIMENSIONS OF VALUE

It is just as important to know our SEIs as it is to know our ABCs.

S, E, and I (which stand for Systemic Value, Extrinsic Value and Intrinsic Value) are the basic dimensions of value, as explained in Formal Axiology, whose founder was Professor Robert S. Hartman.

S, E, and I are dimensions of value. They form a hierarchy, with S worth less than E, and E-value worth far less than I-value. To learn more about these dimensions of value, treat yourself to the book, **FREEDOM TO LIVE**. Here is a way you can obtain a copy:

{See the books mentioned under "BREAKING NEWS" at this internet site:

<http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/Newsletter.htm> . Also the title is listed at Amazon.com.} **This, in my humble opinion, is one of the very best books ever written on the themes of values and ethics.**

A law of Value Science is that all value ought to become Intrinsic Value. Both respect and compassion are aspects of Intrinsic valuation (I-Value.) So also are love and creativity.

Dr. Leon Pomeroy told the writer that our habits come from both nature and nurture. We acquire our habits from our genetic makeup and from the values we have. Hence, it is as important to know values as it is to know brain chemistry, neurophysiology, genetics and other aspects of nature. Our values determine our thinking and our decisions and choices. Thus values are the software (mind) while molecules (and the nerves and genetic components which they form) are the hardware (brain.) We need both.

Many philosophers believe that Ethics consists of logically deduced "should" and "should not" statements based on assumptions about good and about badness involving humans. The theorems derived

from the formal Science of Ethics, once they have been empirically confirmed, are what I would designate as The Moral Law. The more they are verified in practice the more they become the facts of ethical science. The science does have empirical data to which it can point.

Research has shown that there are five or six values shared all across the globe, although different words are used to describe them. These core values are: respect, compassion, fairness, honesty, and responsibility. This then provides a foundation for what is meant by "ethics." When the notion of goodness is applied in the ethical field, these core values emerge. The most basic of all is respect -- respect for yourself and respect for others. The other values tend to follow from that. The respect for others will show itself in the form of compassion. Self-respect leads to sincerity, honesty, transparency and authenticity. Compassion, along with self-respect leads to responsibility. Think about it. If you agree, then live it.

When we do subscribe to these values, then we shall strive always to be:

- Honest and truthful in all our dealings
- Responsible and accountable in every transaction
- Fair and equitable in each relationship
- Respectful and mindful of the dignity of every individual
- Compassionate and caring in each situation

In fact these constitute the Sense of Purpose statement of the Institute for Global Ethics, headquartered in Camden, Maine.

(You may want to visit their website to get a sense of some of the progress being made in teaching Ethics to the world.

http://www.globalethics.org/resources/white_papers.htm)

FAIRNESS CRITICIZED

The critic might respond to the above listing of values to which we should subscribe by claiming "Controversy arises not about

whether, for example, honesty is a good thing, but about whether some particular action is honest or not. Suppose I am an employer and just before Christmas I cut the wages of my employees in half.

Have I been fair and compassionate? No! But my business is going so badly that if I had not cut their wages then I would have gone bankrupt and everyone would have been out of a job. So have I been fair and compassionate? Yes! But I did not have to cut their wages just before Christmas and I could have given them some advance warning and waited till the New Year.

Have I been fair and compassionate? Again, no. Also, I made no distinction between employees who have worked for me for decades and those who joined last month: all received the same cut.

Is that fair? No. But one of the people who joined last month has a disabled mother to support and it would have been a cruel blow for her to receive a bigger cut in wages. So if I had been fairer, and made distinctions based on length of service, would I have been less compassionate? Maybe.

The same action -- cutting the wages -- qualified as fair and unfair, compassionate and cruel. There was at least one conflict between fairness and compassion. Of course, if you ask me whether I believe in fairness and compassion I will say 'yes'. But that" says the critic "does not help me very much in deciding what to do."

To this the applied value scientist would answer along the following lines: The criterion of fairness came directly from the noted philosopher John Rawls and from the Mission Statement of The Institute for Global Ethics. (Rushworth M. Kidder, President.)

Surely, if the pessimistic critic thinks and plots hard enough, he or she can come up with hypotheticals in which one sees some circumstance described as "fair" while at the same time noting some violations of the ideal case. The critic must be careful to avoid thinking systemically – in the worst sense of the term -- that is thinking in a manner where things are seen as only "yes/no; open &

shut; either-or.” Fairness, as is true of many other values, is a matter of degree, not an open-or-shut case.

Formal Axiology has tools and methods for deciding whether one concept is better than another. When applied to the situation the critic describes, it would point in the direction of the workers being made partners (back when business was good), and letting them participate, as directors, in the decision with regard to the cutbacks, setting it up so that the staff participates in both management and shares in profits (and by default, in losses). This is the model, the paradigm, for business and corporate "fairness." This is Ethics, in practice, when applied in the business realm. This does not preclude that they will use, and pay for, consultants who are quite expert in management, to guide their decisions, so that the business is not run into the ground.

There was for many years in the USA, a Council on Profit Sharing Industries. Dr. Hartman, who died in 1973, served for several years as its Executive Director. That Council published guidelines -- based on long experience -- for a business to follow in reorganizing in this fashion. It is the ethical form of restructuring. That Council had a lengthy success record, and many, many endorsements and corporate sponsors. *{See this website to learn of a large business that operates this way:*

<http://www.blustratus.net/sites/JoyAtWork/WinMediaHigh>

and this link tells of a small business with an ethical structure:

<http://www.pvsquared.coop/> }

In Section Three we shall discuss Business Ethics in more depth.

Read over this entire talk given by Hartman to a group of business managers some years back, to get a better idea of what happens when Value Science is applied. It was later reprinted as a chapter included in an anthology. The discussion is both rigorous and clear at once. Admittedly it does omit some of the formal logic, and the deductions from the logic that led to these conclusions: *(Here is a web-link to that site: http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/Research_topics.htm/ Click on AAAS, which is Article 2.)*

If you want to know the analysis behind the good doctor's conclusions, at The Hartman Institute's website, (a link to which was just offered above), click on Research Topics, scroll down, and read the Articles, by clicking on the initials of a paper's title, such as the one entitled "The Measurement of Value" (MOV) which will, in plain, readable English, provide the logical deductions. In the next chapter we will endeavor to introduce the reader to some of these concepts, especially as they have a bearing upon the new young science of Ethics,

The next section defines some of key ethical terms, and value terms, with more than usual precision. The definitions were proposed by Dr. Robert S. Hartman.

Section Three

SYSTEMATIC DEFINITIONS

WHAT DOES "BETTER" MEAN?

I shall quote for you a passage from one of my previous writings explaining some of the fine points of value science, a volume named TRENDS TOWARD SYNTHESIS, by Marvin C. Katz, Ph.D. The book is available from Research Concepts, Inc., in Muskegon, Michigan. To say that something is better under a given concept is to say that it is more valuable, and also to assert that it has more of the features or qualities belonging to that concept. I want to thank

John Austin, publisher, for permission to reprint this – more technical -- excerpt:

One item is a better instance of a particular class-concept than a second item is, if, and only if:

the first item being compared is an actual instance of that concept, and the second item is also, and, the first has more of the class-properties (more fulfills the conceptual intension) than does the second.

{Then we can legitimately say -- according to the value-scientific frame of reference -- that 'x is a better C than y' -- where C is the name of the class-concept, and x and y are instances, or examples, class-members. It is essential that they both be on the same level of abstraction. Apples and oranges can be compared under the class-concept "fruit" or "commodities." But "seat" may not to be compared with "airline seat" -- unless a common rubric, under which they may be subsumed is found. That will then be the concept: C.}

Let's offer an example. If the concept under consideration is "way of life," and two modes of life are being considered, to say "This is a better way of life than that" involves a legitimate usage of the notion "better" if and only if both "this" and "that" are indeed each a way of life and if "this" way exemplifies more of the attributes contained in the intension of the speaker's concept "way of life" than "that" way does.

HOW VALUE CONTROVERSIES MAY BE FACTUAL

If all these preconditions hold then the speaker is using the term "better" soundly according to value science.

Controversies -- often only in regard to matters of fact -- may arise at these three points:

- (1) whether both "this" one and/or "that" one actually exemplify the name "way of life;"
- (2) whether in the concept "way of life" the attributes a, b, c, gamma, delta, phi, omega, etc. -- selected so that they are all on the same level of abstraction of course -- are contained; and

(3) whether "this" purportedly better way actually has more of these "way of life" properties than "that" has.

Thus, at the point of naming, of intensional containment, and of extensional possession of qualities (the properties -- or as J. O. Urmson, in the classic paper "On Grading" has called them, the 'good-making' qualities of a class member -- disagreement may arise. See, in this connection, Cornelius A. Benjamin, "The Scientific Status of Value Judgments," in the journal, *Ethics*, III, 3 (April, 1943), p. 218.

Many of these disputes may be overcome by indexing, e.g., home-sub-1, home-sub-2,etc.; by agreeing to view the seemingly single concept as multiple -- but of the nature of a homonym -- e.g., "spring" or "run" are such homonyms; or by conceiving of separate names for each differentiated concept -- e.g., "You call it a 'rope,' but I call it a 'lanyard'; now we understand each other." Again, "You call it a 'veranda' and I call it a 'lanai,' and we need no longer argue."

Let us take note of a couple of principles and rules derived within the Science of Value. An axiological law is the following: Anything that is not good ought to be good; anything that is good ought to be better. Another principle of axiology is this: We ought to strive to preserve value and to prevent value loss. A way to do this is to emphasize positive aspects of a situation while de-emphasizing the negative aspects.

As we have explained, the science of Ethics is a subset of the science of Values. A basic dimension of Value Science is Intrinsic Value. When that dimension is applied to human persons, one has entered into the domain of Ethics. In the field of Ethics, the careful observer will note that there is a prevailing confusion between selfishness and self-interest. The two notions are employed in a vague and interchangeable manner. Let's see if we can introduce some clarity in this area.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELFISHNESS AND SELF-INTEREST

A person saying "You are selfish!" could mean "I disapprove of your behavior. Do as I say!" That is quite subjective. There is, though, an objective meaning to the concept "selfishness." Let's attempt to explain it here.

Selfishness is concentrating on one's own advantage with *disregard for others* and may involve doing something that affects someone else adversely, such as taking something to which we are not entitled (theft); or depriving someone of something to which he/she is entitled.

Many of the things all of us do are self-interested but that does not mean we are being selfish. For example, we go to sleep because we are tired. We have acted out of self-interest, but it does not involve another person, so it is not a selfish act.

We are not isolated individuals; we form groups. The more the needs and wants of others are taken into account, the more we can say a person is acting self-interested in a proper manner. An informed social-consciousness makes a difference in an individual's moral development. A person acting against the group is often – but not always -- acting against their own self-interest and is rejecting real fulfillment.

THE SYSTEMATIC MEANING OF OTHER VALUE TERMS

A person might inquire, "Who defines terms like 'good' and 'bad'? Or 'better', 'ought', and 'unique'? Will those in positions of power impose the definitions on the rest of us?"

My answer is that those who have power are not the ones; rather it is the scientist in his/her field of expertise who we should turn to when we want clarity and careful precision, when we want answers. In the case under consideration it would be the Formal Axiologists (the Value Scientists) and the Ethicists to whom we should give our attention.

Just as the science of Physics defines terms such as "Force" and "Momentum," Value Science has defined the terms "good" and "bad". We do not need to accept their science, just as no one is forcing us to accept 'watts' or 'ohms' or 'volts' or any of the other terminology that physical scientists employ. For example, here are the definitions of some value terms. People who don't care for technicalities may want to skip the next three paragraphs:

Bad =by definition= If the evaluator thinks that it takes n predicates to make something good, then if, in the mind of the one making the judgment (the evaluator), it possesses $n/2 - m$ predicates (where $m = < n/2$), he/she will call it "bad." In other words, bad things have less than half of what they're supposed to have, in the mind of the person doing the supposing. If they had about half, they would be called Average, or Mediocre, or Fair; if they had more than half, they would be said to be Pretty Good, or Not Bad,

If the item or thing is missing in one of its definitional properties, it will be described as No Good, Terrible, (or some synonym, such as "Lousy" or "Rotten").

To illustrate, a chair with a big hole where the seat is supposed to be is 'a rotten chair.' {It is not good as a chair, but may be good, though, as a prop that a juggler balances on his head. Something 'no good' under one name can be 'good' under another name.}

These definitions become part of a network of ideas, a Model, a frame-of-reference, which when integrated with other concepts form a Model-of-models which is the science, in its theoretical aspects. Once the formulas and the models are interpreted, and applied to the empirical world by means of "bridge laws," the scientists can test their hypotheses against reality, they can confirm, or disconfirm their findings. They thus explain the formerly chaotic and unorganized data.

Scientists say more with less. They form a worldwide community engaged in the enterprise of introducing greater clarity -- rather than more confusion and perplexity -- into the moral field. In my reply to the question "How do you recognize moral right?" I said that moral

right is doing good deeds (*i.e.*, kindnesses) and living with integrity and being an authentic person. When someone is true to his/her own true self, and has committed him/herself to goodness, you will recognize the moral rightness there when you encounter such a person!

When an individual is seen as "unique" he is being viewed from the ethical perspective. When you understand that each person is a precious treasure of value not to be defiled in any way, but at the very least to be respected (if you can't bring yourself to love him or her), and treated with dignity...then you are acting ethically. When you believe that every person has "a story to tell" you have entered the field of Ethics. When you practice "morality" you are being ethical.

MORALITY

What is Morality? It is "Self being true to self." When you are true to your own true self you are being moral. Let me offer a more technical definition:

Morality equals by definition this: $x \in X$. [self becoming Self]
Increasing correspondence of a self with an improving Self-image.
This implies that we must all keep growing (in a spiritual sense) throughout our lives. It also implies that we must "walk the walk" and not just "talk the talk." We must avoid hypocrisy if at all possible. And we comprehend that we will get more value out of life, have a more meaningful life, if we are moral. Rather than insist we 'must' do these things, it is wiser to say: it is preferable for us to act morally.

Morality, though, is a matter of degree. Some of us are more morally developed than others. Aim high! The Dalai Lama has no monopoly on compassion. Saint Francis had no monopoly on goodness. We can all aim to love and serve others -- if we gain ethical insight.

Then once a science of ethics that we construct, using logic and math to provide models for it, becomes respectable and established,

human beings will be less likely to conduct wars. (See in this regard “My Turn” by Wayne W. Dyer:
<http://www.drwaynedyer.com/articles/myturn.php>)

They will also be less likely to put each other down in any way, shape, or form because they will want to be decent persons, civil to one and all, using nonviolent, nonmanipulative methods to 'fight' for what they want and what they think is well worth having. We will all know that what we have, and what we do, follows from what we are! And more of us will want to dedicate our lives, and devote ourselves, to goodness.

Our grasp of Social Ethics will encourage us to seek only win-win solutions in our social interactions.

The critic objects: By this definition, I can make Hitler look moral, by showing that he was true to himself.

Perhaps he was to degree 0.018. I hope we would aim for 98 if we can't reach 100.

**I'll aim for 110.....and when I fall short maybe I'll land at 90.
{.....Would you believe 83 ?}**

Even if you show what you said you could show, it would not comply with his being true to his true Self, which is prerequisite for *morality*.

In order for you to make Hitler look moral, you would have to be the historical Hitler, for only he would intimately know in detail his own Self-Image.

Bless your heart, gentle critic, you did what I, in weaker moments, frequently do: you took the definition out of context -- a definition which I derived, after studying with R. S. Hartman who in turn learned the main idea from Soren Kierkegaard's EITHER/OR (Princeton, 1944, Vol. II, pp. 212, 217, 219.) I'm not saying that you took it out of context intentionally; I am not judging you in any way. You quoted part of the popularization, in ordinary language, of a

rather technical notion in the logic of meaning, known in the trade as Intensional Logic, which reads x epsilon X.

It means an individual, x, is a member of a unit-class named "X" and is moral to the degree there is bijective [one-to-one] correspondence between the x and the developing X. [Here x is a self; and X is that person's self-image.]

Furthermore, to be Whole {'congruent" in the sense of Carl Ransom Rogers}, which is even better than being Moral, is for X to identify with larger and larger *holons* (which is a term coined by A. Koestler. It refers to subsystems of larger systems:

http://www.holon.se/folke/kurs/Distans/Ekofys/Recirk/Eng/holarchy_en.shtml **ml** Also see:

http://www.holon.se/folke/kurs/Distans/Ekofys/Recirk/Eng/holarchy_en.shtml **ml** (Cf. also Rupert Sheldrake's *Theory of Morphic Resonance*, a creative hypothesis awaiting further empirical testing.)

The meaning that goes with the X is what is designated as "the Self-image." It is a set of attributes (a self-concept, consisting of things we tell ourselves about our self, and about who we are.)

Morality, in context, as I explained earlier, is best understood in the following manner. It is a self increasingly corresponding with an improving Self- (Image). *It is a very dynamic definition.* It has lots of implications. {Some of these you will find when you click on WWNN at this link, and read the article What The World Needs Now: http://www.hartmaninstitute.org/html/Research_topics.htm}

There you will also see that the writer tackles, head on, the issue the critic raises, namely: is a 'hitler' being true to his own true Self? [The same logic applies to the questions: Is a pimp, a wino, a criminal being true to his own true self?]

Hitler's self-image, by all objective standards, did not improve as he got older. It was quite stagnant from 1929 until his death. When did he write *Mein Kampf*? And when after that did he change his mind about --or grow out of -- any of his concepts in that book?

The criminal mind is broken: it does not appreciate Intrinsic Value, and has a blind spot in that area -- that is, it lacks sensitivity to the uncountable value of a human life.

In THE STRUCTURE OF VALUE, Dr. Hartman gave five proofs as to why an individual person is worth aleph-one, uncountable infinity. This is a measure of how much meaning there is, even in the serial-murdering psychopath. It is up to each of us to find it there though if we care enough to do so. Of course, as Dr. Karl Menninger points out, that sort of criminal is to be locked away from society for life, in a mental health facility devoted to treatment and study.

We are the creatures who have our own definition of ourselves within ourselves. A knife doesn't know it's a knife. We define ourselves as persons, perhaps. We may define ourselves any old way.

Some say "I'm God's child." Some say "God is only mythology, and I'm a self-made man. I need no God. I live very well without one. Everything goes fine in my life." Some say "We all have an ultimate value (or group of values) for which we would give up other values, or which we would place as first priority, or which we would place at the top of a hierarchy of other values. Let's refer to that top value (or cluster of values) as 'G'....

G is the greatest force for goodness and therefore the ultimate reality."

Some say: "I'm a hermit." Some say: "I'm a pumpkin." Some say: "I'm a good matchstick man, very skilled at manipulating others. That's me: a con artist."

Some say" I aspire to sainthood." Some say: "I don't aspire to sainthood but I do want to dedicate my life to goodness. I want to 'commit' random acts of kindness and beauty."

The last-mentioned self-definition will lead to a meaningful life, full of value -- as does also the life of a Self-Actualizing person in Abraham Maslow's sense. This is predictable.

When Extrinsic Value is applied to a person we are looking at the roles that he or she plays in life. One such role is that of scientist. Let's examine what it means to be a scientist in the field of Ethics.

THE ETHICAL SCIENTIST

A scientist in the field of Ethics needs merely to analyze, clarify, explain, and predict. [The latter follows from the act of explaining, by introducing a time factor. If one can successfully explain, one can probably predict.] A science is a logical frame of reference applied to a set of data. The data may be objects, situations, persons, waves, anything.

$x \in X$ { '*x is a member of the unit class named X*' } is the analog in Ethics to what value is in Formal Axiology. Hartman, in his breakthrough work, based the definition of value- in-general within logic and the mathematics of Set Theory. The answer to a critic's question about where the standard for value theory came from is: It came from Set Theory [including Cantor's Transcendental Theory of Sets when it was interpreted in terms that make sense for axiology.]

"Value" he teaches arises when two sets are in correspondence -- the first set is a set of properties which may be perceived by our five or six senses); the second set is a set of predicates (i.e., names of properties). This set is called the meaning of the concept. In other words, value is the partial fulfillment of meaning; goodness is the total fulfillment of meaning. To the degree anything fulfills its meaning, exemplifies its concept, or is what it is supposed to be, it has *value*.

If a thing fully complies with its description, no matter where the valuer cuts off that definition or description, then he will call the thing "*good*." A "good hammer" has all the features one expects a hammer to have, in his concept of a hammer. "A good person" has the qualities that a person is supposed to have. Thus if the critic wishes to reject Theory of Sets, he is free to reject this definition as being unreasonable, or unacceptable.

The standard -- on the chalkboard or the whiteboard -- will not vary

from place to place, although eventually, as the science of value progresses it may vary by being imbedded in a more sophisticated model or models than we now have. A science is a Model of models, and over time, the concepts become more refined, more elegant, more general and widespread in their applicability -- and in general improved. New branches of math and of logic may be utilized to add a "dimension," so to speak, to supply another way of looking at the topics, another facet to a gem.

Anyone may inadvertently come up with some concept that could add to a systematic discipline by providing one more tool of analysis. Immanuel Kant had a profound impact in the history of Ethics. Henry Sidgwick determined the direction academic ethics in the Western world would take for many decades. Later Stevenson also proposed a theory of ethics. Critics do not seem to care how moral those philosophers were, and neither should we judge the morality of any other proponent of a theoretical structure. We have enough to do with managing our own life, seeing to it that we comply with high ethical standards as we pursue happiness, without judging others.

The writer agrees with the proposition that the scientist in the field of Ethics does not in any way judge moral conduct, or proscribe proper or ethical standards, as these are beyond the scope of his observations and descriptions. However, the theorems of The Science of Ethics serve as the Moral Law. They can easily be translated into imperative grammatical structures, such as Be yourself! Be authentic! Be transparent (rather than a phony.) Avoid hypocrisy -- if you want to maximize the value you get from life. All of these are contingent on that "if."

IS MORALITY ABSOLUTE OR RELATIVE?

The critic asks: Is morality absolute or relative? Morality is 'absolute' on the chalkboard (subject to the qualification that science changes over time as scientists conceive of better models to account for fresh observations); and is subjective and relative in application. The technology that follows from a theoretical system's

being applied is subjective -- as a creative design by some engineer -- and relative to the ones who put that theory into practice. For example, to say that "radioactive elements decay by releasing gamma rays" is absolutely so, if you accept Theoretical Physics and its subset: Physical Chemistry. In actuality though, we don't know when any given ray will be emitted---that is all relative and seemingly sporadic (given our present awareness.)

While the theory is 'absolute,' the data -- in "real life" -- is relative.

The critic may inquire if a specific term of Ethical Science is "eternal". The ethicist replies: If you get involved with one or more of the theoretical concepts and judge them as "eternal," then for you they are eternal! That is your Subjective Truth -- just as the thought that Jesus once lived and performed miracles is for a believing Christian. This is data for the formal axiologist to analyze. He may say that you are Intrinsically valuing the concept. You are finding it edifying to say a scientific term, like "morality" as I have defined it, is eternal. This is just like someone who swears they saw a spider on a table when no one else around says they saw it. Who are we to say that person isn't telling the truth!? It is an existential truth for them.

The critic exclaims: so it is up to each of us to decide what is or is not eternal? In the morning, ethics is eternal, but after dinner, it is not?

And the writer responds: Of course it is up to each of us. We can't get away from that, for the application of the theory is relative and subjective.

My answer is that nothing about science --- including a science of Ethics -- is eternal. But you can come along and claim it is. No one can stop you from making that judgment.

Value judgments are idiosyncratic. The analysis of them by value scientists and ethicists are objective.

CORE VALUES TO LIVE BY

Let's also call attention to one more book worth reading which presents another set of core values -- but perhaps these are the same as some suggested earlier in this essay, but merely formulated in differing words.

The title of the book is **LIFE PRINCIPLES: FEELING GOOD BY DOING GOOD**. It is written by Dr. Bruce Weinstein. His nickname, in the media, is "the Ethics guy." *{Here is a link to a page about the book that may prove to be of interest: <http://www.amaz...TF8&n=283155> }*

He teaches that there are certain core values we all can live by. They are: be loving, respect others, do no harm, make things better, and be fair.

One of Dr. Weinstein's principles merits further comment. It is the one that reads: **Make things better!**

This fine core value will train a person -- if he or she adopts it as a precept for living a good life -- to have a constructive attitude.

Whether you do embrace it is entirely up to you. If, however, you do.... you then will seek opportunities to upgrade and to enhance, to compliment, to boost, to give others a helping hand....and in general to improve on situations, on inventions, on legislation, and on public policies.

I believe that if you are loving, you **WILL** respect others, you **WILL** have a constructive attitude, and you will do **NO** harm. The last value -- fairness -- indicates to me that we should have a sense of justice -- we should seek to keep things in balance, and to restore a balance when something or situation is unbalanced.

A scientist of Social Ethics would add that we ought to make every human interaction a 'win-win'. That is, mutually beneficial; everybody wins.

While what Dr. Weinstein recommends may not be a sufficient guide to an ethical life, it certainly is a contribution to teaching some of the essentials of ethics, and for this he is to be commended.

BUSINESS ETHICS REVISITED

A study of the new science of ethics leads to the conclusion that any business is not fully ethical if it fails to give equal emphasis to these five aspects:

Its shareholders (profit); its customers; its employees; its community; and to its environment.

That is why The Royal Bank of Scotland, for example, directs its local bank managers all over the planet to contribute to the culture of the neighborhood in which the bank is located by sponsoring Arts events, etc., and to contribute some of its profits to cleaning up the local pollution, or to funding an ecological nonprofit association.

This finding refers to corporations with over 50 employees.

The principle enunciated was that no businessman or corporation would be FULLY ethical, if they did not attend to all five considerations. This allows that they may be partly ethical if they pursue only one of them, such as money-making alone. This would be a low order of morality, but better than nothing. Let us though recall here what Benjamin Franklin said:

"He that is of the opinion money will do everything may well be suspected of doing everything for money"

And here is a quote from an anonymous source:

"People are working jobs they hate to buy stuff they don't need to impress people they don't like."

Section Four

SOCIAL ETHICS

DOES SOCIAL ETHICS HAVE PRINCIPLES?

I would like to propose for consideration a principle for Social Ethics.

I offer for the reader's consideration The principle of Inclusivity.

The more inclusive we are, the more ethical.

The opposite of that is exclusiveness, and that could mean trouble.....

In compliance with this principle of being inclusive an example would be:

Once there is a viable Palestinian state that has openly renounced the destruction of Israel and that shows signs of good will and cooperation, Israel, as a gesture of good faith, should express its intention to internationalize Jerusalem for the reason that the city means much to many different factions. There will always be conflict if Israel maintains that Jerusalem is exclusively Israel's.

It ought to be done in small steps with pauses to see how people are behaving at each stage as they adjust to the internationalization. The Israelis can (and will) govern Jerusalem, or at least have a large say in it. There is, though, no reason why a new administrative institution representing all parties can't be set up to do the job of administration of this world-treasured city. They should arrange it so that East Jerusalem, where the Palestinians live, should share in many of the economic benefits which the city enjoys, or rather, should have an equal opportunity

to make profits from tourism, etc. [Keep in mind that this is just an example, an illustration, and not the principle of inclusivity itself.]

We may also refer to the principle of inclusivity as "extending the ethical radius," It is a manifestation of moral growth and development, in keeping with the goal of gaining a wider perspective.

Other Social Ethics principles, in addition to inclusivity, are courtesy, cooperativeness, civility, and seeking to find win-win solutions, mutually-beneficial outcomes.

Once an ethical theory is clear enough, the applications will come easier, the judgments made with regard to how to apply the theory will be sounder. So let's clarify what we mean when we speak of inclusiveness: we simply mean an identification with a wider and wider circle of those a person considers to be in his/her in-group.....until, eventually, it encompasses all of the Family of Man, all persons – and, dare we say it -- even mammals.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, we are not advocating group pressure to conform !! The writer is very much opposed to any suppression of individuality.

I am attempting to emphasize the reaching out to others to let them feel that we feel at one with them and their grievances, and we recognize their needs, that we, as individuals, are, in our own way 'fellow sufferers' so to speak. (Empathy might be a good name for it.) Whoever they are, we want to include them, find common ground, and work together for shared goals that could prove mutually beneficial.

As the masthead to a book I can recommend highly -- NONZERO by Robert Wright -- I found this quote which seems to me to be relevant to the issue of inclusivity. Perhaps this phrasing will serve to clarify the principle better than anything written before or since: It is a remark by the biologist/philosopher Charles Darwin.

"As man advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to the men of all nations and races."

The philosopher Emile Durkheim (who was also a sociologist) wrote:

"In the last analysis men have never worshipped anything other than their own society." And to this comment Robert Wright adds: "Still if worshipping your own society finally, in a global age, involves not denigrating other peoples but, rather, recognizing the moral worth of human beings everywhere, then there is something to be said for worshipping your own society." A very distinguished scientist -- an expert in the work on the human genome -- stated that we are all, regardless of race, genetically 99.9 percent the same. Now, you may find that uncomfortable when you look around, but it is worth remembering. We can laugh about this, but you think about it. Modern science has confirmed what ancient faiths have always taught: the most important fact of life is our common humanity. Therefore, we should do more than just tolerate our diversity -- we should honor it and celebrate it.

Critics may jump to a conclusion that what is advocated here is "not very realistic in the most bitter, volatile conflicts". It is true that to let folks who define themselves as adversaries, who feel subjugated by people of your nation, "know that you are also a fellow sufferer" is a sure way to antagonize them further. The critic would further ask: "what shared goal can two competitors really reach?"

"It seems to me" the critic complains, "that the only way your argument can pragmatically work is with a radical overhaul of current systems and conventions within western society into something altogether more hazy that reeks of harmony. And even then, I can't see this inclusiveness permeating the minds of all those who enjoy competition, whether in sports, business, or life itself. I also think natural selfishness, and individual drive is too strong to

be quenched by what you have so far advocated."

The criticism is well-taken. It helps to be aware that Social Ethics follows from Individual Ethics, in logical priority. Only after persons know their personal Ethics well, and live it, can Social Ethics make much sense. We need to be persons of character, who have principles (based upon good values) and who have the moral courage to put those principles into action. Only when our own local society sets a good example of ethical behavior are we morally ready to 'point the finger' at any other society. Even then, we should not judge other persons, but just let our example shine through, and serve as a model.

I believe it is time for -- as the critic noted -- "a radical overhaul of current systems and conventions", though not just in Western societies. I employ the concept "radical" here in the sense of "going to the roots." We are witnessing a clash of culture and of values on the planet today. The West feels superior to the fundamentalist Islamists; and vice versa. But one fact remains true, through time and clime, namely: Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The 'axiom' for Ethics, our basic assumption, as phrased by Dr. Wm. Kelleher, based upon scientific analysis by Dr. Robert S. Hartman, is:

All persons always deserve positive regard.

This follows when value science is applied to the field of ethics. It points in the direction of civility, decency, courtesy, continuous self-improvement, a drive to make things better, and respect for others. When a person talks the talk and walks the walk of individual morality, then social ethics becomes a viable possibility.

COMPETITION

The critic asks: What shared goals can two competitors have? I would respond in two ways.

1) In a corn-shucking bee or a pea-shelling bee the goal can be providing the most food for the community.

2) The story is told of two Chinese restaurant owners in the same neighborhood who were in such a ruthless rivalry that it was "coming to blows" and causing both places to lose business. One day, one of the owners had a bright idea. He approached his competitor with this concept. He proposed that each manage the other's restaurant for one month, and compete as to who could bring in the most business, and make the best profit margin. The "loser" would gain profit and be more prosperous as a result. The "winner" would gain prestige as the best manager. In truth, there would be no loser and no winner, for they would both win: one money, the other honor. They agreed to the deal. And when the month was over, they became good friends, and they had learned a lot.

Of course, this is not practical for every business, but the spirit of it, the creativity of it, is transferable to every competition.

Let us differentiate between two sorts of competition, one immoral the other moral. Let us not confuse ruthless rivalry with the competitiveness of a contest. We ought to eschew ruthless rivalry -- everyone is the loser. Yet we ought to pursue and glory in a good contest.

In the Olympics, no matter who wins, everybody wins, because the planet then has better athletes, better, and more, role models.

Ethics tells us that competition is fine ----- IF it's the right kind of competition. Yes, selfishness prevails now, it seems, in much of the world, but it doesn't have to always be that way. If what we now

know about Ethics is spread, and taught well, and coached well, people will change for the better, as they will see that it is in their true self-interest to do so.

It would be preferable for all concerned if from now on every competition, where one person is defined as the winner, be interpreted as a learning experience in how to reach excellence. My attitude, if I lose, should be that I'm grateful for the experience, as I intend to find out what mistake I made, and how to do better next time; and if I win, I regard myself as a teacher showing some pointers to a student, who, having good sense, will appreciate the lesson.

Another Social Ethics principle:

SHARED RESPONSIBILITY.

I found this quote by 'anonymous' which may be helpful in understanding what this principle means:

"Just as an athletic team performs better when all players work together as a team rather than as individual stars and benchwarmers, communities and societies perform better when everyone recognizes a shared responsibility for success. People who recognize this are less likely to blame problems on the shortcomings of individuals, more likely to search for the underlying sources of problems, and therefore more likely to find long-term solutions to problems."

Prof. Wright, in the final chapter of his book, NONZERO, is recommending a relationship in which self-interest rationally pursued could lead to cooperation or reciprocal altruism, or the kind of synergy which two companies, about to merge, hope to achieve by such a merger.

He adds: "If self-interested entities are to realize mutual profit two problems typically must be solved: communication and trust."

Thus we now propose a third principle of Social Ethics:

SOCIAL SYNERGY

This refers to that relationship described above, the potential for reciprocal altruism and cooperation. It resembles what physicists call "potential energy" such as when a bowling ball is poised on a cliff ready to be edged off the top of the cliff -- the difference being -- between the physical potential energy and social synergy -- this: when the former is tapped, you've reduced the amount of potential energy in the world; whereas, when the latter is realized, there is more of it. Thanks to Robert Wright for pointing out to us that the implementation of social synergy can result in yet more social synergy.

Now, to sum up, we have three principles -- necessary and perhaps sufficient -- that can serve as a basis for Social Ethics:

Inclusivity

Shared responsibility

Social synergy.

ENDS AND MEANS

Do good ends ever justify bad means?

Some would immediately answer, "Yes." and cite as an example "just wars." [Others wonder if there are any.] How about police entrapment? Many would contend "This is necessary in the U.S.A. because societal progress depends on capturing repeat offenders, and it doesn't violate the Constitution." [..."But," asks the curious child, "Doesn't this just cause more crime?"]. Another example: Would it be okay to rob a bank in order to help get a 'superior design

for civilization' started, in order to introduce a new model society that exemplifies Social Ethics in practice? If robbing the bank implies violence, let me change the situation to one of fraud. If the ones who commit the fraud turns their gains to charitable or sociable purposes does that make it okay? And what if we could use "eugenics" (which most people think of as a bad idea) to isolate a "morality gene" and breed people who always did the ethical thing "naturally"? Would that be the right thing to do?

What's "the right answer," by which is meant here an answer the ethicist may suggest?

The ethical scientist, based upon his research and his science, takes the strong position that *the end virtually never justifies the means* when the means are morally questionable.

First of all, those who claim "the ends-in-view justifies whatever means it takes to reach those ends" fail to define what they mean by the term "justifies." They do not define it. It is just a very vague notion. Whatever they take it to mean, nothing justifies chaos and the causing of needless human suffering.

Secondly, no matter how noble the end-in-view, no matter how worthwhile it would be to achieve it, if the means are immoral they will not get us where we want to go --- except accidentally.

Yes, bad means have on occasion resulted in a good outcome. It is rare, but it has happened. That does not excuse the fact that they were bad means and that we will have to pay for them in some way. For example, a bullet is fired and it performs needed surgery on its target. We still, then, have to live in a world where people are going around firing guns. The next time it is used against a living person it could likely do harm. (Those who know their Ethics will strive to develop nonviolent means of arrest and apprehension of offenders against civil society. They will look for weapons that temporarily

disable instead of kill.)

A bank fraud will probably not bring an ideal society closer. Surely it can't be denied that money might help in spreading the ideas about a better life we could all have if we organized things differently; but the chaos caused by the bank fraud will only get people disturbed -- and disturbed people may not act constructively: they may perpetuate their disturbance by passing it along, thus committing more chaos.

An ethical scientist told me, "I deeply question whether so-called "just wars" are really just. To go to war only makes it more likely that there will be further war in the future, as people become accustomed to the use of violence. They fallaciously think it will solve problems, when it in fact multiplies them."

Every war is fought in the name of some fine-sounding ideal. Every war entails "collateral damage" which is a euphemism for the indiscriminate killing of innocent people. It is out-and-out murder, organized mass-murder, yet the cause is so noble that people want that end to justify the things they are doing in the name of it. Lately, in the television age, the retired colonels and generals come on TV and get the audience involved in the thrill of planning battle scenarios, they brainwash us into thinking it is all a game, as if we were playing with toy soldiers on a playing-field. So they drum up support for the dirty business this way.

The citizen who with ethical sensitivity sees war for what it is will say: "Let's stop rationalizing, as did the cat who, about to eat the mouse, said to it: "I'm doing this for your own good!"

When we in the West go into Iraq, a relatively-stable society at the time, and through our efforts we turn it into 'a failed state,' a breeding-ground for terrorists, a mullah-controlled ally of Iran, governed (if at all) by Sharia Law, which totally suppresses women -- let us stop rationalizing our immorality by saying we are bringing democracy to a people, or we are saving the world from weapons of mass destruction -- especially when we are the ones who possess them. Why don't we really strive to put an end to them by putting an end to the arms traffic in the world? Why aren't we destroying all

the nuclear weapons, and chemical weapons that exist (including our own, of course)?

No, the ends do not justify the means. They never have and they never will. For they cannot. Ethics directs us to always use moral means.

Ends must be compatible with means, and vice versa: if you want stability, use stable means.

If you want a peaceful world, use peaceful means.

If you want love, use loving means.

Try it.

You may be pleasantly surprised by the results you get!

The ethicist agrees. Reporting to me the results of analysis, he concluded:

Means should ideally match the ends-in-view because every means can be looked upon as an end; and every end can be a means to a further end. Thus any given event is BOTH a means AND an end. (For example, an engagement is both an end of casual dating and a means to a wedding.)

If your goal is chaos, use chaotic means, such as violence and destruction. If your goal is stability, use stable means -- such as force. Force and violence, as I see it, are two different things.

When you use force -- as I define the term -- you care about the one you are using it on, and want to rescue that person from worse harm. Examples: restraining someone who is struggling while drowning; or, closing in on and surrounding -- and thus arresting -- someone who is slashing tires, so as to get him into a rehab center -- on the assumption that possibly he is capable of rehabilitation. If the professionals there, after working with him for a while, decide

that he isn't ready to reenter society -- then lock him up until he is ready. [Dr. Kelleher, in his little book, **PROGRESSIVE LOGIC**, cites the work of Dr. Karl Menninger, who in his major work: **THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT**, offered practical alternatives to the current penal system and to the prevailing so-called Criminal Justice System.

{Here is a link where the book by Kelleher is available:

<http://www.empathicscience.org/proglog.html> and here is another perspective on the direction that moral political organization should take:

http://www.radicalmiddle.com/x_lakoff.htm }

“But, argues the critic, “the ends (society’s progress towards peace) justify the means (disregard of individual rights)”.

Societal values do NOT overrule individual values, according to the Science of Ethics.

The science agrees with Kierkegaard's conclusions that the individual must receive top emphasis!!

It is a very pernicious doctrine that would permit the State to dominate over the individual. That view was found in Plato's Republic and is also found in Hegel. It made Nazism possible, and also Stalin's "Communism."

The logic behind seeing the individual as a most precious value to be treasured and loved is this: Intrinsic Values are more valuable to us than Systemic Values. The "state" or "society" are Systemic Values; the individual, when valued properly according to a proof of value science, is Intrinsic Value.

I am not denying that we are social animals, and that it is very difficult to tell where an individual leaves off and society begins; but we disvalue the individual person at our peril.

When we choose Freedom as a value, we will -- if we know our values -- choose the highest kind of freedom, which is our freedom of conscience. And when we develop a sensitive educated conscience we will follow it conscientiously.

We then will be Conscientious Objectors to war. [War is a disvalue (since it means "organized mass-murder in the name of a good cause"), hence, we will want to nullify or neutralize the disvalue, and

one way to do that is to object to it.]

If one wants a more meaningful life he or she will use the scientific understanding in this area rather than turning to Machiavelli for guidance. The choice is up to the individual.

As Wes Hanson has written: “No one can simply read about ethics and become ethical. It’s not that easy. People have to make many decisions under economic, professional and social pressure. Rationalization and laziness are constant temptations. But making ethical decisions is worth it, if you want a better life and a better world.”

THE BEST MORAL ACTIVITY

Kant says it is duty, Aristotle says it is acting in accordance with virtue, and Mill says it is in maximizing our [individual] happiness. The philosophy student asks: Which one is correct?

My response to the student is this: They are all right. I believe Aristotle, Kant, and Mill, if they were around today, would all concur that our most pressing issues today are:

How to clean up and nurture the environment.

How to move those in extreme poverty up into the middle class.

**How to put a stop to human-rights abuses. {See in this connection:
<http://msass.cwru.edu/begun/> and <http://www.peoplesinitiativefordepartmentsofpeace.org/>}**

The moral thing to do is always the compassionate thing to do, We can certainly consider the rules and formalities, with a nod to Kant; we can work continuously on developing our character, acknowledging the contributions of Aristotle; and we can figure out that a more stable, a more peaceful world

to live in, with a more beautiful environment without the eyesores caused by toxic dumps and pollution, will definitely make us happier. Mill would agree that if we work on that we are going in the right direction.

I don't see any conflict among the advice of the three wise men. Just do the loving thing in each situation, and you will be expressing the highest morality. Aim to think and act constructively, and to look for what is good in every situation that arises. Build on that, and you can't go wrong.

Students, whatever the question, love is the answer.

We can now say what “an improving Self-image” means. One’s self-image is improving if it is more inclusive, more responsible, and more adept at creating mutually-beneficial proposals, more inclined to kindness than to asserting one’s own rightness. The highly moral individual would rather be kind than to be “right”; rather perform an act of kindness or of beauty than to argue for the rightness of his/her position.

"You cannot do a kindness too soon because you never know how soon it will be too late."

— Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1843

“What we have done for ourselves alone dies with us; what we have done for others and the world remains and is immortal.”

— Albert Pike, 1885

I close this essay with this quotation from Wayne Dyer:

{Further concepts he offers are found at these web sites:

http://www.innerself.com/Spirituality/becoming_spiritual.htm and also:

<http://www.drwayne/dyer.com>}

"I anticipate a planet at peace — along with health, abundance, and love in my life and in the lives of all others — and I know that it's moving in this direction. I know that for every act of apparent evil, there are a million acts of kindness. That's where I place my attention, and that's what I choose to

give away. By doing so for the larger percentage of my days, my reward is a feeling of being in harmony with purpose."